

A0920

Litigation Collection, 1773-1901 (bulk 1779-1820s)

3 boxes

Processed by Andrea Campetella, 2008

REPOSITORY

Missouri History Museum Archives

P.O. Box 11940

St. Louis, MO 63112-0040

314-746-4510

archives@mohistory.org

DONOR INFORMATION

Accession information for this collection is not available.

SCOPE AND CONTENT NOTE

The Litigation Collection contains papers of court cases tried in St. Louis. The bulk of the collection dates from the French and Spanish colonial period. Among the topics discussed in these cases are assault, theft, debts, the fur trade, land claims and disputes, contract disputes, slander, murder, relations with Indians, and slavery. The collection includes documents in English, French and Spanish. Many of the French and Spanish documents have been translated.

The following pages contain translations of many of the documents in the Litigation Collection.

[Box 1, Folder 1]

[Original in French]

Note for Monsieur Papin Beaufond

The government sued in 1773 for the abuse which had stemmed in Martinique about titles of nobility. It demanded that the colonists make proof of nobility and submit their titles to the sovereign counsel; it published different ordinances to which it was necessary to conform.

It was during this time that one of the Papins from Martinique wrote to the Count of Malestroit to ask him to furnish him with the proofs of the origin of his family.

He produced in support of his reclamation a note establishing his family ties, to which the Count of Malestroit made allusion in the following response which he addressed to the inquirer.

Here is the letter of the Count of Malestroit:

April 23, 1773

Excuse me please, sir, if my response is as late as the letter which you have given me the honor of writing me in Brest. I allow myself very little leeway from the strict regularity in correspondence, but I have so many affairs and business to conduct alone, for, in the last four years in which I lost my mother and have given my resignation which even my friends know well not to count on me. I come back, sir, to the object of the very instructive letter which you write me and of which I wish to thank you in particular since it tells me that I still have charming relatives to know on the other side of the hemisphere, and of a branch that I thought, I admit it, with no offspring and totally annihilated. Be persuaded, please, sir, of the pleasure and of the honor that I will give myself to recognize the people of which you speak to me, so advantageously, and even to enter into particular liaison with them, as soon as they would like to come to France. You can assure them, or even to communicate to them this letter.

I will only be in Brittany for another month or two and I am constrained to return to my home, in Paris, which is my habitual residence since the peace, outside of three or four months each year which I spend on my lands. Thus I am going to, Sir, from the moment of my departure, although overburdened with preoccupations, throw myself with a real eagerness, into research which these gentlemen desire, conjointly with you. They can be assured of all my attentions. I fear only that the complicated woes of various sorts which have happened to my house for more than the space of a century, and of which you must know, render this painful task of long duration. Here are the reasons. At the tragic end of the last Regence of the kingdom (in 1721) to finish off the preceding woes, there descended, on superior orders a commission at the chateau of Pont-Calleck in order to reseize all the papers which could be found there from the League of Spain. This search was done, they tell me, with the greatest severity and during this operation which could not be more severe as they all are, they carried off, without regard nor care, almost without examination, entire cases and trunks filled with only private and particular titles to the house of Guer, Malestroit, Pont-Calleck. The materials of this capture were directly carried and deposited at the chateau of Nantes, and from there, some time after, expedited to Paris, from where, since this time, we have been able to pull out only bits and pieces, often simple bills, presented without guarantee, on common paper. You can see, Sir, that I find myself in the greatest distress, not having had in truth until now, the time to solicit and obtain a general order from the King, in order to permit me to reestablish the totality of these papers and titles, and precisely, which I have forgotten to mention, the entire genealogy of the house of Papin (which I certainly recognize as being ancient and illustrious) as well as all the affairs which are relative to it, these are all part and parcel. I cannot commit myself to anything positive dealing with these French-American gentlemen (which I so sincerely wish to know) that I have not secured and reseized all the trunks and cases of archives stolen from the chateau of Pont-Calleck in 1721, by superior order of the Duke of Orleans, then regent of France. I am going to seriously occupy myself in obtaining this grace and this justice on the part of His Majesty, and as soon as they have decreed and I have recovered this body of materials and of debris, outside of the fact that I will immediately do the scrupulous research of everything concerning the house of Papin, I will be in contact with you, sir, and with the Sirs Papin of Martinique. Please do not doubt, sir, in

particular my respectful sentiments of perfect devotion in which I have the honor to be, sir, your very humble and obedient servant.

Signed: the Count of Malestroit of Pont-Calleck, superior officer of cavalry and of dragons, formerly head of brigade of the gendarmes of ordinance of My Lord the Dauphin.

Today, my address for all time, no matter where I am, is still perfectly safe at Hennebond, in my mansion, or in my chateau of Pont-Calleck.

Provisional response to your note:

The son in question of Marie Papin was precisely the father of the grandfather of my own grandfather. I just verified it this moment. It is true that it's the heiress Jeanne de Kermeno, who is found immediately on my genealogy after Marie Papin, and I recognize both of them as my grandmothers. I remember very well, even though I don't have at this moment my genealogical titles at hand, that toward the beginning of the 16th century, there entered into our house the general heiress of the Papins from Anjou, a very distinguished house actually, and generally recognized as such and the heiress in question was between you and me very rich: she brought us more than 66,000 francs of income from her lands alone, which was prodigious at that time. I still have in my portfolio the details of all the great wealth, but which have been dissected or sold since that time. So here are the facts that I will affirm to without difficulty, sir, when it will be necessary, for the honor and the tranquility of the sirs Papin of America, and I owe by duty this homage to the truth, which while waiting to furnish the entire series of their titles, which probably will justify that they are actually of the same house as that heiress, who was my great-ancestor or great-great ancestor.

I pray you, sir, at your earliest convenience, to please give me the address of these gentlemen and the place where they live on the island of Martinique, the indication of the port by which I should write, if it's necessary to put a stamp. I wish to know the baptismal names and the ages of these gentlemen to know if they are married, what titles and qualities that they take from father to son, since their emigration from this country to overseas. I will be infinitely sensitive to this attention.

Signed: Count Malestroit du Pont-Calleck.

This letter proves that there existed a link of family between the Papins of Brittany and the Papins of the Antilles, and the letter given to the Count of Malestroit should contain the elements.

Thus it is this note that we must find, we should, it seems to me, ask the Papins of Martinique to inform us on this question, since they are the ones who have taken the initiative of this search.

It has been more than a hundred years that these facts have passed. Can we hope to find a trace today? The whole question is there. In any case, we can still ask them to help us and to let us know what they know.

Paris, August 3, 1894

[Documents 2 and 3 as listed on the collection inventory are not translated. Both in French]

[Box 1, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

We, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of Infantry of the regiment of Louisiana, Commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

As a consequence of the affair which happened yesterday at ten o'clock in the morning at the Rivière du Moulin [Mill Creek] between my mulatto woman named Mariane and the negress Lorine, belonging to M. Gaspar Roubien, and the mulatto woman named Louison, belonging to M. Duralde, the mulatto woman named Mariane, having being mistreated by several blows by the said other two, which puts her at risk of death. And as she belongs to us, not wanting, in our rank as master of the said Mariane, and as Commander, to preside over this affair we send it back before Monsieur Devolsey, cavalier of St. Louis, adjunct captain of infantry, of this place in order to inquire about the facts and atrocities which happened between the said Mariane, my mulatto woman, the said Lorine and the said Louison and to order whatever he will judge fitting. In St. Louis, 23 January 1779

Fernando de Leyba

In the matter of the above order, we have done due diligence and made judicial inquiry as follows.

First, we have mandated in appearance before us, Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of St. Louis, adjunct captain of Infantry of the place of St. Louis, the named Fanchon, negress belonging to the widow Dodier, whom, after having had her raise her right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked her if she swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to question her. Answered that yes, that she swore and promised.

Asked what had happened yesterday at the Riviere du Moulin at ten o'clock in the morning between the mulatto woman named Mariane, belonging to M. Don Fernando de Leyba and the named Lorine, negress of M. Gaspar Roubien and the named mulatto woman belonging to M. Duralde and that she should give us an exact account. Answered that yesterday at ten o'clock in the morning, while at the Riviere du Moulin, the mulatto woman named Mariane, belonging to the Commander, came there to do laundry and while washing in the hole cut in the ice, she had had a few words with the mulatto woman of the Sr. Duralde for the place of the hole where she was washing. The two came to a few slaps in the face, and after the affair was finished, the named Lorine, negress of the Sr. Roubien had gotten up from her spot and had [illegible] that the said Mariane who had wanted at the same time to stand up for herself. And that they had come to blows but that the said Lorine, being the strongest, had thrown the said Mariane into the water and would have drowned her if she, the deponent, had not gotten her out. That next the said Lorine had again come to blows with the said Mariane and that she had thrown her into the fire and had given her several blows, that she, the deponent, had gotten the said Mariane out of the fire and that she had done what she could to separate them.

Asked if she had anything else to say in order to shed light on this affair. Answered that no, she had nothing further to say. A reading was made of her deposition. She said that it was true, that she persisted under the oath that she had made and made an X, her ordinary mark, not knowing how to sign, in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses, who signed with us, adjunct Captain as stated above. Given this day, January 23, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Devolsey

mark of X
the said negress Fanchon

J. Labuxiere

Diego Blanco

Next we have mandated in appearance before us, the named Melanie, negress belonging to the Reverend Father Bernard, priest of this parish, whom, after having had her raise her right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked her if she swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to question her. Answered that yes, that she swore and promised.

Asked what had happened yesterday at the Riviere du Moulin at ten o'clock in the morning between the mulatto woman named Mariane, belonging to Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, the named Lorine, negress belonging to Gaspar Roubien and the mulatto woman named Louison, belonging to Monsieur Duralde. And that she should give us an exact account. Answered that yesterday at ten-thirty in the morning or approximately, she was sent to do laundry to the Riviere du Moulin, that the mulatto woman of Monsieur the Commander came there to wash also. And washing in the hole cut into the ice, the mulatto woman Louison said a few words to the mulatto woman Mariane, who answered her in the same terms, giving each other a few slaps in the face mutually, that having finished their dispute, the named Lorine, negress belonging to Gaspar Roubien, who was also there to wash a little farther away from Mariane, mulatto woman came to hit her. That this last [woman] having wished to stand up for herself. The named Lorine had thrown her into the water where she would have drowned without the rescue of the named Fanchon, negress of the widow Dodier, who got her out of peril. That next the said Lorine had pushed the negress Mariane and thrown her into the fire that the washerwomen kept to warm themselves, that the said negress Lorine gave several blows to the said Mariane, by holding her underneath herself, and that it was the said Fanchon, negress of the widow Dodier who tore her away and separated them.

Asked her if she had knowledge that the said Mariane had had disputes or other difficulties beforehand with the said Lorine. Answered that she had not noticed anything and that she had not had any difficulty between them beforehand, that she, the deponent, was in this place from the first.

Asked if she had anything else to say in order to shed light on this affair. Answered that no, she had nothing further to say and that was all that she knew. A reading was made of her deposition. She said that it was true, that she had nothing to change nor add nor subtract, that she persisted under the oath that she had made and made an X, her ordinary mark, not knowing how to sign, in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses, who signed with us, adjunct Captain as stated above. Given this day, January 23, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Devolsey	mark of X	J. Labuxiere	Diego Blanco
	the said Melanie		

Next we have mandated in appearance before us, the named Joseph Coté, boy resident of this post to whom, after having had him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him is she swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to question him. Answered that yes, that he swore and promised.

Asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes. Answered that his name was Joseph Coté, that he was about fourteen years old, that he did not yet have an occupation and that he professed the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman, and was making his residence in this post.

Asked what had happened yesterday at the Riviere du Moulin at ten o'clock in the morning between the mulatto woman named Mariane, belonging to Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, the named Lorine, negress belonging to Gaspar Roubien and the mulatto woman named Louison, belonging to Monsieur Duralde. And that he should give us an exact account. Answered that yesterday at ten o'clock in the morning or around there, he was sent to go to heat up the water for the negress Fanchon, who was doing laundry at the said river, that the named Mariane, mulatto woman belonging to M. the Commander came in order to wash and that while washing, she had some difficulty with the named Louison, mulatto woman belonging to M. Duralde, that their difficulty finished with a few slaps in the face that they gave each other and a few injurious words, that the entire dispute was finished between them when, a moment after the named Lorine, negress belonging to M. Gaspar Roubien, who was washing a little removed from the said Mariane, got up from her place and came at the above mentioned Mariane in order to beat her. This last, having wanted to stand up for herself. Lorine threw herself upon her and plunged her into the water through the ice and that it was the said Lorine, not having had enough, came back at the said Mariane, mulatto woman, and threw her into the fire that they had made to keep the negro washerwomen warm, where she gave her several blows on the stomach and on the head and that the said

Fanchon, negress had run to her to pull her out of the fire with burning skirts, and had removed her from the hands of the said Lorine with a lot of trouble, that he had seen the said Mariane leave, coming back toward the village, crying.

Asked if he had knowledge whether the said Mariane had given a reason to the said Lorine to mistreat her and whether they had had a dispute together before this affair. Answered no, that he had not seen the said Mariane say anything to the said Lorine, nor had noticed if she had had any difficulty with her before this affair.

Asked if he had anything else to say in order to shed light on this affair. Answered that no, he had nothing further to say. A reading was made of his deposition. He said that it was true, that he persisted under the oath that he had made and made an X, his ordinary mark, not knowing how to sign, in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses, who signed with us, adjunct Captain as stated above. Given this day, January 23, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Devolsey	mark of X	J. Labuxiere	Diego Blanco
	Joseph Coté		

We, Don Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of St. Louis, adjunct captain of Infantry of the place of St. Louis.

In the matter of the commission addressed to us by Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, Commander in Chief, and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois. Dated on January twenty-third, this present month, our decree to the Sr. Reynal, surgeon, to examine the person of the named Mariane, mulatto woman belonging to the said Sr. de Leyba, sick from the blows that she has received from the named Lorine, negress of Gaspar Roubien, citizen of this post in St. Louis. Dated the same day, the report in writing of the said Reynal, surgeon of the said day. The petition before the King addressed to the Reverend Father Bernard, priest of this parish in order to give his consent so that his negress could depose judicially, the order to the widow Dodier to declare if she consents for her negress to be questioned, the order of the named Francois Coté for his consent that the deposition of Joseph Coté, his son, all dated the same day, January twenty-third, the sent below of the said orders of the three persons mentioned above, together with the deposition of the named Melanie, negress of the Reverend Father Bernard, priest of this parish and the deposition of Joseph Coté, third witness dated the same day. The whole thing considered and duly examined, we have declared and do declare the said Lorine negress, belonging to Gaspar Roubien and to Mariane Condé, his wife, duly attained and convinced to have wanted to drown the said mulatto woman Mariane by throwing her into a hole cut into the ice where she was doing laundry, from where without the rescue of the named Fanchon, first witness, she would have perished. And not content with this meanness, to have thrown her into a fire, which was nearby to warm the washerwoman and to have given her several dangerous blows from which with the rescue of the said negress Fanchon, the said mulatto woman Mariane could have been burned, having pulled her out with her clothing on fire. Of such bad blows and acts of violence committed meanly by the said Lorine, upon the person of the said Mariane, she has been found abed and gravely ill, as well as it appears by the report of the said Sr. Reynal, surgeon. In reparation of which, we condemn the said Lorine to be beaten with a hundred lashes of the whip, which will be given on the public square of this post, that is fifty lashes today at four o'clock in the afternoon and fifty lashes tomorrow, the twenty-fourth of this month, at the same hour and place as above; we forbid her to commit a second offense in the future as well as toward the said Mariane as toward any other whoever that may be, either by bad words or by acts of violence under pain of a more severe punishment. We order and render the said Gaspar Roubien and Mariane Condé, his wife, in their role as masters of the said Lorine, guarantors and [illegible; owners?] of the said Lorine, mulatto woman, in the [an illegible line] to make a recovery. We condemn them to pay all of the treatments of the surgeon since the first moment of his first examination until the day of her complete recovery and restoration and we charge them in all the charges and expenses of the procedure, which shall be executed. Given in St. Louis in the hearing room, the said day, the twenty-third of January, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

A copy of the present sentence to be signed by the said Roubien.

Devolsey
23 January, 1779

[Box 1, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

We, Don Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of St. Louis, adjunct captain of Infantry of the place of St. Louis.

By virtue of the commission addressed to us by Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, dated today, in order to gather information about the assaults and of the blows that the named Mariane, mulatto woman of Monsieur Leyba, the Lieutenant Governor, admits, from yesterday at the Riviere du Moulin that at ten o'clock in the morning by the named negress and the named Louison, mulatto woman, we order M. Reynal, surgeon, to have himself taken immediately to Government house and examine the said mulatto woman for the blows that she could have received on that date. He will make his report for us to be remitted to whom it may concern. In St. Louis, January 23, 1779

Devolsey

[Box 1, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

We, the undersigned, Antoine Reynal, master of surgery, residing in this post St. Louis, by virtue of the order of Monsieur Don Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of Saint Louis, adjunct captain of infantry of the place St. Louis, dated today, the twenty-third of January, seventeen hundred seventy-nine, we had ourselves taken to government house, into a high bedroom in order to see and examine a mulatto woman named Mariane, belonging to Monsieur de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor of the establishment whom we found lying on her bed, ill with a rather considerable fever, complaining of pain in her right side, as well as her whole body, which she told me was caused by blows that she had received. Having verified in the most exact manner possible, I didn't find any wound on her body other than a contusion situated on her aforementioned right side of around an inch across and a half an inch in length, which appears to me made by a fall on a hard object or by some blunt instrument such as kicks or a stick or other. Not having been able to discover other [contusions] because of the olive color of her skin and having observed yesterday when her master sent for me to treat her that she had a fever and was spitting up blood, I bled her in the foot (causes [illegible] to look for some [illegible]) and put her on a regimen of some [illegible] and I ordered the necessary [treatment?] to stop and prevent accidents which could have arisen. The state of the sick person today, not having at all gotten worse, and although the fever persists, for the present, I don't see that the consequences would be dangerous to her health, except in the case of an accident. In St. Louis, the day and year as stated above.

Reynal.

[Box 1, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

We, Don Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of St. Louis, adjunct captain of Infantry of the place of St. Louis.

By virtue of the commission addressed to us by Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, dated today, we order the widow Dodier to declare to us, in writing below, by the present order if she consents that the negress Fanchon would depose judicially about these facts on which we are going to ask questions. In St. Louis, January 23, 1779

I permit the negress to sign and to make her deposition.

Widow Dodier

[Box 1, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

We, Don Pierre Francois Devolsey, cavalier of the royal and military order of St. Louis, adjunct captain of Infantry of the place of St. Louis.

By virtue of the commission addressed to us by Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, dated today, we beg the Reverend Father Bernard, priest of this parish, to declare to us, in writing below, if he is willing to permit the negress to depose judicially about the facts on which we are going to ask questions. In St. Louis, January 23, 1779

Permission to my said negress to give witness, this January 23, 1779

P. Bernard

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, the captain of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

Sir:

Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post St. Louis, Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie] and François Bonrozier, inhabitants of this post named by all the other inhabitants for motives set forth hereafter in the present petition. Let us take the liberty to expose to you that for the last several years there has appeared in this post the named Louis Mahas, a savage of the nation and who had been a slave formerly in Canada, for the last nearly seventeen years that this savage has been residing in this post and at intervals in the woods, he has not ceased to commit several armed robberies, either by killing the cattle of individuals, by debauching the slaves with drink, insulting the inhabitants, and having even wanted to kill with a gun and taking to all sorts of violence and excesses until threatening that he wanted to scalp Spanish and French heads. As we [illegible] for all the said Louis Mahas, capable to get carried away to murder toward one of us or of our slaves during their work time in the fields, and that it would be dangerous to whomever to correct him if one were to leave him at this post and that he would seek vengeance at the first occasion that he would find, either on us, our children or our slaves, that the said savage, submitting to no subordination besides that he knows several neighboring nations of this post to whom he is capable of giving bad principles. We have recourse to your authority, Sir, so that it may please you to order that the said Louis Mahas be expelled and banished forever from this colony, as a trouble maker of the public peace and having already committed there several disorders and evil spells and armed robberies in addition to the fear of other greater unfortunate happenings that could result. We continue our wishes for your prosperity, in St. Louis, December 30, 1778.

Labuxiere	mark of X
Labbadie [Labadie]	François Bonrozier

In the matter of the present petition, we order that the justifications of the stated facts in the present petition will be made to be ordered to whomever it may concern. In St. Louis, December 31, 1778

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

I, the undersigned, Noel Langlois, I certify that the named Louis Mahas, savage, beforehand slave, and presently calling himself free, was a slave of Monsieur Darpentigny, captain of the troupes of Canada, whom he sold to an English merchant and that the said Louis Mahas killed the said English merchant, his master, that after this fatal blow, he fled into the nations of this continent and next being chased by the said nations, he found refuge in St. Louis where he gave marks to other bad subjects. This is what I assure to whom it may concern, in St. Louis.
January 1, 1779

Noel Langlois

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

I, Joseph Mainville Dechesnes, inhabitant of St. Louis, not knowing how to sign, under my ordinary mark, in presence of the undersigned witnesses, I certify, declare and affirm that at the arrival of M. Cruzat at this post, approximately four years ago, that the named Louis Mahas, passing in the street in front of my yard, with his rifle, at eight o'clock in the morning, the said Louis Mahas, free savage with his own deliberation and without ever having given him a reason to do wrong, but by a pure meanness, fired a gunshot at my cow in the yard while my negress was occupied in tying up the roof. From which gunshot, the cow fell over dead and by the same shot just missed my negress, who having asked him why he had done that, he only responded that he would pay for the cow, that it was for his pleasure, which he never did pay for. And having complained to the Sr. Cruzat and to the Sr. Piernas, this last on his departure, they ordered him to give me a deposit, which he never could find and that was that for my cow. In St. Louis, January 2, 1779.

Ortes, witness

mark of X
Joseph Mainville Deschenes

Louis, witness of the
present document
Lapointe

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

I, the undersigned, Angel Isquierdo, soldier of the garrison of St. Louis of the Illinois, certify that approximately two years ago, at seven o'clock in the evening, before retreat, I went out from the Guard Corps to go behind a building serving as a mill, near our Guard Corps, where I noticed the named Louis Mahas, savage, who was stopped at this place with his tomahawk in hand. As soon as he saw me, he ran toward me and gave me a blow with the tomahawk that I parried with a stick that I had and I disarmed him of his tomahawk and to get rid of him, I was obliged to give him a blow on the left arm, of which he still has the mark on his left arm of five inches or about higher than his wrist. So the said Mahas said to me "You hurt me." I answered him "Why are you attacking me? You were asking for it." He replied to me "That's true, I was wrong" and he went away with saying anything else. That's what I affirm true in St. Louis. January 2, 1779

Angel Isquierdo

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

I, Francois Villet St. Cloux the undersigned, in the presence of witnesses to authorize my signature, I certify that the first days in the month of December, finding myself in the Illinois River to hunt, the named Louis Mahas, being near the camp of the named Honoré, the said Louis Mahas, having taken his rifle, said that he wanted to kill some Frenchmen and fired a gunshot with the idea of killing, but I, St. Cloux, having stood up to the gunshot, he didn't hit anyone and seeing this, the said Mahas, who had a bad idea, I got help for myself from a few hunters of the river, who were found present there, we tied him up with thongs. The next day, having untied himself, he kept a moody silence and came back down with me to St. Louis. He lodged at my house, where, having arrived he went up to the attic and let down his warrior braid, saying "for a long time I have dressed in the French way, I'm going to dress myself as a warrior and do my hair" that this same day the guard came to arrest him at my house by the sergeant of ordnance that I know this savage runner of neighboring nations capable of bearing himself to regrettable extremes for the citizens of this post and even against the Spanish and that it is necessary for the security of the village that he be expelled from this post, assuring myself, Monsieur Lieutenant Governor, that he was a man with very bad thoughts and that if released from jail, he won't be a long time without avenging himself and committing several fatal effects in this post or elsewhere. That is why I give this present attestation to you, Sir, the Lieutenant Governor in order to serve and value that which we claim, in St. Louis, January 2, 1779

Francois Villet

To bear witness of the present attestation
1779 Papin

Serraute, witness of the signature of
Villet

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in Spanish]

Inventory of the belongings of the free savage named Luison el Majá [Louis Mahas] who is imprisoned in this jail, given to me by the order of the Commander in Chief of these parts.

The following things:

First	One so-called Fuller rifle with half stock
	One [illegible] with its bag
11 <i>libras</i>	Some quantity of bear butter, about ten jars
5 <i>libras</i>	Seven deer pelts, and one bear pelt, not cured
10 <i>libras</i>	One [illegible] from Indiana
	One cape of old white cloth
	One wooden [illegible] and a knife
9 <i>libras</i> and 8 <i>sueldos</i>	Owed by Mr. Reinar, for 47 pounds of meat
10 <i>libras</i>	Idem by Mr. Berdá, for 50 pounds of meat
	One straw bag with various knick-knacks of savages

I declare, by my signature below, to have received all the things detailed in this inventory, to present them whenever the Commander in Chief orders so.

San Luis de Illinois, January 23, 1779.

Diego Blanco

[Box 1, Folder 3]

[Original in French]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, the twenty-eighth of January, seventeen hundred seventy-nine. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part, having been informed today at eight o'clock in the morning by Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison of St. Louis that the named Louis Mahas, held in our prisons of this post in order to be sent under orders from Monsieur the Governor General, escaped last night from the said prison, and presented us the irons that the said Mahas had on his feet, which appeared to us to have been cut with a file. Which has obligated us at this instant to take ourselves to the prison where, being accompanied by the said Sergeant Blanco, by Louis Richart and Philippe Sirogane, soldiers of the garrison, we noticed that the said Mahas had escaped through a fracture which had been made in the wall of the said prison, below the level of the earth, of around one foot wide by one foot and a half high and that the stones which were torn out of there with some instrument of a hard body, which obligated us to have a search made of the said Mahas without having been able to discover any vestige until the present. This is why we have made up the present oral statement to serve and value that which we claim and have signed the said day and year.

Diego Blanco

Philippe Sirogane
Fernando de Leyba

Louis Richart

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana and Lieutenant Governor of the establishments of the Illinois and their dependencies.

Claude Tinon takes the liberty of explaining to you [line illegible] before, farmer of the Prairie Catalan, the quantity of one hundred sixty-four *livres* of flour for the rent of a piece of land, which the [illegible] rented to him three years ago, plus seven days of man-hours to do woodworking and carpentry, two days of a team and a plow, a pair of iron door supports and four hinges and a cloth bag, the whole thing lent by the plaintiff, such a request that the plaintiff has been able to make to the said Meynard. He has always sought to put distance between himself and his obligations and he retired to the mill of Sr. McCarty with his wife. As the said Meynard takes away his effects little by little to the other side of the river [the east side of the Mississippi, under English jurisdiction] and that he has only a little wheat left in his barn and two pigs which he could take away, the whole thing without paying the plaintiff. He has recourse to your justice, Sir, that it may please you to order that what remains be seized until the plaintiff be paid. He will continue his wishes for your prosperity. In St. Louis, January 11, 1779

Tinon

In the matter of the present petition presented to us by Claude Tinon, farmer of the Catalan Prairie, versus the named Louis Meynard, also a farmer, at present on the English side of the river.

We name the said Labuxiere to do the temporary seizure of the leftover effects by the said Meynard to the said place of the Catalan Prairie. He will go with this intention to take himself to the said place in order to do there an inventory of the above mentioned goods and will leave them under the charge and guard of the said Delor, whom we establish as guardian and depository of the above mentioned effects to represent us according to the inventory which will be made of it by the said Sr. Labuxiere, when he will be required by us. We forbid him to seize them for himself, under pain of response. Given in St. Louis, January 12, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

[This document includes a second copy of the latter of the two paragraphs, which reads "In the matter of the present petition..."]

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

In the year seventeen hundred seventy-nine, the thirteenth day of the month of January, at 8 o'clock in the morning by virtue of the order of the said Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part, I, Joseph Labuxiere in order to witness the second order, dated today, took myself to the Catalan Prairie in order to make the temporary seizure of the effects belonging to Jean-Baptiste Meynard, farmer, moving to the English side of the river, to insure the payment of what he owes to the said Claude Tinon, farmer of the said [illegible] place, I was accompanied by the said M. Delor, principal farmer of the said place and Etienne Lalande, also a farmer, we were taken into a barn belonging to Monsieur Loisel, the named Louis Meynard, son of Baptiste Meynard showed us a pile of wheat in sheaves that the two witnesses estimated at twenty measures containing three bushels each of wheat after it was beaten or approximately half belonging to the said Louis Meynard, son, plus two big pigs, of which a male and a female, which is all we found belonging to the said Baptiste Meynard. And which effects conforming to the orders of the said Mr. Lieutenant Governor, I wished to charge the said Sr. Delor. He refused to give in, answering that he was not the guardian, and said as his answer that these effects were not portable to his house and that he could not. In response, not wanting to mix himself in with this in any way. In the matter of such a refusal, I charged the said Louis Meynard, junior, with it in order to represent it when required as depository of good of justice except for the risk of fire of the barn and we signed the said day and year.

X Mark of Louis
Meynard

X Mark of the said Lalande
LaBuxiere

Delor

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In Spanish]

To Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana and Lieutenant Governor of the Western Part of Illinois.

Sr.

Juan Bautista Menar [Jean-Baptiste Meynard], before you with due respect, says that he was on the 16 of this month in the Catalan Place [Prairie Catalan], where he has some property, and where he found out the news that everything had been seized under the orders of Your Honor, as a result of a petition presented by Mr. Tinó [Tinon], a resident of the said place. He [Tinon] asks, Sr., to be paid for the installation of the doors he did at the house of this petitioner, a job for which he has been paid in kind, with a fishing-net and a sow. Also [he asks to be paid] for a piece of land that he had rented to Luis Menan [Louis Meynard], son of this petitioner, to sow four *minots* [bushels] of wheat; having told Your Honor that this supplicant had rented the said land. There is no truth in most of the other things that his petition says (as this supplicant will demonstrate through many witnesses). I request that Your Honor do justice with the full force of the laws, and if this petitioner says something that is not true, he will suffer the penalties that you impose, and in case contrary the said Tino [Tinon] might be sentenced to pay the just dues and my property might be returned to me, a grace that I await from your renowned justice.

San Luis de Illinois, January 18, 1779

Mark of Juan Bautista Menar

[In French]

In the matter of the petition of the named Tinon against the named Meynard on the date of the eleventh of this month, our decree of the twelfth of the said month together with the temporary seizure made of the effects of the said Meynard to insure the payment of the claimed debt of the said Tinon. On the date of the thirteenth of this month the response of the said Meynard to the demands of the said Tinon [illegible] derogation of all these claims of the said Tinon. The whole thing seen and examined, we order the said Tinon to make proof in writing or by witnesses of the said demands against the said Meynard within three days, failing which the temporary seizure will become permanent until ordered by us. Ordered in St. Louis, the 18 of January, 1779

deLeyba

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

I, the undersigned, certify to have seen working the Sr. Tinon in the house of the Sr. Meynard, as much
woodworking as carpentry. In St. Louis, January 20. 1779

Delor

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

I certify to have rented eight *arpentes* of land for the sum of two hundred thirty-seven *livres* of flour to the Sieur Etienne Lalande who paid me. Given January 21, 1779

Delor

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

I certify to have seen [illegible] by M. Meynard to the Sieur [illegible] two and a half measures containing three bushels each of wheat for some land that he had bought from him two pairs of iron door supports and a little bolt left. The year seventy-six, the second of May of the same year. Given January 13, 1779.
Delor

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

At the post of St. Louis the twenty-first of January, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Before us, Don Fernando de Leyba, Captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of said part. There was present the person of Louis Meynard, and after having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts about which we were going to question him; he answered yes, that he swore it and promised.

Asked him if he had knowledge of the affair between the said Tinon and the said Meynard, his father, concerning the affair which treats his request of which we read to him to discover that of which is in question. Answered that yes, he had knowledge of all that the said request treated.

Asked him if he knew in what way this affair had happened and that he would give us an account. Answered that it is true that his father had asked to rent some land from the said Tinon, but that they had not agreed on a price and that his father had been for a little while in Canada, and that upon his return, the said Tinon asked him for the rent of the land, and that since there was no fixed rental other than a verbal agreement to pay the same price that the said Lalande was supposed to pay to Delor, the former owner. And that he would pay a proportional share with regards to the day, the men, and the plow, he knew that Tinon had worked but that he didn't know the quantity of time and that as for the iron door supports, when his father was in Canada and during his absence the said Tinon had asked him about the two supports, he had answered "I don't know if my father owes them to you or not, but I'm going to see if I have some to give to you." That this affair remained thus until the arrival of his father, when he asked him if he owed the door supports to Tinon, he answered that he in no way owed them and that as for the hinges, he owed him two that he offered to give him and that he was offering to give them back immediately, as for the cloth bag, the said Tinon had looked at it and chose out of five that he offered to him and that besides he had offered to the said Tinon ninety-seven *livres* of flour, to pay for the rental of the land, that he didn't know if this was the exact payment or if he owed him something further, that he knew that his father gave Tinon a sting ray and a little sow about six months old to pay back what he did in the house.

Asked him if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair. Answered that he had nothing further to say.

A reading was made of the deposition. He said that it was true and that he continued under the oath that he had made, and declared not to know how to sign his name, made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, witness of the assembled who have signed with us, Lieutenant Governor, Fernando de Leyba.

Fernando de Leyba

X mark of Louis
Meynard, son

Labuxiere
Diego Blanco

[Box 1, Folder 4]

[Original in French]

St. Louis, of the Illinois, the twenty-first of January, seventeen hundred seventy-eight

In the matter of the certificate of the said Delor of the twenty-first of this month, by which it appears that he rented eight acres of land to the named Lalande for two hundred thirty-seven *livres* of wheat, and that he made no mention of the quantity of land that Tinon rented to Meynard, as we have enjoined it to him in our decree of yesterday and have notified him and finding that the delay would be too long if we had to send out a second order to the said M. Delor in order to have a clarification asking him by our first decree that the two parties Tinon and Meynard, they have agreed upon five acres to be paid proportionally to which the said Delor rent to the named Lalande, the assessment made keeping the proportion. It appears that the five *arpentes* of land rented to Meynard have yielded one hundred forty-seven *livres* and a half of wheat, which account the two parties persist in acknowledging Tinon in his demand in his request of the eleventh of this month and Meynard in his responses in the derogation of the eighteenth of this same month. And to which the said Tinon signed and the said Meynard made his ordinary mark, the same day and year.

X Mark of Meynard
Fernando de Leyba

Tinon

In St. Louis of the Illinois, January twenty-second, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Between Claude Tinon, farmer of the Catalan Prairie, plaintiff on the one hand against Jean-Baptiste Meynard, also a farmer, defendant, on the other hand. In the matter of the petition of the said Tinon tending to the said request toward the said Meynard, dated January eleventh of the present month, our decree at the bottom stating that the temporary seizure will be done of the effects of the said Meynard for the security of requests of the said Tinon, has precipitated the departure of the said Meynard for the English side of the river on the said eleventh of this same month, the temporary seizure effected by the said Labuxiere that we have named as a matter of course, this effect dated the thirteenth of the said month, the petition directed toward the said Meynard, the said dispensation of the demands of the said Tinon of the eighteenth of this month, our decree below stating that the said Tinon will provide justifiable proof of the demands dated the same day, notifying the said Tinon, by certificate of the Sr. Delor which says that he simply saw working the said Tinon at the house of the said Meynard on the twentieth of the said month, the judicial deposition of Louis Meynard, son of the said Jean-Baptiste Meynard, defense witness, produced by the said Tinon who declares that his father had rented land from Tinon without designating the quantity and that he paid him for his father eighty *livres* of flour. Declaring that he had not made [illegible] the amount of the rent or if he told that he gave Tinon a sting ray, a little sow of six months for his work which he supposedly made to him in the same way the cloth bag asked for at the bench, admitted verbally by Tinon and as for the iron door supports which he doesn't know he [illegible] to him by his father [illegible]. And after that, Delor gave to him the said deposition yesterday. Our order to Delor, farmer of the Prairie Catalan in order to inform us how much land he rented to the named Lalande and how much he paid him in rent and the quantity of land that Tinon rented to Meynard [illegible] yesterday. Delor certified it, which declares to have rented eight *arpentes* of land to Lalande for two hundred thirty-seven *livres* of flour without declaring the quantity which Tinon rented to Meynard. The presentation of Tinon and Meynard today in the court chamber where they have come to agreement on five *arpentes* of land, and the evaluation made by us of the rent which these five *arpentes* of land could produce amounting to one hundred seven and a half *livres* of flour.

In the matter of whatever Delor paid to Lalande for eight *arpentes*, the signed act of the two parties this day. The entire thing considered and examined we have condemned and do condemn the said Meynard to deliver without delay to the said Tinon the quantity of fifty and a half *livres* of flour remaining from the one hundred seven and a half *livres* which we have valued the rental of the said land, having already been paid ninety-seven *livres*,

besides remitting with no delay the hinges which his son offered to Tinon, according to the deposition, we forbid him very expressly to cross over to the opposite side of the river. And the pigs have been put under the watch of Louis Meynard, his son, that he satisfies the said Tinon and that he has never ordered us to reject the said Tinon from all other demands mentioned, by the petition against Meynard. Lack of sufficient proof and without having been able to produce any piece of evidence nor accounts [illegible] from Meynard and as several years have passed without settling their accounts [illegible] let us put to this regard the two parties out of court and out of trial for all repetitions and demands set forth by their petitions, let us condemn Tinon to pay for all cost and expenses of the trial, which will be executed [illegible] in the chamber of the government in St. Louis, the twenty-second of January, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 5]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry of Louisiana, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of said part.

Sir:

Joseph Labuniere, citizen of this post, takes the liberty of exposing to you that you have had the goodness to accord to him a permit, together with the named Vivarenne, last Spring, for the post of Kans [the Kansa Indians] and that in order to prevent that the traders and hunters do harm to each other and spoil the trade with the nations, you have, Sir, published an order so that each one keeps himself within the limits of his permit, and is forbidden to bring in merchandise without having a post conceded by your permit. The plaintiff had been alerted by Jean Marie Cardinal, trader with the Little Osage, that the named Louis Beaudouin to whom you have graciously accorded a permit to hunt down the Missouri had, against your orders, entered the river of the Kans [Kansa], according to said Vivarenne with nine hundred *livres* of merchandise for trade, and that he had seven packets of buckskins, beaver, and other skins, in spite of the opposition of said Vivarenne, associate of the plaintiff and that he had taken them downriver to the post of the Missouri and remitted them to his brother, a trader, from this post to other traders of the said place for animals [illegible] with theirs. And the plaintiff was defrauded by this means of the little profit that he could have made in this trade.

The said plaintiff has just learned that the boats on the Missouri are at Fort St. Charles [Fort San Carlos, at the north end of the village of St. Louis] stopped by the wind, and that they should arrive tonight in St. Louis. It is in these circumstances, Sir, that the plaintiff resorts to your justice to reprimand the insubordination of said Louis Beaudouin, who, in trading his seven packets of furs in the post that you have accorded to the plaintiff, has violated the orders that you have so wisely made known to all the hunters and traders of the Missouri River.

The said Cardinal alerted the plaintiff that the witnesses were the named Valée, Joseph LeProvençal, the named St. Michel, Giles Langlais and the named Varoquier, this last the associate of said Beaudouin, who attempted to oppose the procedure of said Beaudouin but [illegible]. Consequently, Sir, the plaintiff resorts to your goodness, so that it may please you to mandate an appearance of the said witnesses to declare what they know. And in the case that the said traders of the Missouri post be loaded with the packets of the said Beaudouin, you may order them to remit to the plaintiff the quantity that he could have traded in the post of the plaintiff, who continues his wishes for your prosperity, in St. Louis, February 20, 1779.

Labuniere

In the matter of the present, we order that all pelts that the named Beaudouin, *dit l'Habitant* trader of the Missouri post, will be brought down to St. Louis, and will be put in the hands of the widow Chouteau, who will take charge of them as trustee until we order otherwise. St. Louis, February 20, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

In the matter of the [illegible] of the pelts which were remitted by the named Beaudouin to Dame Chouteau, dated the [illegible], we order that he will be examined before us about the facts mentioned in the present petition. St. Louis, February 22, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, twenty second of February, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Information. Don Fernando de Leyba, capitain of infantry, of the regiment of Louisiana, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

Report

We have mandated in appearance before us Jean Marie Cardinal, trader of the Missouri post to whom after having had him raise his right hand, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts of which we are going to question him. He answered yes that he swore and promised.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Jean Marie Cardinal, that he was forty-eight years old, and that he was a trader by trade, professing the religion of catholic, apostolic and roman.

He was asked how it was that the named Louis Beaudouin, hunter of the Missouri, had been in the river of the Kans, and [he was asked] to give an exact account of what he knew.

He answered that he learned that the named Louis Beaudouin, hunter, had entered into the river of the Kans with merchandise from the named Joseph, *dit* le Provencal, hunter, the named St. Michel, the named Giles Langlais, and the named Valée, *engagé* [hired hand] of the said Beaudouin. That they had told him that said Beaudouin had traded in this river with the savages Kans, for the quantity of approximately six or seven packets of buckskins. That after having made this trade, the said Beaudouin had gone downriver to the Missouri post to rejoin his brother who was there trading. And that he, the deponent, being informed by the above mentioned demands of the maneuver of the said Louis Beaudouin, and knowing the orders that the Lieutenant Governor had given about this subject, he believed it was his duty to alert the said Labuniere, associate of the named Vivarenne, trader of the river of the Kans.

He was asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that he had nothing else to say, and that this was all that he knew.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, that he still remained under the oath that he had made. Declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark.

In the presence of Jean Baptiste Ortes, carpenter, and Sieur Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses who have with us the Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Diego Blanco

mark of said +

Jean Marie Cardinal

Ortes, witness

Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated in appearance before us Michel Joseph Peron, *dit* Provencal, *engagé* of the named St. Michel, who after having raised his right hand and made the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him. He answered yes that he swore and promised.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was called Michel Joseph Peron, *dit* Provencal, was thirty-four years old, professed the job of *voyageur* [trader with Indians] and exercised the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion.

He was questioned as to with whom he went upriver in the Missouri and at what place he wintered over.

He answered that he went upriver as an *engagé* of the named St. Michel and that they had been hunting in the Missouri, and from there he had [illegible] continuing their hunt as far as thirty leagues [90 miles] into the river of the Kans.

He was asked if he had knowledge that the named Louis Beaudouin, hunter of the Missouri, entered the river of the Kans with trading goods, and if he had traded with the savages of this said river, and that he [was asked to] make an exact account of whatever he knew.

He answered that, being in the said river, hunting with the named St. Michel and Gille, his *bourgeois* [bosses], the named Louis Beaudouin, hunter, was also there with the named Vallée, his *engagé*, and the trading goods, he traded to the knowledge of him, under deposition, with the savages, 14 years and even, according to what Beaudouin's *engagé* named Valée told him, for the quantity of six hundred *livres* of skins. Having made this trade, the said Beaudouin went downriver to the post of the Missouri to rejoin his brother, a trader of this post, which he, the deponent, went downriver at the same time with Le Bourgeois to the Little Osage [?] found Sieur Cardinal to whom the deponent, as well as the other hunters, have told of the maneuvers of the said Beaudouin. He was asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that he had nothing further to say except that while in the river of the Kans, the deponent as well as the other hunters had said to the said Beaudouin that it was evil to trade these pelts with the Kans, because it might very well not have benefited him in any case.

A reading was made to him of his deposition, he said that it was true and that he was still under the oath that he had made. Declaring that he did not know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark.
In the presence of Jean Baptiste Ortes, carpenter, and Sieur Diego Blanco sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses who have, together with us Lieutenant Governor, signed these present [documents] this day and year.

Diego Blanco

mark of +
Michel Joseph Peron

Ortes, witness

Next we have mandated in appearance before us, Louis Beaudouin, implicated in the affair in question. He raised his right hand and made the sign of the cross, after which we asked him if he swore to God and promised to the King to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked him his name, age, profession, and what religion he professed.

He answered that his name was Louis Beaudouin, that he was around twenty-six years old, that he was a *voyageur* by trade, and that he professed the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked him what type of permit he had when he left this post in order to go hunting in the month of September.

He answered that he left with the named Varoquier, who had a permit to go hunting and to buy slaves.

We asked him if he saw the permit and if the two things that he cited could be specified. He answered that he had not seen the latter but that Varoquier had told him about it.

We asked if he did not have knowledge of the ordinance published on the church's door a little time before the departure of the *voyageurs*, which forbids trading in any post without being furnished with a permit by the Commander.

He answered that he had knowledge of this.

We asked him why, having knowledge of this ordinance and not having more than one permit to go hunting, he went into the river of the Kans in order to trade with the savages of this nation.

He answered that he entered into the river of the Kans with the named Varoquier in order to hunt, and from there to buy slaves. That having been before in their river and above the merchants, they found the savages who wanted to pillage them, and who told them to trade, about which they refused. So the savages told them that they were going to pillage them, upon which seeing that they preferred to trade rather than to let themselves be pillaged, at the risk of giving the pelts to the merchant and that after they had traded with them they [the savages] went downriver to join the merchants.

We asked him why he was [violating?] the sworn statement he had made by saying that he had been forced to trade while he is [illegible] by the declaration of the witnesses that he did business by his own good will, in spite of the representations that were made at the time by Sieur Vivarenne, trader of the said nation, making him see the wrong that he would do in doing this prohibited business.

He answered that after having made the trade, he went downriver to find the merchants, where Sieur Vivarenne was. That he [Vivarenne] asked him if he had traded, the deponent answered that yes, of course he had traded, and offered to give him [Vivarenne] the pelts that he had if the same quantity of loot that he had given to the savages was returned to him. And that Vivarenne replied to him, if you traded ten or twelve packets, that could do me harm, but that if you are telling me that you traded six or seven, that would not do me harm.

We asked why he said that he was going to do slave business, as he must not ignore that such business is prohibited and forbidden, the ordinances having been published before, so that no one could be ignorant, which proves that he had intended to use the merchandise that he had carried uniquely for the trade, and that they were useless for the hunt.

He answered that he had no merchandise for the slave trade.

We asked for what sum he had equipped himself, in what store, and how much this sum had produced in pelts.

He answered that he had equipped himself for the value of four or five hundred *livres*, from the store of Mme Chouteau and elsewhere, and that [such sum] had produced six packets of buckskin and approximately a half packet of [tainted?] skins.

We asked if he had something further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, that he had nothing further to say. Except that it was Varoquier who induced him to do all this.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was true and that it was the same as what he heard, and that he was still under the oath. He made his ordinary mark, not knowing how to write or sign.

In the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison and Luis Richard, soldier of the said garrison as legal witness, together with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this present on said day and year.

+

Diego Blanco	mark of Louis Beaudouin,	Luis Richard
	Deponent	

Sentence

In St. Louis of the Illinois. February 23, 1779.

Joseph Joseph Labuniere, citizen of this post, associate of the said Vivarenne, trader of the river of the Kans, plaintiff in the matter of the confiscation of the peltry,

Versus the named Louis Beaudouin, hunter of the Missouri River, defendant.

In the matter of the petition regarding the peltry, dated the twentieth of this month, that the said Louis Beaudouin has intruded [illegible] of the published orders and of our notices in the river of the Kans, where he brought some merchandise, traded with the savages of the post, which were accorded to the said Vivarenne, his associate, and to the named Montardy. In which trade the said Beaudouin took away six or seven hundred *livres* of pelts from one proprietor of the said post, resulting in that the pelts which the said Beaudouin traded in the said river have made him [illegible] our decree below of the said petition of the twentieth of said month, resulting in that all the pelts which said Beaudouin took downriver on the Missouri will be remitted to a warehouse, in the charge of Dame Chouteau, the deposition of two witnesses of twenty cases [?] covering what Louis Beaudouin declared was in the said river where he traded for six to seven hundred *livres* of pelts, and that he made this trade in spite of warnings that several other hunters made to him. The declaration of said Louis Beaudouin of the same day which admits [illegible] entered the river of the Kans, in order to go to the heights of this river to trade in slaves and when, on the way, the savages forced him to trade his merchandise, which he traded for six hundred *livres* of good pelts and fifty *livres* or thereabouts of [tainted?] skins at two *livres* by sight.

In the matter of [illegible] order of said Don Pedro Piernas, previous commander of this post, made in the name of the King on June 30, 1771, published and posted on the doors of the dependencies of his Catholic majesty in the Illinois, which expressly forbids the trade of red slaves in this part of Missouri and to intrude on the lands of the Royal Majesty, under pain of confiscation and punishment, following the exigencies of the Crown together the orders that we have made, published, and posted at the post of St. Louis, this seventh of last August before all the traders and hunters for the Missouri and tributary streams, which expressly [forbids] to every trader and hunter to intrude with merchandise and to trade in any post other than that accorded to them, under pain of confiscation of pelts, merchandise, and of exemplary punishment.

Having examined the entire matter, and considering the admission that the said Beaudouin made that he was going to trade slaves in this part as an insubordination to the King's and this government's orders, this admission aggravates more strongly his crime and merits a punishment which will impact on the future, in addition to the declaration that he made to have traded pelts in the post which was prohibited to him, against our order cited above, which he declares not to have been unaware of.

As reparation for all of the above, we have declared and do declare said Louis Beaudouin well and duly arraigned and having acted by contrary means and seized by insubordination to the orders of the king and of the government. In consequence, we have condemned and do condemn him by means of confiscation to lose the six hundred twenty-five *livres* of pelts that he traded in the river of the Kans, which we have put into a warehouse upon his arrival. About such confiscation, we judge that a third [be given] as royal taxes, amounting to two hundred eight *livres*, and the other two thirds, amounting to four hundred seventeen *livres*, [be given] to the said Labuniere, Vivarenne, and Montardy, who are supplied with our permits for the trade of the river of the Kans, giving one hundred nine *livres* to each one of them. In addition [Beaudouin is condemned to] fifteen days of prison and [paying] all of the cost of the trial which will be executed, given in the chamber of the government in St. Louis of the Illinois, February 23, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 5]

[Original in French]

Inventory of the peltries which was given to me by order of Monsieur de Leyba, coming from the confiscation done upon Louis Beaudouin.

155 pounds of beaver @ 3e	_____	465
15 pounds of beaver @ 3e	_____	45
392 buckskins	_____	392
13 pounds of mink skins	_____	6.10
Total: nine hundred eight <i>livres</i> and ten <i>sous</i>	_____	908.10

Having seen that I paid by order of Monsieur Leyba to Madame Chouteau for the ticket of hunting equipment from the said Beaudouin and below _____ 234

At the sign of the king

A third of the confiscation _____ 208

The expenses of justice _____ 70

To Vivarenne, his part of the confiscation _____ 139

To Montardy _____ 139

To Sieur Labuniere _____ 139

[Total] _____ 929

Everywhere I paid in advance twenty *livres* and ten *sous* which are to be reimbursed to me [illegible] ten *livres* by Mr. Vivarenne, and ten *livres* by Mr. Montardy. I beg Mr. Leyba to order that this reimbursement be made to me by the said Mr. Montardy and Vivarenne, certifying the present account veritable in St. Louis, the February 24, 1779. Labuniere

In the matter of payments made by Mr. Labuniere of expenses mentioned and the receipts of Mr. [Josty?] to whom he remitted the peltries as much as for the royal taxes, Vivarenne as well as for Montardy, together the note that he paid to Dame Chouteau for said Beaudouin and attached the receipt of said Mr. Labuniere for his part of the confiscation, which he had remitted to us. In consequence, we well and validly discharge the said Sieur Labuniere of the said sum of nine hundred eight *livres* ten *sous* in pelts which were deposited into his hands by our orders, belonging to the said Beaudouin and [illegible] by virtue of our sentence dated yesterday and as it appears that the account of the other part that he paid twenty *livres* ten *sous* too much, we order to each Mr. Montardy and Vivarenne to reimburse him ten *livres* five *sous*.
St. Louis, February 24, 1779.

We the undersigned and undermarked certify to having received each one the sum of one hundred thirty nine *livres* in pelts for the share which we were owed from the confiscation of named Beaudouin, the remaining three shares add up to the sum of four hundred seventeen *livres* of which we hold Monsieur Leyba free and clear and all others. In St. Louis, June 28, 1779

Labuniere
For my share

Montardy

mark of
+ Vivarenne

[Box 1, Folder 6]

[Original in French]

Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of infantry, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

Sir:

Silvestre Labadie takes the liberty of informing you that since last year, he noticed that Mr. Marié, his neighbor, had encroached onto his land by fourteen feet on one end and by about six feet on the other end. The first proprietor of the land of Mr. Marié had planted six fruit trees and a grape vine on this encroachment, which bore a lot of fruit. The plaintiff finds himself entirely troubled by the want of his land [and] has begged

Mr. Marié to move his fence back, which he did at the behest of the plaintiff, and out of pure meanness [he] cut and tore out the said trees after his fence [illegible], despite the supplications and pleas that the plaintiff made to him. As the trees cause harm and notable damage to the plaintiff, that the fruit trees are [bordering?] the land and in addition cause sharp pain to the owner, and as such assaults are not permitted but expressly forbidden by the laws, the plaintiff has recourse to you, sir, so that it may please you to apply all the vigor of the laws, and to condemn him to [pay for] the damages that he is causing to the plaintiff, and for expenses as well.

In St. Louis, March 6, 1779. Silvestre Labadie

A copy sent to Mr. Marié, ordering him to respond within three days.

St. Louis, March 6, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

Today, the [illegible] of March, 1779, I, Francois Demers, bailiff in the royal jurisdiction of St. Louis of Illinois, notify and give copy of the petition and decree of the plaintiff to Mr. Alexis Marié, in St. Louis the said day and year.

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 6]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry, of Louisiana, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

Sir:

Alexis Marié takes the liberty of responding before you to the demand of Mr. Labadie, which was signed on the 6th of this month, by stating that it is painful for him to see himself undergoing a trial, the route of which is as oblique as that which Mr. Labadie takes in order to bring a lawsuit, the facts of which, reported by Mr. Labadie to you, bear no relationship to the specifics that have taken place and exist presently. The encroachment of which Mr. Labadie complains is real, but this petitioner has no part in it. As the land was sold to him in that state, he was within his rights to remove the trees that are the subject of the trial, since they were part of the land that was requested from this petitioner. Also, Mr. Lachance, first proprietor of Mr. Labadie's land, had never intended to sell to Mr. Conand, second owner of the land which [illegible] encroached, and that the said Conand never sought the slightest problem with this petitioner, who [in turn] never put the slightest obstacle in returning to Mr. Labadie the land that he says was encroached, and these last days when it was a question of drawing the property line, [Mr. Labadie said that] if this petitioner did not pull out these trees he would remove them and cut them down, that the trees were old and were good for nothing. Besides, this petitioner removed the trees when he moved the fence back. And not after the fence was moved, as Mr. Labadie reports so incorrectly.

The said Labadie boldly reports that this petitioner tore out a grape vine, while it was he himself who cut it, and that there was only a hole or a stump remaining when the fence was moved. Besides this grape vine was withered and never bore any fruit.

The said Labadie falsely reports that he forbade this petitioner to tear out his trees, he does not admit that he is lacking in subordination and that he has no defense and that the orders of Monsieur the Lieutenant Governor, which must be followed and respected in this post, as well as the defenses of the Mr. Labadie, the petitioner believes [illegible] than to stop there.

The said Labadie must remember the proposition, as unjust as indiscrete, which he made to this petitioner, by telling him that if he [Marié] would give him an apple tree, he [Labadié] would give him six or even twelve [apple trees] that he would take from the orchard of Mr. Laclede, [a proposition] which the plaintiff refused, and which proves how little niceness there is in Mr. Labadie. He himself cut one of the trees which was in the [way of the] partitioning fence, discovered by the said Marié. The said Labadie said several times to the judge that if it were not for these trees, which he would cut down because of the shade they gave to his garden, which was harmful to the vegetables, which proves that he [Marié] never acted with meanness, as the said Labadie said in his petition.

The petitioner believed that to remove the said trees was even more within his rights, as the said Lachance and the said Conand, who were the previous owners of the land of the said Labadie, had said that the trees never belonged to them, and that they had never had the least difficulty in that regard, which the said Mr. Lachance hopes to state when called [to testify], along with Mr. Chancelier, inhabitant of this post, who was present when the said Labadie said to this petitioner that he would not give twenty *sous* for these trees and that he could take them away, which the said Chancelier offers to declare. Everything which the petitioner takes the liberty to report to you, Monsieur, proves rather clearly the vindictive spirit and the litigious character of Mr. Labadie. In these circumstances, the petitioner resorts to you, so that it would please you to state that the said trees belong legitimately to Mr. Marié, as a part of his [illegible] and that he could remove them as a piece of furniture included in the sale, [illegible] the said Labadie of the petition and the [illegible] years since [illegible].

In St. Louis, March 8, 1779.

Marié

In the matter of the present petition, we order that an inquiry will be made of the facts and declarations. In St. Louis, March 8, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

Deposition

In St. Louis of the Illinois, 1779, we, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of infantry of the regiment of Louisiana, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of said part.

On the said day and year, by virtue of our decree above, we have mandated the appearance Jean of Marie Pépin, *dit* Lachance, inhabitant of this post St. Louis. After making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts we were going to interrogate him about. He answered yes, he swore and promised.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professed. He answered to be named Jean Marie Pépin Lachance, that he was a merchant by trade, professing the catholic apostolic and roman religion, and that he was around forty years old.

He was asked what knowledge he had about the trees cited in the petition of the said Marié, about which we had been given knowledge, and that he had to give an exact account. He answered that he had been one of the first owners of the land [illegible] the said Labadie, and that he had never believed that the trees in question were his, that they were planted by the named Renaud, who sold to the said Marié, and that he had always thought that these trees belonged to Mr. Renaud [and] that he, the deponent, had never had the slightest pretension. That when he sold his land to Mr. Conand, he had still been persuaded that he had all his land, and that he had never looked for any difficulty on this subject, and that, he did not intend to include the trees in the sale that he made to the said Conand, knowing well that they did not belong to him, and that they belonged legitimately to the named Renaud, who had since sold to the said Marié.

He was asked if he had something further to say to shed light on this affair. He answered that he had nothing further to say, except that it was he himself who planted the fruit trees that separated the woods from the said land, and that when he had planted them, he believed he had put them right on the line.

A reading was made of the declaration, he said it was true, that he affirmed and ratified it under oath, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of said Joseph Labunière, citizen of this post and Louis Richart, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have, with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed these present (documents) the said day and year.

Mark of +
Jean Marie Pépin, *dit* Lachance

Labunière

Luis Richard

Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated in appearance Louis Chancelier, inhabitant of this post. After making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts we were going to interrogate him about. He answered yes, he swore and promised.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professed. He answered to be named Louis Chancelier, that he was an inhabitant laborer of this post, professing the Catholic apostolic and roman religion, and that he was thirty-seven years old.

He was asked if he had knowledge of an affair in regard to which he was cited in the petition of Mr. Marié, and about which we had been given knowledge, that he had to provide us with an exact account. He answered that lately, walking in a street with Mr. Marié and being in front of the house of Mr. Labadie, they saw Mr. Labadie, to whom Mr. Marié said "I have just been to Monsieur the Commander's house to speak to him about the trees. He told me that the tax on the trees was fifty *sous*, that I could accommodate myself with you, and that if I wanted to turn them over, I was the master," to which the said Labadie replied "I would not give five *sous* for all those trees, they are not good for anything, and you can keep them and do whatever you want with them."

He was asked if he had something else to say in order to shed light on this affair. He answered that he had nothing further to say. A reading was made of his declaration, he said that is was true, that he ratified and affirmed it under oath, and signed in the presence of said Joseph Labunière, citizen of this post and Louis Richart, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses who, with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this present (document) on the said day and year.

Louis Chancelier

Fernando de Leyba

Luis Richard

On the said day and year, we, Lieutenant Governor, having been informed that [illegible] had aided in the transport of the trees after they were tore down was Francois Guyon, we have mandated him to appear before us. After making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts we were going to interrogate him about. He answered yes, he swore and promised.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professed. He answered to be named Nicolas Francois Guyon, that he was around thirty-nine years old, that he practiced the job of blacksmith, and that he professed the Catholic apostolic and roman religion.

He was asked if it was he who transplanted the trees from the place where the said Marié removed them to the place where he put them. He answered yes, that he had aided in the transportation.

He was asked if, when they did this maneuver, the new fence was already planted to separate Mr. Marié's land from that of Mr. Labadie. He answered that no, that the old fence was removed but that the new fence was not in place.

He was asked if he had something else to say in order to shed light on this affair. He answered that he had nothing further to say and that what he declared was the truth.

A reading was made of the declaration, he said that he ratified and affirmed it under oath, and having declared not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of the Sr. Joseph Labunière citizen of this post, and Louis Richart, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, living in St. Louis, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed the said day and year as above.

Mark of +
Nicolas Guyon

Labuniere, J. M.
Fernando de Leyba

Luis Richard

[Deposition by Louis Lirette follows, not translated]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, March 10, 1779.
Silvestre Ladie [Labadie], merchant in St. Louis,
versus Alexis Marié, inhabitant of St. Louis.

In the matter of the petition of Mr. Labadie, that Mr. Marié, his neighbor, had encroached by fourteen feet on the land of Mr. Labadie on one side, and by around six feet on the other side, that the first owner of Mr. Marié's land had planted six trees and a grape vine on this encroachment, that he made a verbal request to the said Marié that he should return the piece of land that was his, that the said Marié had returned it but had torn out and cut down the trees that were [planted] on this encroachment after the said separation fence was put up, despite the pleas that had been made to him. Concluding, the said Mr. Labadie [requests] that, if it pleases us, we condemn [illegible] the said petition, dated the end of the present March, but our decree at the bottom, in the same day, states that the said petition will be reported to the said Marié so that he can respond, in three days time. In response to which the said Marié, on March 8, stated that he was within his rights to remove the trees in question, as they were a part of the land he had acquired from the named Renaud, first owner of his land and who had planted the trees, that Mr. Lachance, first owner of the land at present. The said Labadie never intended to sell to Mr. Conand, second owner of the land which was enclosed, and that Mr. Conand, who sold to said Labadie, asked him for this encroached land, the said Marié put no obstacle about giving it back to him. That the said Labadie said to the said Marié, when it was time to draw the boundary line, that if he did not tear out the trees he would remove them and would cut them down, that the trees were old and were good for nothing. That the said Marié removed the said trees before making the ditch to put up the new fence, and before the said boundary fence was planted, and with the consent of said Labadie. And that it was Labadie himself who cut down the grapevine, and that there was only a hole or stump when the new fence was planted. Besides, the grape

vine had never borne any fruit. Through witnesses, he offered proof that he believed that to tear out his trees or to cut them down was within his rights, that the said Labadie had told him to remove them, and that he would not give five *sous* for them. And again, offering as proof that when he removed them, there was only the old fence, and that the new fence was not yet planted. In conclusion, that the trees that were removed are to be judged his, as an understood effect in his sales contract, to [counter?] the said Labadie in his request to condemn him to the expenses. Our decree of the 8th of this month, stating that information will be given before us about these facts. The declaration of said Lachance, on the same day, first owner of the land of said Labadie, who declares that he never thought that the trees in question were his, that they were planted by the named Renaud who sold his land to said Marié, that he had always thought that these trees belonged to said Renaud, that he never had the slightest pretension to own them, that when he sold land to Mr. Conand, he had been persuaded for a long time that he had all his land, that he never sought any difficulty on this subject, and that by the sale that he made to the said Conand, he did not intend to include these trees, knowing full well that they did not belong to him and that they belonged legitimately to the named Renaud, who had since sold to the said Marié. The deposition of the said Chancellor, who declares to have been present when the said Labadie said to the said Marié that he would not give five *sous* for all these trees, that they were good for nothing, and that he could remove them and do whatever he wanted with them. The declaration of the said Guyon, who declares to have helped the said Marié to remove the said trees, and that the old fence was removed but that the new one that was to separate the two pieces of land was not planted yet. The declaration of Louis Lirette who declares the same, to have also helped to remove the said trees, that the former fence was not there, but that the one who was to separate the two pieces of land was not yet planted.

Everything seen and duly examined, we have found that there was no basis for a trial between the two parties, that by the depositions of said Lachance and of the other three witnesses, the request of said Labadie against said Marié is unfounded, and only comes from a spirit of chicanery and stubbornness, contrary to the union which should rule between neighbors, not finding, furthermore, any motive nor other reason which could tend to condemn the said Marié, proven by the depositions of said Guyon, and Lirette that the said Labadie did not tell the truth in his false allegations of his petition that the said Marié tore out and cut down the trees after the new boundary fence had been planted. In consequence to all the above, and decreeing to this, we reject all the requests and pretensions of Mr. Labadie against the said Marié, concerning the removal of the said trees, as being done without foundation or reason. We condemn the said Labadie to [pay for] the expenses of the trial, which will be executed, given in St. Louis, in the chamber of the Government by us Don Fernando de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor and civil judge, the said day, 10th of March, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Fernando de Leyba

Today, March 13, 1770, I, Francois Demers, bailiff in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois in St. Louis, residing there, have been [illegible] to go to the domicile of the said Labadie, merchant of this post, where he was, and speaking directly to him, I had him sign and gave him a copy of the current sentence of the court, to conform himself to it, and that he would make no cause of ignorance. In St. Louis, the said day and year.

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Fernando de Leyba, captain of infantry, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the Establishments of the Illinois and their dependencies belonging to her Catholic majesty.

Sir:

Nicolas LeCompte takes the liberty of informing you that around the fifteenth of last October, he hired the named Chalifour and the named Jetté so that they would go wintering with him on the Mississippi to work sawing wood, [a job] worth two hundred pounds in furs that the plaintiff gave to Chalifour, and one hundred seventy pounds to the named Jetté. They agreed that Chalifour would work the high saw on the scaffolding, and the other [would work the saw] down below. But the said Chalifour, being on the worksite, refused to go up the scaffolding and work the saw, saying that he wanted to saw down below, to which the plaintiff replied several times that he had hired him to work the high saw and that his comrade was for the lower saw, which obligated the plaintiff to have the named Jetté high up, which was not in fact [illegible] a lot of wood to the plaintiff by this refusal of the said Chalifour who, in addition to this disobedience to his master, covered him and his wife with [bad] words. And both the said Chalifour and the said Jetté acted in their own will, going as far as to threatening the plaintiff to abandon him in his wintering quarters, which they would have done had not the plaintiff, suffering so much from their bad humor and brutality and lack of work that left the plaintiff in a difficult situation, several times they went to pick up pecans, around ten *minots* [three bushels], which they sold to several persons. Finally, Sir, the said Jetté and the said Chalifour have constantly refused to obey the said plaintiff in everything that was their obligation and was commanded to them. These past days [the plaintiff] had bought a roe buck from the savages near their camp, he begged them to go and get it, and they equally refused, preferring to let it be eaten by the dogs. Everything that the plaintiff exposes to you, Sir, we can give you the proof.

The plaintiff took the liberty to tell you that the said Chalifour and Jetté had spent their time that they owed to him in making canoes and piles of wood to their profit, and you have had the goodness to order the plaintiff to seize all of it. But the said Chalifour and the named Jetté made off with it by force yesterday evening, while treating him [illegible] and threatening him with one hundred blows.

It is in these circumstances that the plaintiff has recourse to you, Sir, so that, if it pleases you to make Jetté and Chalifour appear before you, to condemn them to repair the wrong that they have made to the plaintiff, and to lose their wages for their disobedience and to [pay for] the costs. In St. Louis, April 10, 1779.

In the matter of the present inquiry, [so ordered] that a copy be passed to the named Chalifour in order to answer within three days, in St. Louis, the 10th of April, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry of Louisiana, commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois and Lieutenant Governor of the said part.

Sir:

Pierre Chalifour and Joseph Jetté take the liberty of responding to the petition presented to you against them by Nicolas LeCompte the tenth of this month. The said LeCompte claims that Chalifour agreed to work the high saw. He answers that in no way he agrees with Mr. LeCompte on this fact, and that he only intended to saw at the bottom, which he did with all his power. And Jetté sawed up high during the entire time of the work. Mr. LeCompte, seeing that Chalifour did not want to saw high on the scaffold, came to remove the saw from the woods and carried it to his cabin, saying to the said Chalifour that as he did not want to saw up high he could go away, which the said Chalifour was on the point of doing, but Mr. LeCompte told him by way of Jetté to stay, and to saw as he was accustomed to do, which is what they did.

The petitioners say to you, Sir, that which [illegible] have had a spirit of vengeance and of bad humor which Mr. LeCompte claims, that they mistreated him and his wife with bad words. On the contrary, the plaintiffs have suffered all sorts of swear words on the part of the said LeCompte, even to the point of denying them the necessary food to do such rough and painful work, he reduced them to [eating] field corn and even denied them oil to season it. They asked him for a little suet in order to be able to eat this food, he again refused and made candles of it. Finally Sir, the petitioners have suffered all the imaginable bad treatment from the said Mr. LeCompte during the wintering. Even though Jetté was not required to saw at the top of the scaffold, he did not refuse to saw there. And when Mr. LeCompte wanted him to square off the pieces of wood, after having fired the said Chalifour, he had started to do that and would have continued if the said LeCompte had not called Chalifour back, even though he [Jetté] was not required to square off [the wood]. The said Mr. LeCompte had told him [Jetté] that he would pay him well, but that he wanted to take Chalifour to court. As for the time that Mr. LeCompte says they [the petitioners] lost picking up pecans, it is inappropriate that he has [illegible] them and it is true that they picked up three *minots* or about [of pecans], but it was only on Sundays, during time that they were not required to work, and Mr. LeCompte's work never suffered from it. In regard to the wood that Mr. LeCompte says they made for their own profit, on holidays and Sundays they made a canoe and three little piles of corn to be husked. The plaintiffs have done no wrong toward Mr. LeCompte, since this small job was done on holidays and Sundays. As for the roe buck that Mr. LeCompte says they left to be eaten by dogs, the named Jetté was extremely sick and Chalifour was tired [after] a lot of work, and it was even night, and Mr. LeCompte could have carried it himself since he was at the site where the roe buck was, which was not eaten by dogs but by the family of the said LeCompte, without giving one single piece of it to the petitioners, who had an extreme need of it. As for the refusal that Mr. LeCompte says that they made to him when he accommodated them with a couple of work projects, it is pure calumny, since they did all that was licit and honest.

As for the wood that Mr. LeCompte says that they wasted, the petitioners ask that they be visited, and that anything found wasted, they offer to take it into their account at the price that he who finds it values.

Mr. LeCompte cannot say that he was not happy with the petitioners, since six days before the expiration of their time, which was the end of March, he told them he had just received a letter from the Commander, which asked him for forty planks, ten feet long by five quarters of an inch, and he begged them to stay in order to saw them for him, which they humanely did, and they sawed thirty five of them in spite of the bad treatment of Mr. LeCompte, telling them that he had had enough. He promised them some tobacco but gave them spoiled tobacco, and half of their food was still very bad. As for the canoe and the three piles [of wood] that they took away upon arriving, the said LeCompte never forbade them from taking them and did not say anything about M. the Commander. On the contrary, he told them to take their booty and go. The petitioners [illegible] to your [illegible] the justice that is due them, and continue their wishes for your prosperity. In St. Louis, April 12, 1779

+
mark of Jetté

+
mark of Chalifour

In the matter of the present petition in response to that of Nicolas LeCompte from the tenth of the current month, let a copy be passed to the said LeCompte so that he can reply and counter in writing the reasons alleged in the above petition, and to present proof of the facts set forth in his petition on the tenth of this month, everything [should be done] in three days time. Given in St. Louis, April 13, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

Handed over to Nicolas LeCompte in his domicile, in his presence, I the bailiff have signified in St. Louis, the 14th of April, 1779
Demers

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of infantry of the regiment of St. Louis and commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the establishments of the Illinois.

Sir:

Nicolas LeCompte takes the liberty of replying before you, in response of the petition by the named Chalifour and Jetté, on the 2nd of this month. And says that he disavows and does not at all agree with all the facts that the said Chalifour and Jetté claim in their responses, which only has invented things in order to color the bad conduct that they had toward the plaintiff during their wintering; and that everything that he claims in the first petition is truthful. The said Chalifour and Jetté complain that they were undernourished, but the plaintiff offered them several times to make pot luck with him, which they refused and preferred to do the ordinary thing with the meat that Mr. LeCompte gave them. He never left them lacking [in food] and they always had [food] in abundance, although he told them it would be better if they eat with him because they were wasting too much time heating up their kettle, [an offer] that they always refused and that Mr. LeCompte can prove with the attached documents.

As for what Chalifour and Jetté claim that the plaintiff used the name of the Commander in order to get them to saw forty planks, this is false. He knows all too well the respect and the subordination that he owes to his superiors to make such propositions. The adverse parties are only seeking ways to wash themselves of [the fact that] they did not want to fulfill their obligations toward him. In these circumstances, the plaintiff has recourse to you in order to beg you to examine the attached certificates, and if they are not sufficient, to mandate the appearance of Noël Langlais along with the named Pitre and Sansouci who are [illegible] who will depose everything that is within their knowledge, and to condemn his adverse parties to charges and expenses. In St. Louis April 14, 1779

Mark of Mr.

+

Nicolas LeCompte

In regards to the contradiction of the said LeCompte's hired men, and the categorical denial of the said LeCompte, we order that information will be taken from the witnesses mentioned above, in front of us, in order to be ordered that which will belong to St. Louis, the 15th of April, 1779

De Leyba

Information in St. Louis of the Illinois, the twenty-first of April, seventeen hundred seventy-nine. In front of us, Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

[Deposition by Noël Langlais, not translated]

We have mandated the appearance before us of Antoine Roussel, *dit* SansSouci, inhabitant of this post. After having had him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we were going to interrogate him. He answered yes, that he swears and promises.

He was asked his name, age, profession and what religion he professes.

He answered that he was named Antoine Roussel, *dit* SansSouci, that he was forty-nine years old, exercising the profession of mason and professing the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion.

He was asked if he had some knowledge of the differences that had come up between the Master Nicolas LeCompte and his hired men, either in their wintering or in their trip. A reading was made to him of the request of the said LeCompte, and of the response of his hired men.

He answered that the second of the month of last January, he found himself at the campsite of Mr. LeCompte, who was having wood sawed by the named Chalifour and Jetté. He saw and heard, being present, that the said LeCompte says to Chalifour that he should saw at the top of the scaffold in the place of the said Jetté, who did not know how to work the saw and who was damaging the wood, to which Chalifour answered that he did not want to saw on top and that he was not required to. The said LeCompte answers him that it has been two months that Jetté has been sawing on top, saw as much time on top as he and I will be content, to which Chalifour [illegible] refused, saying that he did not want to saw on top. The said LeCompte, seeing the obstination of the said Chalifour, says to him, since you do not want to saw on top, you can leave. At which he removed the saw from the woods and carried it to his cabin. Chalifour packed in order to leave, and the said leCompte says to Jetté, since we cannot saw, let's make canoes, and you can square off the pieces, you will be well paid with your wages, but as for Chalifour, I will take him to court in St. Louis. Jetté says to him that he was hired neither to make canoes nor to square off the wood, but that he was going to do it. So that Mr. LeCompte, seeing that Chalifour was given almost all his wages, says to the deponent, my money is lost, I have to [illegible] this man and immediately sent Jetté to ask Chalifour if he wanted to saw as he was accustomed, that he could come back, and if he did not want to, he could leave. Jetté went to get Chalifour, and this last came back and started to saw as though nothing had happened. That he, the deponent, did not hear bad words said, not from the beginning to the end, while he stayed there with them, that he did not see any lack of meat on the part of Mr. LeCompte, that he always had some while the deponent stayed there, and that he had even left them a roe buck, saying that he saw them work during approximately a half day [illegible] and squaring off a couple pieces of wood once or twice, and pulling pieces [illegible].

He was asked if he had something further to say to shed light on this affair. He answered that he had nothing further to say and that he did not know if they had oil or suet to eat. A reading was made to him of his deposition. He said it was true, that he continued under the oath that he had made in front of us, and he made his ordinary mark, not knowing how to sign, in the presence of the said Joseph Labunière, citizen of this post and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, legal witnesses who with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this present day and year.

Mark of Antoine
+
Roussel, *dit* SansSouci

Labunière

Sentence.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, April 22, 1779. In the case of Nicolas LeCompte, inhabitant of this post and plaintiff, against Pierre Chalifour and Joseph Jetté, his hired men, defendants.

In the matter of the request of the said Nicolas LeCompte, dated April 10 of this present year, that he had engaged the said Chalifour and Jetté to saw wood and that the said Chalifour did not fulfill his obligations and refused to saw where the plaintiff ordered him to, and refused to do several other services during their wintering and even outraged him and his wife with words, that the said Jetté followed the example of the said Chalifour on several occasions during the wintering, concluding in that the plaintiff withheld the wages of the defendants and charged them with paying charges and expenses. Our decree below of the said petition on this same day, mandates that a copy will be sent to the said Chalifour and Jetté so that they can respond within three days. The response of said Chalifour and Jetté in the 13th of the present month, denying all that the said LeCompte claimed against them. In their petition they claim that they did their duty as hired men and that it was Mr. LeCompte who outraged them with bad language, and denied them the necessary food as hired men. Our decree below of the same day, the 13th of April, ordering that a copy [of this petition] be sent to the named LeCompte so that he can reply within three days. The reply of the said LeCompte of April 4, holds that he had fulfilled the duties of a good master toward his hired men and that he did not allow them to run out of food, persisting in the facts advanced in his first petition, and trying to make proof by witnesses of the facts claimed in the said petitions of the 15th of April. The information gathered by us and the deposition of Noel Langlois, who declares that the

said LeCompte did not allow the hired men to run out of food, that for a month and a half that he stayed in their camp there was always meat, and that the said hired men even refused to eat with the said LeCompte, wanting to make their own pot luck, despite the fact that Mr. LeCompte represented to them that they were wasting a lot of time in getting their kettle ready by leaving off work two hours before sunset, without the said hired man changing anything in their manner of acting. Mr. LeCompte represented to them that he was barely earning his money, that during all the time that the said Langlois stayed in this place, he never saw the said LeCompte act with bad temper towards his hired men. The deposition of Antoine Roussel, *dit* SansSouci, who declares that the said Chalifour sawed with [illegible], that he never saw the hired men lacking food, and that during the time that he stayed in their camp, he did not hear bad words on the part of anybody, that the proofs [illegible] LeCompte to Chalifour, the hiring of said Jetté by Mr. LeCompte which obliges him to do anything that the said LeCompte orders him, which would be sincere and honest. The certificate of Mr. Linetot, who declares that while he was at the place, he never saw the said LeCompte mistreating his hired men and that he saw him giving them meat and corn. The certificate of the named Pitre, who declares that during the month and a half that he stayed with Mr. LeCompte, his hired men were not lacking in meat and other food, that he even offered to have them eat with him and that they refused. Having considered and examined it, the declarations of the said witnesses and certificates, it appears that the said Chalifour influenced the said Jetté into disobedience toward his master, we condemn the said Chalifour to twenty-five pounds of deer skins in fines [to be given to] the church of this post, we forbid him to do this again in the future under pain of more rigorous punishments, furthermore we condemn him to three-quarters of the charges, and the said Jetté to the other quarter of the charges, fines which will be taken from their wages, and the surplus will be delivered to them without delay by Mr. LeCompte. To be executed [illegible] in St. Louis in the chamber of the government, the 22nd of April, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

Handed over the present sentence to the named Chalifour and Jetté at their domiciles in St. Louis, speaking to their persons. The 22nd of April, 1779.
Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

I, Joseph Pitre, under my ordinary mark, I certify not to have [seen] at all a lack of food on the part of Mr. LeCompte and his men during the month or thereabouts that I spent near his camp. Given in St. Louis this April 12, 1779

Mark of +
Joseph Pitre

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

I certify that as long as I was with the said LeCompte, that his men were not mistreated and even that they seemed to me to be very happy. They left the saw three days before Easter. I gave some corn to Mr. LeCompte [illegible] in order to fulfill the [Easter] abstinence [from meat] the holy day, although they refused the meat. This 19th of April. Given in St. Louis as true, this 19th of April, 1779.

Linetot.

[Box 1, Folder 7]

[Original in French]

Before us, have appeared Nicolas LeCompte and Joseph Staie [Sansouci?] this last has been voluntarily hired by the said LeCompte until the end of next March, for and by means of the sum of one hundred seventy pounds of skins, in order to do the work of a long saw and all other works that would be sincere and honest, to do his best to avoid [illegible] and will do everything for the best and for the interest of his master, under pain of losing his wages, as agreed upon, we have signed in the presence of witnesses this October 4, 1779, in the village of Cahokia.

Nicolas LeCompte

+

ordinary mark

Joseph Staie

+

ordinary mark

J.W.F.R.

witness

[Box 1, Folder 8]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Governor of the western part of the Illinois:

Madame Montardy, in the absence of her husband, takes the liberty of representing to you very respectfully that she finds herself grievously offended in her honor and her reputation, which has never been tarnished by any stain.

The plaintiff's husband being off to trade in the Missouri, the named Louison Desnoyer took herself to fort Missouri to wait for the plaintiff's husband, and stained her with calumnies and pernicious words to destroy the union and the accord that prevailed in her marriage, by saying to Mr. Montardy that his wife was the concubine of the said Blanco. She did everything she could to compel Mr. Montardy to believe her, but Mr. Montardy, knowing the virtue of his wife, appears not to have given any faith to it, as he sent right away one of his men, who is [illegible] Deschamps, having him [Deschamps] tell her that she should get rid of these bad [accusations].

The plaintiff has just learned that this is not from today, but that for already a long time the said Desnoyer has been casting aspersions upon her honor and tarnishing her reputation with these calumnious words. She was told by the wife of Mr. Deschamps that the said Desnoyer made public for everyone that she [the plaintiff] was Mr. Blanco's concubine, using other defamatory terms which it would [not] be judicious to explain to you, Sir, as the said Desnoyer has spread these false rumors publicly and she has been unhappy enough to want to [illegible] herself to her husband, who could have [a bad] impression about the conduct of the plaintiff, which subsequently would degenerate into hate and would have an impact on the morale of her husband. In her unhappy situation, she resorts to your justice, Sir, that it may please you to receive the proofs which the plaintiff takes the liberty of citing and if they are found to be sufficient, the said Desnoyer be condemned to publicly restore the plaintiff's honor, especially as she has not had any shame in tarnishing her so meanly.

Yesterday around nine o'clock at night the plaintiff found the said Desnoyer in the street, by her house. She wanted at that time to do justice and in the [illegible] of the night to withdraw her statements, but such a reparation is not acceptable. This is why the plaintiff believes herself required to seek your authority, Sir, in order to force the said Desnoyer to do this publicly and to condemn her to pay charges and expenses. She continues in her wishes for your prosperity. In St. Louis, September 22, 1779.

Montardi

In the matter of the present petition, we order the plaintiff to present witnesses who have heard the words which the Desnoyer woman uttered against her and other cases of which she finds herself aggrieved. These witnesses she will present before us within nine days from the present decree. In St. Louis, September 22.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 8]

[Original in French]

In the presence of the undersigned witnesses and under my ordinary mark, not knowing how to write nor sign, I, Marie Dinant, wife of Jean-Baptiste Deschamps, I certify and affirm that, several times, the woman Louison Desnoyer told me, the deponent, that Madame Montardy was the whore of Mr. Blanco, and that she was quite certain that Mr. Blanco went into Madame Montardy's neighborhood under any pretext in order to see this hussy, and several other remarks against the reputation of Madame Montardy. That yesterday evening, the 22nd of the current month, being in my front yard, and the said Desnoyer being seated on her front stoop, between eight and nine in the evening, I overheard the said Desnoyer who was talking to a person seated next to her, that she had been at Madame Montardy's by orders of Mr. the Commander, but that instead of begging forgiveness, she had made her cry by reproaching her that she had gotten pregnant with a child during the absence of her husband, and thus, she had had an abortion. And that the daughter that she had at present was not from Montardy, that she was astonished at what she wanted to do, the lady, that she should remember her conduct from a time not so long ago. That her husband was certainly living with her, and several other terms against the reputation of the said Madame Montardy, which I recall by the reminding that she made to me several times, not only against Madame Montardy in particular, but also against other persons who did not deserve it. This is why I am giving this present deposition, which I offer to affirm in my soul and conscience in front of Monsieur the Commander. In St. Louis, September 23, 1779.

[illegible], witness mark of + Labuxiere, witness
The said Dinant, wife of Bte Deschamps

I, Charlotte Jacinthe, wife of Louis Ride, inhabitant of St. Louis, under my ordinary mark, not knowing how to sign, in presence of the undersigned witnesses, I certify and affirm that, having gone to speak with Madame Desnoyer on her stoop, Mr. Blanco was passing by in the street and the said Desnoyer called out to him, Mr. Blanco did not want to stop and continued on his way to the lower part of the village. So the said Desnoyer told me, the deponent, that Madame Montardy was a whore, and that Mr. Blanco was going to see this hussy, but that he would pay for it, that Madame Montardy had been a whore all her life and that today she wanted to find her bearings and I, the deponent, not knowing Madame Montardy by the little time that I had been here, I did not answer her and I withdrew. That is what I affirm, as being the pure truth and that I offer to affirm in front of Monsieur the Commander. In St. Louis, September 23, 1779.

Cadoux [?] mark of + Labuxiere
Witness Charlotte Jacinthe, wife of Ride

In St. Louis of the Illinois, September 24, seventeen hundred seventy-nine. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, Captain of the Regiment of infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

In the matter of the depositions of the two witnesses produced for us by Madame Montardy against the woman Louison Desnoyer. We have mandated the appearance before us of the two said witnesses, Charlotte Jacinthe, wife of Louis Ride, and Marie Dinante, wife of Jean-Baptiste Deschamps, to whom, after having had them swear, as it is prescribed under law, and having read to them their depositions, we asked them if they had anything to add or subtract, to which they answered no, that they were the truth and that they persisted and ratified them under the oath that they had made. At the request of the said Charlotte Jacinthe, who added that the said Desnoyer had made the remarks contained in her deposition about a year ago. And they made their ordinary marks, not knowing how to write or sign, in the presence of the Sr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of the post and Louis Richard, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have, with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed these present documents, on the said day and year.

Luis Richard

mark of +
Charlotte Jacinthe,
Wife of Louis Ride

mark of +
Marie Dinante, wife of
Bte Deschamps

Fernando de Leyba

Labuxiere

In the matter of the petition presented to us by Madame Montardy, against the woman Louison Desnoyer, dated the 22nd of the current month, our decree below stating that Madame Montardy will present witnesses for us of the remarks made by the said Desnoyer, dating from the same day. The depositions of the two witnesses from the 23rd of the present month, the testimony made before us of the said witnesses by their depositions, dated today. Everything examined, we order that a copy of the said petition will be passed to the said woman Louison Desnoyer in order for her to respond in nine days time dated from the present decree in writing, and upon her response, it is up to the other party to reply. In St. Louis, September 24, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 8]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Fernando de Leyba, Captain of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Agnès Dénoyé, petitioner, and humbled to be mandated to appear before your respectful person, in order to respond to the unjust and unbecoming accusations on the part of Madame Montardy, who says that I offended her in her reputation and destroyed the union which prevailed in her marriage. I only told the said Mr. Montardy that, by the poor advice of his wife, I had [suffered?] the reproaches of several people. And that I [suffered?] the reprisals of Madame Montardy, who came in contact with perverse persons and tumultuous minds that advised and persuaded [her] to [draw blood?] her request brought upon the petitioner, and [illegible] divert the apparent storm in the hope that I will restore her honor and her easy morals, which have pushed her to ardently pursue me [in the courts]. Madame Montardy is not ignorant [of the fact] that I know her intimately. Although I have made steps toward her, she persists in stating that I am guilty and that she had fitted out for good reason. Wisdom and justice will dissolve everything. It is true that I took myself to the home of the said lady. This was so that she could avoid the storm. But after having conferred together and come to terms in the presence of the named Toussaint Deschamps, son, accompanied by his mother, to leave things as they were, we talked about throwing the petition into the fire. All of a sudden, in the presence of Toussaint Deschamps, these three ladies withdrew, telling me that they would rejoin me in an instant [illegible]. What a surprise for me when these ladies went by another road, which [contradicts?] our just and clear agreement. Governor, must such a frail female be received as a witness in your presence, the torch of vengeance and of desire committed publicly in order to be [illegible] of integrity, my sworn enemy, finally the [illegible] of Madame Montardy, this woman requires the restoration of her honor on my part. She dares a lot, for had she forgotten what happened at her house so little time ago, in the presence of her husband, this affair is quite recent, and obvious to the public. This is so that the lady must try a restoration of her honor if she finds herself wounded in her person, which speaks so highly of her husband, that she had accorded forbidden favors to a personage [illegible].

Too equitable, Governor, to condemn the petitioner to make an unjust reparation that this lady has required of the petitioner, as she has in no way offended her in the nature of her exposition.

The petitioner, not finding herself guilty of the atrocious invectives of which the [illegible] asks [illegible] that the said Madame Montardy be condemned to [pay for the] charges and expenses.

This considered, Sir, the plaintiff hopes that your will look at her with pity on her sad [illegible] and wishes for the conservation of your days.

In St. Louis, October 4, Agnès Desnoyer

[Box 1, Folder 8]

[Original in French]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, October 7, 1779.

Madame Montardy, wife of the said Montardy and in his absence, residing in this post St. Louis, versus the woman Louison Desnoyer, also residing in the said post.

In the matter of the petition of the plaintiff dated the 22nd of September of [illegible] said Desnoyer remarks that she made to Mr. Montardy, the husband's plaintiff, at fort Missouri, against the plaintiff's reputation, offering to prove that the said Desnoyer made the said remarks against her honor, and requesting that she [Desnoyer] publicly restores her honor and be condemned to [pay for] charges. Our decree at the bottom of the said petition, stating that Madame Montardy will present before us, within nine days, depositions from witnesses who have heard the remarks that the woman Desnoyer made to the said Montardy against her, which have aggrieved her, dated the same day. The two depositions about the remarks that the Desnoyer woman made about the said Montardy, which only cite conversations held in the past and that have no connection to the remarks about Madame Montardy that supposedly happened at the Missouri fort. The said depositions, dated the 24th of this month, our decree stating that a copy of Madame Montardy's petition of the first of the present month will be given to the Desnoyer woman. She [asserts?] to have made no remarks to the said Mr. Montardy against his wife, [remarks] that cold have brought disunion between them. That if someone has reported to Madame Montardy that she had spoken about her previously, these old remarks were made worse by those who reported them. And that she is in no way guilty toward Madame Montardy, that they have known each other for a long time. That the woman Toussainte Deschamps [illegible] of witnesses is unjustly [illegible] who seeks to [illegible] the said Madame Montardy and she, the Desnoyer woman by [illegible] and putting discord between them.

After having seen and attentively examined everything. Considering that the remarks that the Desnoyer woman made to the said Mr. Montardy at fort Missouri are not mentioned by the two witnesses; that what they assert in their depositions has no connection to the principal complaints [of the plaintiff], and that it appears that the content of the said depositions is only disputes between them. As a consequence, we impose silence as much on Madame Montardy as on the Desnoyer woman and the others implicated in the present affair, we put them outside of the court and [illegible]. At present on this subject, we forbid them to make any kind of prejudicial remarks in the future about the ones against the others, aimed at destroying their reputations, under penalty of being brought to court with all the rigor of the laws against she who will find herself the first aggressor. We condemn the said Desnoyer and the said Madame Montardy, each one the [illegible] of the charges and expenses of the trial. Given in the chamber of the government by us.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 9]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana and Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Barbe Vilecompte [Villecompte], widow, present inhabitant of this post of St. Louis, takes the liberty of explaining to you that a year ago she rented her property to the named Louis Dubreuil, inhabitant of the said post, for [a total of] three years, according to the farm lease deposited in the archives of this government. By the said lease, the said Dubreuil has committed himself to maintain the house, fences, and outbuildings, [making] all the necessary repairs, and to remit to her two hundred *livres* of flour at the end of the said three years as a rental charge. In addition, [he committed] to take care of the cattle, in order to return them to her in the same state at the end of the said term. But the said Dubreuil, far from satisfying these conditions, for the past year that he has been in possession of her property, has let the house, the hay barn and the fences fall into ruin, without repairing them, to such an extent that it is no longer possible for the plaintiff to inhabit her house, where she has her lodging, because the roof is not in condition and the fences and outbuildings are entirely ruined. The said Dubreuil, not contented with having left the property of the plaintiff ruined, has even, by his negligence, let perish a portion of the cattle that she had rented to him, and made arrangements to sell the rest of the cattle. As the plaintiff saw that the said Dubreuil was attempting her ruin, and that he had no property against which the plaintiff could lay claim, she took the position of bringing verbally her just complaints to you, based on her farm contract, may you show goodness to her, Sir, and to prevent the dispersal of the only property that remains of her, you order the said Dubreuil, in light of his poor conduct, to give back the property to the plaintiff, and to get out of her property, which he has done without wanting to do any repairs to the said property, or to replace the cattle that he wasted, which has obliged you, Sir, to seize the approximately four hundred sheaves of wheat, which he has harvested on the lands of the plaintiff, as a security for the repairs that he should have done and for missing cattle that he has not been able to replace.

As the plaintiff finds herself exposed to the inclement weather because of the repairs that need to be made to her house, outbuildings and fences, and which the said Dubreuil has always refused to do, [as he has refused] to return the missing cattle, she resorts to your justice, Sir, so that it may please you to go to the place where her land and buildings are, in order to inspect them and estimate by arbiter in your presence, so that the said Dubreuil be held to pay her a third of the repair work to do, since he has enjoyed a year without doing any at all. And that the two remaining years of the farm-lease will be accredited to the plaintiff, as well as having the said arbiter whom you will appoint make an estimate of the animals that he [Dubreuil] lost and that are missing, so that one third of the repairs and the cattle estimate is taken, if you find it just, Sir, from the sheaves of wheat seized from the said Dubreuil, as there is not any other resources to satisfy the plaintiff, who will continue her wishes for your prosperity. In St. Louis, the 19th of August, 1779.

X mark of the widow Parent

In the matter of the present petition, we order our going, on the 17th of the current month, to the place requested by the plaintiff, in order to estimate the necessary repairs to her buildings that should have been made by the said Dubreuil. These estimates will be made by the arbiters before us, as well as [the estimates of] the cattle owed by the said Dubreuil, to be followed by the orders that will be most fitting. In St. Louis, August 16th, 1779.

Fernando de Leyba

In the matter of the above estimates, we order that the sum of two hundred seventy three *livres* and six *sols*, eight *deniers* in pelts as mentioned, be withdrawn out of the sheaves of wheat seized from the named Dubreuil, the price of the charges of justice according to the current price of wheat and the whole thing charged to the said Dubreuil.

Which wheat shall be threshed and winnowed under the diligence of the said widow Parent, who shall keep an account of the expenses according to the memoir which will be produced for her, signed by us, which expenses as much for justice as for threshing, she will [illegible] the said wheat, be specially held for the account of the said Dubreuil. To which we condemn him who will be [illegible]. In St. Louis, August 18th, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

We, Jacob Michontack, Joseph Louis Gautier, and Francois Alarie, certify to Monsieur the Commander in chief of St. Louis and to whom it may concern that during the last festivity of All Saints Day of this present year, the named Joseph Buteau sold to us, in His Catholic Majesty's side of the Cuivre River, a small quantity of rum plus some pelts, against the orders of our government, and in spite of Mr. Blanchet's opposition, who had ordered him to get out of the river. On the strength of which we have made our ordinary mark at the Cuivre River, November 4, 1779

Mark of François Alarie

Mark of Michon

Mark of Joseph Louis Gautier

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

We the undersigned Laurent Michon, Laporte, Belan, Cazeneuve, and Francois Alarie, certify to Fernando de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor, that at Mr. Blanchet's request we have helped him to seize the pirogue that, in violation of the law, was trading in the Cuivre River, where we are hunting. The said boat belongs to the named Buteau, who resides on the American side of the [Mississippi] River, which boat we surprised trading rum to our hunters against the orders of our government. And it was the said Buteau himself who was trading the rum. We confirm the above, and offer the present to be put to good use. At the Cuivre River, November 4, 1779

Ordinary mark of Cazeneuve

Ordinary mark of the Sieur Belan

Ordinary mark of Michon

Ordinary mark of Laporte

Ordinary mark of Francois Alarie

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

By order of Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief, Lieutenant Governor, we the undersigned, Diego Blanco, Louis Blanchet, and Joseph Labuxière have done the inventory of the peltry seized from the named Buteau, [who] violated the law by doing commerce in the Cuivre River. After having inventoried the said peltry, we have found the following:

Seventy-three and a half *livres* of deer skins in receipt

Five *livres* of rough deer skins, one bear skin in receipt, one bear skin [illegible]

Six doe skins in receipt, five fawn skins, plus one doe skin scraped and [illegible]

This is what we certify true in St. Louis, November 5th, 1779.

Mark of Louis Blanchet Diego Blanco

Labuxiere

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 5th, 1779. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

At the warning that has just been given to us by the named Blanchet, who under our orders checks that no forbidden commerce is done in the Cuivre River, a tributary of this [Mississippi] River, that he had seized a canoe full of goods, with two men who were in the said river in violation of the law, in order to do forbidden commerce. One of the two men escaped. And that he [Blanchet] brought the canoe with the goods and the [remaining] man to this post, to the government's disembarking point.

In consequence, we have immediately gone to the disembarking point, accompanied by the said Blanchet and Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of the Sr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, legal witnesses.

Once there, the said Blanchet showed us the said canoe, in which the following items were found:

- First, a third of a measure of rum [*tafia*], about forty pots
- Plus a little barrel containing around ten pots of rum
- Plus three little barrels of rum of about four pots each
- Plus around seven hundred *tierçons* of flour in seven sacks of cloth, as many good as bad
- Plus twelve doe skins
- Plus two little packages of deer skins
- Plus a little cake of around fifteen *livres* of suet
- Plus ten and a half *carottes* of tobacco
- Plus a little copper cooking pot with lid
- Plus a little copper cauldron
- Plus a gun and a horn [of gunpowder]
- Plus a bad sack with two or three *livres* of hard tack
- Plus another sack with a little [illegible] and around three *livres* of bacon
- Plus a little empty barrel
- Plus a little chest of bad wood, locked, in which it was found around one half *livre* of gun powder, twenty-two woodsmen's knives, a bad shirt of cotton, two razors, a calumet [peace pipe] and a knife
- Plus two bad bear skins
- Plus three bad blankets and an old cow robe
- Plus two bad hatchets
- Plus a bad deer skin with hair
- Plus the canoe mentioned before with two little oars

The effects listed above we have put under the care of the said Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, who has voluntarily taken them and promised to hand them in whenever will be required by us. We have signed, except the said Blanchet who has made his ordinary mark, not knowing how to write or sign, on this day and year in question.

Mark of Blanchet

Diego Blanco

Labuxiere

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 5th, 1779.

We Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of Infantry, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor, in reference to the case mentioned above, wanting to verify the motives that caused the seizing of the above mentioned effects, make the present judicial inquiry. Consequently, we have mandated the appearance before us of the named Charles Ouilf who, after raising his right hand and making the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth, about the facts on which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, that he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that his name was Charles Ouilf, age thirty-one, that he served the King in the rank of a soldier of the seventh company of the battalion of Louisiana, and that he professed the Catholic, apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked why he was at this post, when his destination is the Missouri Fort.

He answered that yesterday the named Blanchet had arrived at the Missouri Fort, and asked for assistance with two prisoners. That Corporal Rocq had ordered him, the deponent, to accompany the said Blanchet to this post with the two prisoners.

We asked for the names and whereabouts of the two prisoners.

He answered that one was named Buteau and the other Baribeau. That he did not know what had become of the first, because while pushing off from the shore during the night, which was dark, he had jumped into the water and it was impossible to know on which side he was. When the said Baribeau had arrived at this post, he had been imprisoned.

We asked if he knew the residence of these two men.

He answered that he knew that the named Buteau was a resident of the American side of the [Mississippi] river, and that Baribeau was a wandering man, sometimes engaged on the American side, sometimes on this side.

We asked if during the navigation from Fort Missouri to this post, he had heard that the seizure of the effects of the said Buteau and Baribeau had been done in the Cuivre River, by vassals of His Catholic Majesty. If these effects were on land when they were seized, if they were seized while [Buteau and Baribeau were] doing commerce, or if they were seized when the effects were still on their boat, and without them having started the commerce.

He answered that he had heard from the said Blanchet, at their arrival at Fort Missouri, and in the presence of the said Buteau and Baribeau, that he had seized them on land, while [Buteau and Baribeau were] doing commerce and trading rum with His Majesty's subjects, and that the said Buteau and Baribeau had not disagreed.

We asked what had happened that night at the river shore, when he was in the pirogue, and what had caused him to come and get the guard, that he should give us an exact account.

He answered that, as he had been put on charge of guarding the boat, he grounded it to do his guard duty, but believing that no accident could happen, he had set down his gun in the boat and had fallen asleep on the ground. That he had been awakened by the sound of someone rowing, and that at that instant he had seen a man who was in the boat, paddling softly, and had realized that [the man] had cut the cord of the boat, that at that instant he had taken a paddle in order to get into the boat, but that it was getting too far away from land so he could not board it, which forced him to run to the guards to warn them and ask for help. That the guard had come to his aid immediately and that he, the deponent, was running the length of the strand, that the man who was in the boat, having seen them and fearing to be captured, had jumped in the water and swam away, and that he could not see where he went. That next he had gone after the boat, and that he had brought it back to the shore. That he had no doubts that it was the said Buteau who had stolen the boat, since he had talked to him, telling him to surrender, that the said Buteau had not wanted to do this, preferring to jump into the water.

We asked if he had something further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said it was true, that he ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark. In the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Charles Ouilf mark Diego Blanco Labuxiere Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 6th, 1779. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor as above, have mandated the appearance before us of the corporal of this garrison, Pedro Rebouil, to whom, after having him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to interrogate him. He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that his name was Pierre Rebouil, that he was forty-three years old, that his occupation was in the service of the King in the rank of Corporal in the seventh Battalion of Louisiana, and that he is of the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked him why he had left the quarters the night of the fourth of the current month, around three o'clock after midnight.

He answered that, finding himself on guard duty, the named Blanchet had come to warn him and to ask for help against the named Buteau, who was stealing a boat [Blanchet] had seized, which was under the guard of the named Ouilf, a soldier. That he went immediately, and recognized that it was indeed the said Buteau [illegible], that he had cut the cord, that as soon as the said Buteau saw him, he had jumped into the water, and that he, the deponent, had brought the boat back to land.

We asked if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said that it was true, that he persisted and ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of Joseph Labuxiere, legal witnesses, who have with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Pierre Rebouil mark Labuxiere Diego Blanco Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated the appearance before us of the soldier Joachim Pereyra, to whom, after having him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to interrogate him.

He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that his name was Joachim Pereyra, that he was thirty-four years old, that his occupation was in the service of the King, in the rank of Corporal in the seventh Battalion of Louisiana and that he is of the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked why he had left the quarters the night of the fourth of the current month, about three o'clock after midnight.

He answered that, finding himself on guard duty on the said night with Corporal Rebouil, he had been ordered to go with him after a seized boat that the named Buteau was stealing. That upon arriving at the water's edge, the said Corporal had him stay at the fire to guard a few effects that had remained there, that the said boat had already been set adrift, when the named Charles Ouilf was there to guard it, but that the said Buteau, having cut the mooring line, had climbed in. And the Corporal Rebouil, having [run?] along the water's edge, had brought back the boat. The said Buteau had jumped into the water.

We asked if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said that it was true, that he persisted and ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of Joseph Labuxiere, legal witnesses, who have with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Labuxiere Joachim Pereyra mark Diego Blanco Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated the appearance before us of the soldier Daniel Aplouney, to whom, after having him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to interrogate him.

He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that he name was Daniel Aplouney, that he was thirty-six years old, that his occupation was in the service of the King, in the rank of soldier in the seventh Battalion of Louisiana, and that he is of the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked why he had left the quarters the night of the fourth of the current month around three o'clock after midnight.

He answered that, finding himself on guard duty with Corporal Rebouil that same night, the said Corporal had had him leave with him to go after a seized boat that the named Buteau was stealing from the port. That having arrived at the water's edge, the said Corporal had sent him along the water's edge in order to see if he could discover anything. That having left, a moment after, he saw a pirogue that was coming upstream, and that it arrived on land with the named Charles Ouilf and the named Blanchet, who were bringing it.

We asked if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said that it was true, that he persisted and ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of Joseph Labuxiere, legal witnesses, who have with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Labuxiere

Daniel Aplouney mark

Diego Blanco

Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated the appearance before us of the named Blanchet whom, after having him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to interrogate him.

He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that his name was Louis Blanchet, that he was forty-nine years old, that he was a hunter by occupation, and that he is of the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman.

We asked why he found himself in this post.

He answered that he had left the Cuivre River to bring here a boat with two prisoners that he had seized doing commerce, in violation of the law, on the said river.

We asked what the names were of the two prisoners, and where they are.

He answered that the hired hand named Baribeau was in prison, and that his boss named Buteau had escaped as they drew near the post, as the boat drifted near the rock [Buteau] had jumped to land, and they did not see him after that.

We asked where these two men reside.

He answered that the named Buteau, owner of the pirogue, is a resident of the post of the Cahos [Cahokia], on the American side of the [Mississippi] river. And the said Baribeau, his hired hand, is a wandering man, finding work where he can.

We asked in what place and for what motive he had seized this pirogue.

He answered that the seizure was in the Cuivre River, territory of His Catholic Majesty. That he had seized this boat following orders that prevent the introduction of any foreign merchandise into the lands of His Catholic Majesty.

We asked if, before the seizure, the said Buteau had started to trade, and with whom.

He answered that, before the seizure, the said Buteau had started to trade with the hunters, and that he sold rum to the named Jacob Metot, François Alarie, and Joseph Louis Gautier.

We asked if he seized the boat by himself or if he was accompanied, and if the said Buteau and Baribeau had made any resistance.

He answered that he had made the seizure assisted by Baptiste Belan, Laurent Michon, Joseph Laporte, and the named Cazeneuve and Alexis Michon. And that at the time of the seizure, Buteau and Baribeau had not made any resistance.

We asked what had happened at the water's edge the night of the fourth of the current month, at three o'clock after midnight, when he was guarding the pirogue, and what reason made him go and warn the guard, and that he should make us an exact account.

He answered that, being on land, sleep had overcome him, and that he woke up all of a sudden with the sound of the waves. He saw that the pirogue was no longer there, and that made him go to warn the guard.

We asked if it was the pirogue all by itself that was adrift, or if someone had set it adrift in order to take it.

He answered that it was the boat's owner Buteau who, while he the deponent was sleeping, had come to set it adrift by untying the cord and that he had embarked by, he believed, the drift of the boat, that the said boat started to drift, the soldier who was [illegible] had noticed and wanting to fight it out with the said Buteau, this last had jumped in the water, and had with all speed remounted the [illegible] he, the deponent, had arrived with the guard corps as the soldier was bringing the boat back to land, and that he had helped him to bring it back.

We asked if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said that it was true, that he persisted and ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of Joseph Labuxiere, legal witnesses, who have with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Labuxiere

Louis Blanchet mark

Diego Blanco

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 9th, 1779. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor as above, we went to the prison of this post to see the named Baribeau, one of the accused. After having mandated his appearance before us, we had him raise his right hand and make the Sign of the Cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to interrogate him.

He answered that yes, he swore and promised it.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that his name was Joseph Baribeau, that he was thirty-one years old, that he was a *voyageur* by occupation, and that he is of the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman.

We asked for the reason why he was in prison.

He answered that it was because he was hired by the named Buteau in order to go into the Mississippi, and that the said Buteau entered the Cuivre River, in spite of statements of the deponent, who told him not to trade, that it was against the orders of the Spanish government, that he knew that commerce was forbidden. And in spite of the fact that Mr. Blanchet, who was in the river, had forbidden the said Buteau to trade and [had told him] to get out of the river. That in spite of all the statements and reproofs, the said Buteau had traded about three bottles of rum, which caused Mr. Blanchet to seize the boat and that he, the deponent, said to Mr. Blanchet that since Buteau, the owner, had wanted to put himself in a bad position by doing prohibited commerce, that he was innocent, and that Buteau had traded in spite of his opposition, that out of good will he was going to help Mr. Blanchet with the descent of the boat [to St. Louis], and was going to submit to [the authority of] the Commander.

We asked from what post he had left to do commerce, and to whom this post belonged. He answered that he had left from the post of Cahokia, belonging to the United States of America.

We asked who the Cuivre River belongs to.

He answered that it belonged to the domain of His Catholic Majesty [of Spain].

We asked where the residence of the said Buteau was.

He answered that it was at the Cahokia post.

We asked if, when he had left Cahokia, the named Buteau had told him that he wanted to go into the Cuivre River to trade.

He answered that he had not told him this, that he had only said that he was going into the Mississippi, and that when they were facing the Cuivre River, Buteau had entered it, saying that there were hunters in this river who

owed him, and that he wanted to go see them, as well as savages from the American side who were wintering there.

We asked if when the said Blanchet came to seize them, if he was alone or accompanied by anyone.

He answered that the Blanchet was not alone, that he was accompanied by five or six men.

We asked if, during the seizure, there were a few articles that were not included in the inventory that is found on the first page of these proceedings, of which we made a reading [illegible].

He answered that there were the same things, neither more nor less.

We asked if he had anything further to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that no, he had nothing further to say.

We read his deposition to him. He said that it was true, that he persisted and ratified it under the oath that he had made, and declaring not to know how to sign, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Diego Blanco, sergeant of this garrison, and of Joseph Labuxiere, legal witnesses, who have with us, the Lieutenant Governor, signed this said day and year.

Labuxiere

Joseph Baribeau mark

Diego Blanco

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

We, Don Fernando de Leyba, Captain of Infantry of the Regiment of Louisiana, Commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois. By virtue of the judicial inquiry done by us against the named Buteau, residing on the American side, and accused to have done prohibited commerce in the Cuivre River, where his boat was seized when surprised doing commerce, in violation of the law, with the vassals of His Catholic Majesty.

We order that the said Buteau be summoned by our bailiff, and by public proclamation three times over, in order to begin serving a sentence in the prisons of this post. And we mandate his appearance before us in order to understand his reasons and motive on the said occasion. Given in St. Louis, in the chamber of the government, November 6th, 1779.

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

In the year 1779, November 7th, at the end of the St. Louis parish's high mass. By virtue of the decree of Don Fernando de Leyba, Commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, I myself, Francois Demers, bailiff, in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois, have expressly taken myself to the public square of the St. Louis post, to the door of the said church, from where I, in a loud and intelligible voice and by public proclamation, have summoned the named Buteau to appear within nine days, dated from today's date, in front of the Lieutenant Governor, to begin serving a sentence in the prisons of this post, and to respond to the accusations against him regarding the seizure of his boat, which was, in violation of the law, on this side of the Cuivre River. After having waited the necessary time, and as the said Buteau did not present himself so that I could notify him of the present summons, I withdrew, on the strength of which I have written up the present verbal report to be put to good use. In St. Louis, the said day and year.

Demers, bailiff

I, the undersigned, Sergeant of the garrison of St. Louis, certify that the named Buteau did not present himself to go to prison in this post, following the summons above. In St. Louis, November 16th, 1779.

Diego Blanco

In the year 1779, November 18th, by virtue of the decree of M. Don Fernando de Leyba, Commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, I, Francois Demers, bailiff in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois, have expressly taken myself to the public square of the St. Louis post, to the door of the said church, from where I, in a loud and intelligible voice and by a public proclamation, have summoned the named Buteau to appear within nine days, dated from today's date, in front of the Lieutenant Governor, to begin serving a sentence in the prisons of this post, and to respond to the accusations against him, regarding the seizure of his boat, which was, in violation of the law, on this side of the Cuivre River. After having waited the necessary time, and as the said Buteau did not present himself so that I could notify him of the present summons, I withdrew, on the strength of which I have written up the present verbal report to be put to good use. In St. Louis, the said day and year.

Demers, bailiff

I, the undersigned, Sergeant of the garrison of St. Louis, certify that the named Buteau did not present himself to go to prison in this post, following the summons above. In St. Louis, November 28th, 1779.

Diego Blanco

In the year 1779, November 29th, by virtue of the decree of Don Fernando de Leyba, Commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, I, Francois Demers, bailiff in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois, have expressly taken myself to the public square of the St. Louis post, to the door of the said church, from where I, in a loud and intelligible voice and by a public proclamation, have summoned the named Buteau to appear within nine days, dated from today's date, in front of the Lieutenant Governor, to begin serving a sentence in the prisons of this post, and to respond to the accusations formed against him regarding the seizure of his boat, which was, in violation of the law, on this side of the Cuivre River. After having waited the necessary time, and as the said Buteau did not present himself so that I could notify him of the present summons, I withdrew, on the strength of which I have written up the present verbal report to be put to good use. In St. Louis, the said day and year.

Demers, bailiff

I, the undersigned, Sergeant of the garrison of St. Louis, certify that the named Buteau did not present himself to go to prison in this post, following the summons above. In St. Louis, December 15th, 1779.

Diego Blanco

In the year 1779, December 15th, we, Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, by virtue of the confiscation and judicial inquiry done by us of a pirogue seized while doing prohibited commerce, in violation of the law, on the Cuivre River, from the named Buteau, inhabitant of the American side [of the Mississippi river]. And in order to prevent spoilage, we have ordered that the [seized goods] be sold at present to the highest and last bidder, and at this moment we have announced to the public that the purchasers will pay the prices of their auction in deer or beaver skin [illegible] and without delay. The public being assembled, the sale was done by Mr. Blanco, authorized guardian of the said effects, as follows:

First, a third of a measure of forty pots of rum sold to Mr. Dubreuil for ninety-six <i>livres</i> , herewith	96
Item, three barrels of rum of about four pots, sold to Mr. Dubrueil for forty-one <i>livres</i> , herewith.....	41
Item, a barrel of rum of around ten pots, sold to Mr. Dubrueil for thirty-two <i>livres</i> , herewith.....	32
Item, a small cake of suet of around fifteen <i>livres</i> , sold to the Sr Chauvin for twelve <i>livres</i> , ten <i>sols</i> , herewith.....	12.10
Item, ten and a half <i>carottes</i> of tobacco, sold to Charles Ouilf, soldier, for twenty-six <i>livres</i> , herewith.....	26
Item, around seven hundred <i>livres</i> of flour in seven cloth bags, as many good as bad, sold to Mr. Chevalier for one hundred twenty-two <i>livres</i> , herewith...	122
Item, a small copper pot with lid and one small copper cauldron, sold to Ortes for ten <i>livres</i> , herewith.....	10
To next page.....	329.10

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

As a consequence of the power which was remitted to me by Mr. Blanchet, I have received from Don Fernando de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor, one hundred sixty-three *livres*, sixteen *sols*, eight *deniers* in peltry, [to be given] to Mr. Blanchet as his third of the confiscation done upon the named Buteau, who was taken in the Cuivre River violating the law, as it had been ordered by Monsieur de Leyba. Inventory of the said sum, I hold him clear of debt and promise to hold Blanchet clear of debt. In St. Louis, November 17, 1779. Sarpy.

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

Inventory of the effects that the named Baribeau has declared to have in the boat that was seized from the named Buteau, which were sold at auction. Don Fernando de Leyba has remitted to him the price that they were sold for, from his own money and out of his good will without [illegible] in the procedure.

Namely:

Five <i>carrotes</i> of tobacco	12.10
[illegible] remitted to him as it was seized	
A little cauldron	3
Everything that he claims in the chest of his boss, containing [illegible] knives and an old cotton shirt	10
100 <i>livres</i> of natural flour	[illegible]
A hatchet	3
His gun and his powder horn	10
Total in booty at thirty-eight <i>livres</i> , ten <i>sols</i>	38.10 in peltry

I, Joseph Baribeau, recognize that Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, Lieutenant Governor has remitted to me, out of his good will and by his own grace, the amount of the inventory [illegible] on the strength of which, I give the present receipt in St. Louis, November 10, 1779, not knowing how to sign, I have made my ordinary mark, in the presence of the undersigned witnesses.

Diego Blanco

Joseph Baribeau mark

Labuxiere

[Box 1, Folder 10]

[Original in French]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, December 16th, 1779. We, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the Regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, and commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

In the matter of the verbal statement made by us about the seizure, at the warning of the named Blanchet, of a pirogue loaded with effects, taken by him in the Cuivre River, on lands of His Catholic Majesty. The said pirogue belonging to the named Buteau, inhabitant of the place of Cahokia, on the American part, in receipt of the [illegible] at present the attestation of Mr. Labuxiere, Blanco and Blanchet, who have examined the peltry coming from the boat. The attestation of three hunters of the Cuivre River, who declare that the said Buteau sold some rum to them. The judicial inquiry made by us through the deposition, from the fifth of the current month, of the named Charles Ouilf, soldier of the garrison of Fort Missouri, who was sent from the said Fort to escort the boat with the named Blanchet to St. Louis. The deposition of Corporal Rebouil, who declares to have been told during the night by the named Blanchet that the said Buteau had come in the said night to steal the boat, and that he had gone as reinforcement. The deposition of Joachim Pereyra, soldier, who declares to have accompanied the said Corporal Rebouil during the same night, in order to help the said Blanchet against the said Buteau, who had stolen the seized boat. The deposition of the said Blanchet, who declares to have seized the said boat and the named Buteau with the named Baribeu, his hired hand, who were doing prohibited commerce in the said Cuivre River, that while bringing the boat with these two men to St. Louis, the named Buteau, as they were approaching St. Louis, had jumped to land and had escaped, and that being arrived in the port in front of St. Louis at night, the hired hand had been put in prison, and that while Blanchet was guarding the boat with the named Ouilf, soldier, the said Buteau, taking advantage of the darkness, had come to cut the moorings of the said boat, and had obliged Blanchet to call the guard to his rescue in order to run after the boat, but that the said Buteau, fearing to be caught, had jumped in the water in fear of being killed or taken, and had escaped, and that they had brought the boat back. The deposition of the named Baribeu, detained in the prisons of this post, hired hand of the said Buteau, who declares that the said Buteau entered the Cuivre River in spite of his protests, that he traded some rum, that he had done all that he could to prevent him but that the said Buteau did not want to listen. Our decree stating that the said Buteau will be summoned by a public proclamation, during a period of nine days, for three nine-day periods, to answer the accusation against him, and to begin to serve his sentence in the prison of this post. The three nine-day summons by the bailiff Demers. The attestations of Sergeant Blanco, who declares that the said Buteau did not appear within the time limits of the summons. The sale by auction of the effects seized in the said boat of the said Buteau, in order to prevent their spoilage, amounting to four hundred eleven *livres*, joined to the one hundred twenty-one *livres*, ten *sols* of natural peltry which were found on the boat, according to the attestation and examination of Mr. Labuxiere, Blanco and Blanchet, adding up to the sum of five hundred twenty-one *livres*, ten *sols* of peltry. The whole thing considered and examined, we have declared the said Buteau in rebellion by reason of having furtively tried to steal the seized boat, which was under the authority of the King and of his justice. In reparation, we condemn him to six months of prison, if taken perhaps, of the [illegible] the seizure made [illegible] and confiscation, to have acted against the orders of the government by doing prohibited commerce on the lands of His Catholic Majesty from which seizure, amounting to five hundred twenty-one *livres*, ten *sols*, we adjudicate one third to the royal treasury, amounting to one hundred sixty-three *livres*, sixteen *sols*, eight *deniers*; one third to the seizer Blanchet, and the other third to the costs of justice. We condemn, besides, the said Baribeu, hired hand of the said Buteau, to fifteen days in prison for having violated the law. Given in the chamber of the government by us, Lieutenant Governor, this said day and year.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 11]

[Original in French]

To Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry of Louisiana, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie] and Auguste Chouteau, merchants of this post, take the liberty of informing to you, sir, that last year they acquired the permit of Mr. Cartabonne and of the named Moran to trade with the Otos [Otoes] and the Panis [Pawnees]. Consequently, for the exploitation of these two posts they equipped the said Moran and the named Fitzjame, who left, according to your orders, to trade in the said posts. The deponents have learned, and have been informed by a reputable source, about [the deeds of] the named Duchesne, trader supposedly with the post of the Mahas [Omaha]. The named Larche and LeCompte, while going through the post of the Otos [on their way to the Omahas], that the said Duchesne had made a deal engaging the savage Otos to stop the said Larche to trade with them, and thus he robbed the deponents of the furs that said Moran, their trader, could have obtained in the said post of the Otos. And to outfit a team with [illegible] the said Larche, who might trespass into the said post and crush the deponents' trade. The said Duchesne drew forth from his equipment [illegible] of LeCompte a quantity of merchandise that they turned over to the said Larche, who continued to trade against your precise and public orders. And [illegible] the position of their trader, Moran. By this maneuver, you see, Sir, that the said Duchesne found himself alone with the said LeCompte at the post of the Mahas, and that they conducted business to the deponents' detriment, which occasioned the late arrival of their trader, which still proves that the said Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte are accomplices, and are conspiring together in this prohibited commerce.

In these circumstances, the deponents resort to you, Sir, that it may please you that the pelts coming from the post of the Otos be seized temporarily, until the said Moran, their trader, arrives in this post and is questioned in front of you, Sir, so that it may be decided to whom the goods belong. In St. Louis, June 4, 1779

Auguste Chouteau Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie]

In the matter of the present request and the reasons set forth, we order that all the pelts brought by the named Larche from the post of the Otos, where he traded against the public ordinances, be seized temporarily and put in the charge and guard of Mr. Papin, outfitter of the named LeCompte until the arrival of the named Moran, in charge of the ongoing trade of the said post, to be decided by us which one is right. In St. Louis, June 4, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

As a consequence of the arrival of the said Moran in this post, [the absence of whom] had stopped until the present the proceedings of the trial brought by the said Mrs. Labbadie [Labadie] and Chouteau. We order to the said gentlemen, plaintiffs, to produce their witnesses in order that they be heard and questioned before us, next Friday the 25th of the current month at 10 o'clock in the morning. In St. Louis, June 23, 1779

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, June 25th, 1779
Judicial Inquiry.

We, Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry of Louisiana, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, by virtue of our order of June 23 of the present month, and of the request of Mrs. Labbadie [Labadie] and Chouteau, dated this day, that the named Moran, Frédéric, Janvier and Renaud, witnesses cited by them, be questioned about the facts of the complaint brought by them before us.

Consequently, we have mandated the appearance before us of the named Moran, to whom, after having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts on which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, that he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professes.

He answered that his name was Antoine Moran, was about forty-five years old, practiced the occupation of trader, and professed the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman.

We asked which nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had traded with the Oto nation.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, if it was as a *bourgeois* or an *engagé*.

He answered that he had traded in the capacity of *commis* [assistant] to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie].

We asked if any of the other *bourgeois* authorized to trade had gone to this nation to do business, while being assigned to another post.

He answered that Mrs. Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte had come into the land of the Otos, while they were assigned to the post of the Mahas.

We asked how was that these traders had gained admittance into this post [of the Otos] to trade. And that he had to make an exact account of everything that he had seen taking place.

He answered that they had gained admittance by way of the savages, to whom they had appeared reasonable.

That they had agreed when the savages told them "at present you can leave," that they started to ready themselves to leave but that by some misfortune they were missing a man who was hunting, and that the weather turned bad. That the savages thus told them "you can leave tomorrow," and that very late in the evening Mr. Duchesne was talking to the nation's chief, where there were young male savages, this chief was shocked by what Mr. Duchesne probably told him. At this moment the savages made their cry [illegible] Duchesne was stopped, the savage warriors who were by this deponent's fire got up, made their cry in the same way, and the chief told them "take care of this boat, it will not leave." The chief having come to this deponent's fire, he [the deponent] asked him "What is it, my father? What has happened?" That the chief did not want to answer him, and that, having [the deponent] reiterated his request, the chief told him "Duchesne is saying bad things. He shocks me. My young men are not happy. I think that I will stop his boat tomorrow." Then the deponent complained to the chief, saying to him, "My father, you make me pity you and them too. We are obliged to listen to the word of our chief. We are not like you. They are assigned to the Mahas, and I to you, you have presently received them and now you do not want to let them pass." He answered that it was not he who was [illegible], that it was Mr. Duchesne, and that the young men the next day would stop Mr. Duchesne and Larche. As they were getting ready to leave, having seen a savage in their boat, the other savages surrounded the boat and, taking the oars, they brought them back to deponent's fire. The deponent made his complaints to Mr. Duchesne and told him "Mr. Duchesne, if you had not made those nasty remarks to the savages, you would have not been held." That the said Duchesne, wanting to get the deponent's advice, told him "What am I going to do? I feel like going to Larche, and together we will leave a bit of merchandise here with a man to trade." That the deponent answered him, "This is your fault that you are being held, I believe that you have done a bad thing. Figure it out yourself, I do not want to get mixed up in this." So two savages got on either side of the river, and brought the boat back. When they arrived to the campground, Larche and LeCompte made a lot of reproaches to Duchesne, telling him that it was all his fault. That Mr. Larche stayed behind through December, still having all the merchandise, and that the savages then left for their wintering places. He [Larche] sent word to Duchesne at his post to come and get the merchandise, that there were not any savages, and that it was a good moment to pass the merchandise through [to the post of the Omaha]. That Mr. Duchesne gave by way of answer that they were [illegible] to the Otos, that it was necessary that [the merchandise] be consumed.

We asked if he understood the language of the Oto nation.

He answered yes, that he understood a little.

We asked if he himself heard with his own ears the words that Duchesne said to the chief or to the young men, which words caused all these [illegible] to come about. Or if he had not heard Duchesne, if some other white [man] had possibly heard him and thus knew that, and that he should name him.

He answered that he had not heard him, that he had only known about it by the Indian chief as he had reported it. That as for other whites, he did not know if someone had known or heard anything.

We asked if he had sold his entire small stock of merchandise.

He answered yes, that he had sold everything, although with a mediocre profit, because of the other merchandise that had remained there.

We asked for what amount of merchandise Duchesne had squared things off with Larche.

He answered that he had heard from Larche that he had gotten eight hundred *livres*.

We asked how much he estimated that the traders of the Otos had lost owing to this merchandise which remained.

He answered that he estimated the loss at twenty packets.

We asked what month it was when Larche had sent word to Duchesne to come and get the merchandise, and if the river was navigable.

He answered that Larche had sent word to Duchesne in the month of December, and that the river was navigable.

We asked if in spite of the savages' opposition and attempts to prevent the passage of this merchandise, if he thought that Duchesne could have found some other way to get the merchandise to its destination [at the post of the Omaha].

He answered that he could have found passage by land, as Larche had asked him to send horses with that purpose.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered that he had nothing else to say and that was all that he knew.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made and that there was nothing there to be changed or added on or diminished. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of the Sr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and of Louis Richart, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Luis Richard

mark of Antoine Moran, deponent

Labuxiere

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, the twenty-eighth of June, seventeen hundred seventy-nine.

We have mandated the appearance before us of the named Frédéric. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Louis Frédéric, was thirty-three years old, practiced the occupation of *voyageur* and professed the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked what nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had traded with the Otos.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, whether as a *bourgeois* or *engagé*.

He answered that he had traded in the capacity of *engagé* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie].

We asked if any other *bourgeois* authorized to trade had gained admittance into this nation's post with merchandise in order to do business, having his destination in another post.

He answered that Mr. Larche, LeCompte and Duchesne had gained admittance, while they had the post of the Maha nation as their destination.

We asked what motives these traders had to gain admittance in this post to do business, and that he should give us an exact account.

He answered that they had agreed with each other to leave a man with the Otos with merchandise. That they left Mr. Larche behind, telling him "Stay here. As soon as the savages leave for their wintering place, we will come and get you." That after the savages had left, Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]'s *commis* [assistant] had said to Mr. Larche, "You can leave now. You have a two-man canoe," and that Mr. Larche did not at all want to. That he [Larche] had sent word to Duchesne to come and get him, but that Duchesne had answered that as the

merchandise had remained there, it was necessary to trade it. That he had not heard this last fact, but that he had heard it from the named Renaud, Mr. Duchesne's *engagé*.

We asked if when they had stayed with the Otos, they had been forced by the savages to stay there. That is to say, if Larche, LeCompte and Duchesne had been held by the aforementioned savages, or if it was by their own free will that they stayed.

He answered that it was the savages who forced them to stay.

We asked if, in spite of savages's opposition, he, the deponent, thought that Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte could have diverted their merchandise or passed it through during another time, so as not to occasion any loss to the traders authorized to trade in this nation's post.

He answered that they could have passed it through if they had stayed another five or six days, because all the savages were leaving for their wintering, and that there would be no one in the village.

We asked if he, the deponent, had heard with his own ears that one of the traders had words with the savages in order to get himself held up, and to make the traders assigned to the said post believe that they were being held against their will.

He answered that he had not heard with his own ears that these traders had any words with the savages in order to get themselves held up, but that he saw the savages arrest them.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say and that was all that he knew.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made, and that there was nothing there to be changed or added or diminished. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Antoine Stéfarel, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Antonio Stéfarelli mark of Louis Frédéric, deponent

Labuxiere

Fernando de Leyba

July 5, 1779.

We have mandated the appearance before us of the named Janvier. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that his name was Pierre Janvier, that he was thirty-seven years old, practiced the occupation of *voyageur*, and professed the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion

We asked what nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had traded with the Otos.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, whether it was in the capacity of *bourgeois* or *engagé*.

He answered that he had traded in the capacity of *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie].

We asked if any other *bourgeois* authorized to trade had gained admittance into the post of this nation with merchandise in order to do business, having his destination in another post.

He answered that the said Larche had stopped to trade with the Otos.

We asked what motive this trader had to gain admittance into this post in order to do business, and that he should give us an exact account.

He answered that he was positive that Mr. Duchesne had been held at the post of the Otos by the savages, and that seeing himself held, he conspired with the said Larche and LeCompte, and that Mr. Larche stayed with the merchandise to trade. That some time later, the said Larche sent a savage with the name Renaud, his *engagé*, in order to tell Mr. Duchesne to have the merchandise sent [to the post of the Omaha], that the said Renaud had reported that Duchesne had answered that, as the merchandise had remained behind, it was necessary that it be traded with the Otos.

We asked if, in spite of the force that the savages had used in order to prevent Mr. Duchesne from passing through, the deponent believed that Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte could have diverted their merchandise or passed it through in another time, so as not to occasion the loss to the traders assigned to this nation's post. He answered that he felt that it was impossible that Mr. Duchesne could have passed, and that he could have continued on his way at the time that Mr. Larche had told him to come and get his merchandise.

We asked if he, the deponent, had heard with his own ears that one of the traders had had words with the savages in order to get himself held, and to make the traders of the said post believe that they were being held against their will.

He answered that he had heard nothing like that.

We asked if he, the deponent, had heard with his own ears the answer that Renaud carried from Duchesne, saying that Duchesne did not want to come and get his merchandise, and that it was necessary to trade it in the said post of the Otos.

He answered yes, that he had heard it from the mouth of the said Renaud.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made and that there was nothing there to be changed or added or diminished. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Mr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Antoine Stéfarel, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Stefarelli mark of +Pierre Janvier, deponent

Labuxiere Fernando de Leyba

Next we have mandated the appearance before us of the named Renaud. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Louis Renaud, was forty years old, practiced the occupation of carpenter, and professed the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked what nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had traded with the Otos.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, whether it was in the capacity of *bourgeois* or *engagé*. He answered that he had traded in the capacity of *engagé* of Mr. Larche and LeCompte.

We asked for what motive Larche and LeCompte had stayed at the post of the Otos with merchandise, without going to their destination, which was to the post of the Mahas. And that he should give us an exact account of what had happened concerning this affair.

He answered that upon arriving at the post of the Otos, the savages had arrested Mr. Duchesne, and that as he could not pass through, he entered into partnership with Mr. Larche and LeCompte. That Mr. Larche stayed behind at the said post with the merchandise. And that next, Duchesne and LeCompte continued on their way to the Mahas. That he, the deponent, had stayed behind with the said Larche in the capacity of *engagé*, and that after living there for a month, without Mr. Larche having traded anything, Mr. Larche sent him with a savage to tell Mr. Duchesne that he could send for his merchandise, that it was still whole, and that he had not traded anything. That Mr. Duchesne had answered that he would not send for it, that as it had remained behind at the post of the Otos, it was necessary to trade it.

We asked why Larche himself had not taken the merchandise to its destination, when he had sent word to Duchesne to come and get it.

He answered that at that time the Missouri river was covered with ice, that he [Larche] had no horses to carry it overland, and that Mr. Larche was alone with him, the deponent.

We asked if Mr. Duchesne had a sufficient number of people and horses to go get the merchandise.

He answered that when he went to see Mr. Duchesne to tell him to go get the merchandise, he had four men, including the deponent, and that he could have taken the horses of the Maha savages.

We asked if he, the deponent, had heard with his own ears that one of the traders had had some words with the savages in order to get himself held up, and to make the traders at the Oto post believe that they were being held against their will.

He answered no, that he had never heard that.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say, and that he had said all that he could.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made and that there was nothing there to be changed or added or diminished. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of Mr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Antoine Stéfarel, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Stefanelli mark of Louis Renaud, deponent Labuxiere Fernando de Leyba

At St. Louis of the Illinois, July 6, 1779.

We have mandated the appearance before us of the above named Francois Larche. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Francois Larche, was fifty-seven years old, practiced the occupation of *voyageur*, and professed the Catholic apostolic and Roman religion.

We asked what nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had left St. Louis to trade with the Maha nation, but that he had been held by the Otos.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, whether it was in the capacity of *bourgeois* or *engagé*.

He answered that it was in the capacity of associate of Mr. Nicolas LeCompte, who had a permit to trade in the post of the Mahas.

We asked for what motive, having a permit to trade in the Maha post, they had gotten held in the post of the Otos. And that he should give us an exact account of what had happened at the post of the Otos, where they had stayed to trade against the public ordinance dated August 3, 1778.

He answered that upon arriving in post of the Otos, they had given some presents to the savages, so that they would let them pass. That after the said savages had received the presents, he, the deponent, had left. That the savages had surrounded the boat in order to stop it, that they took it back to the village, that Mr. Duchesne, being held by the same savages, told him "Let's collaborate. I will leave you behind," which he agreed to, and Mr. LeCompte, his associate, agreed to. Thus he, the deponent, stayed in the said post of the Otos with four pieces of cloth, a keg of gunpowder, and other little trinkets, the whole thing amounting to around fifteen hundred *livres*. That he had not traded anything whatsoever during the whole autumn, because Mr. Duchesne had told him that he would send for him through the Maha savages. That toward the month of December, when the savages had gone into the woods to hunt, he sent a man to tell Duchesne to come and get the merchandise. Mr. Duchesne sent word by the same man that it was impossible for him to send for the merchandise because the trails were not at all passable, that all he had to do was to trade with the Otos, since the merchandise had been held up there.

We asked why, when Duchesne sent word that he could not send for the merchandise, the deponent did not take himself the merchandise to the Mahas, where the said Duchesne was located.

He answered that he did not have enough manpower, having only one man, and that the Missouri was covered with ice, and that he himself was sick.

We asked if he had confided with the named Moran, *commis* of the said Labbadie [Labadie], authorized to trade with the Otos, about the impossibility to pass the merchandise to the post of the Mahas, and if he had finally asked him for help in this affair.

He answered that yes, he had asked but that the said Moran had refused to help him. That Moran told him that, the season being too bad, his men would refuse [to go] because they had not been hired to go to the Mahas, and that besides he [Moran] had a lot of work to do, especially on the boats, and that he could not go.

We asked if he thought that Duchesne had spoken to the savages in a bad way in order to get himself held, making the traders of the post believe that he was being held against his will.

He answered that he firmly believed that the savages held Duchesne by their own ill will, that he had not seen or heard anything that would cast doubt upon the said Duchesne.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say except that the trade had not been advantageous to him in this post, nor hurtful to the *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]. That he did not have enough merchandise as he, the deponent, sold him a part of his own. That seeing the impossibility of going to the Mahas, he had tried to sell all of his merchandise to the said Moran, but Moran had refused, saying that he was not the boss.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of the Sr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Philippe Zirogane, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Phe Zirogane mark of +Francois Larche, deponent Labuxiere Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, July 8, 1779

We have mandated the appearance before us of the above named Pierre LeCompte. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Pierre LeCompte, was thirty-nine years old, was a *voyageur* by trade, and professed the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman.

We asked in what capacity he had traded, whether it was in the capacity of *bourgeois* or *engagé*.

He answered that it was in the capacity of *bourgeois*, to trade at the said post of the Mahas, with a permit that he had from his brother.

We asked for what motive he had left his merchandise with the Otos, having a permit from his brother to trade at the Maha post, and that he should give us an exact account of this.

He answered that, having left St. Louis with Mr. Duchesne with his permit to go to the Mahas, as they were passing through the post of the Otos, Duchesne had been held by the Oto savages who told him "You are bound for our village." That Mr. Duchesne had replied that he was not bound for their village, that he was [bound for] the Mahas, and that he offered them a present so that they would let him pass through. After the said savages had received the present, they told the deponent that he could leave, which he did, but after going approximately a league and a half upriver, the said savages came after him and led his boat back to their village. That Mr. Duchesne proposed to the deponent to collaborate in leaving some merchandise behind, which they did, and that they left Mr. Larche behind with the Otos with approximately fifteen hundred *livres*, and that they left for the Mahas. That a short time thereafter, when they were at the Mahas, Mr. Larche, whom they had left with the Otos, sent the named Renaud, his *engagé*, to tell Mr. Duchesne to send for the merchandise. That Mr. Duchesne answered through the said Renaud that he could not send for it, that the savages would not go there, and that besides the season did not permit this.

We asked if he believed that Duchesne had been held by the savages' ill disposition, or if the said Duchesne had spoken to them in a bad way in order to get himself held, making the traders of the Oto post believe that he was being held in spite of himself.

He answered that he had seen the boat held up, but that he had not seen or heard anything that would throw suspicion onto the said Duchesne.

We asked if he, who was with the Mahas when the named Renaud came to tell Duchesne to send for the merchandise, found that there was any possibility of finding a way to have the merchandise sent for from the post of the Otos.

He answered that there was absolutely no possibility, that the season was too far advanced and that the said Duchesne told him that it was all the same whether the merchandise ended up with the Otos or by the trails, which were impassable in this season.

We asked to estimate how much the traders assigned to the Oto nation had lost owing to the merchandise that they left behind.

He answered that he did not believe that their merchandise harmed Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] in any way, because Mr. Larche only traded after the fall hunt, and that the *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] did not have enough merchandise as he accepted a portion of Mr. Larche's merchandise.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say, and that was all he knew.

A reading was made to him of the deposition. He said that it was the truth, and that he still remained under the oath that he had made. And having declared not to know how to sign his name, he made his ordinary mark, in the presence of the Sr. Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Louis Richart, soldier of this garrison, legal witnesses, who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and year.

Luis Richard

mark of +LeCompte, deponent Labuxiere

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, July 9, 1779

We have mandated the appearance before us, the Lieutenant Governor, of the above named Mr. Duchesne. After having him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, we asked him if he swore to God and promised the king to tell the truth about the facts about which we are going to question him.

He answered yes, he swore and promised.

We asked him his name, age, occupation and what religion he professed.

He answered that he was named Jean-Baptiste Duchesne, was twenty-seven years old, trader by profession, and professed the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman.

We asked what nation he had traded with this year.

He answered that he had traded with the Maha nation.

We asked in what capacity he had traded with the Mahas, whether it was in the capacity of *bourgeois* or *engagé*.

He answered that it was in the capacity of *bourgeois*, to trade with a permit that he had.

We asked for what motive, having his permit to trade with the Mahas, he had left his merchandise at the post of the Otos, against the published ordinance of August third of last year, which forbids either leaving or passing any merchandise in any post other than the one assigned by the permit, and that he should give us an exact account of it.

He answered that he had in good faith tried to execute the orders carried in his permit, but that the Oto savages had forced him to remain [in their post]. That he had given them presents, and that after receiving the presents, they had told him that they did not have enough merchandise at their post and that he needed to leave half of [the merchandise in] his pirogue. That he saw himself in a fix, and that in spite of the protests he made, they did not want to listen. That he determined to leave the said Larche with a little merchandise with the Otos, in order to be able to pass the rest with [illegible] to Mr. Larche not to trade, that he would eventually find a way to get the merchandise through, and that Mr. Larche in fact did not trade until after the hunt [illegible]. That before trading he sent a man [to the post of the Mahas] to tell him, the deponent, to come and get the merchandise. But that the Missouri river was covered with ice, and the overland tracks were so impassable that the savages did not want to go there by the rivers, which were overflowing with snow onto the tracks [illegible], and the fear that they were going to other nations, that the merchandise would have run the risk of being lost, and that it was not sufficient to pay for the expenses incurred in transporting it through such a long route. And that in spite of his good will, this is what prevented the *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], not having enough merchandise, he

[sold?] a portion of that he had left with the Otos in the hands of Mr. Larche, who traded the rest during the course of the winter.

We asked what sum of merchandise he had left at the Oto post in the hands of Mr. Larche.

He answered that, between his and LeCompte's merchandise, there was about sixteen or seventeen hundred *livres* in the hands of Mr. Larche.

We asked how much this sum of sixteen or seventeen hundred *livres* of merchandise produced in packets [of furs] for him.

He answered that it could have produced around seventeen hundred *livres* in all.

We asked how much distance there is between the Oto nation and that of the Mahas.

He answered that it would be around eighty leagues.

We asked how he could say that he had only made around seventeen hundred *livres*, while he was contesting the seizure that we did of the packets that Mr. Larche brought down to St. Louis, and which were under Mr. Papin's charge. That there was a quantity of four thousand two hundred two *livres*.

He answered that the peltry that they had made at the Mahas was included [in the count], as he had delivered it to them at the said Oto post while passing through.

We asked if he had anything else to say to shed light on this affair.

He answered to have nothing else to say.

A reading was made to him of his deposition. He said that it was the truth, that he still remained under the oath that he had made, and he signed in the presence of Joseph Labuxiere, citizen of this post, and Louis Richard, legal witnesses who have with us, Lieutenant Governor, signed this day and in the above mentioned year.

Luis Richard

Duchesne

Labuxiere

Fernando de Leyba

In St. Louis of the Illinois, July 10, 1779, in the case of Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie] and Auguste Chouteau, merchants in St. Louis of the Illinois, versus Jean-Baptiste Duchesne, Francois Larche and Nicolas LeCompte, traders.

In the matter of the petition of the plaintiffs, that they were the proprietors of the Oto post during last year, 1778. That the named Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte came into the named post with merchandise, against the public orders, and that they traded there to the detriment of the plaintiffs. That the peltry that the named Larche traded in the said Oto post was seized provisionally, until we be informed and it was decreed to whom it [the peltry] belongs. The said petition, dated the 4th of last June, our decree of the same day at the bottom of the said petition, stating that the peltries that the named Larche traded to the said Otos will be seized provisionally and placed under Mr. Papin's care, until the arrival of the named Moran, *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] for the exploitation of the said Oto post. The inventory of the seized peltry placed under Mr. Papin's care, signed by him on the same day, last June 4th. Another inventory of peltry remaining after the equipment, paid to Mr. Papin, belonging to the defendants and remaining under the guard of the said Mr. Papin, under the risks of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]. Another decree of last June 23rd, stating that as a consequence of the arrival of the named Moran in St. Louis, the said plaintiffs were obliged to produce their witnesses to be questioned in front of us. The petition of the said plaintiffs of June 25th, where they call as a witness the said Moran, their *commis*, and the named Janvier, Renaud and Frédéric.

The inquiry made by us of the said witnesses, beginning on June 25th with the deposition by the named Moran, *commis* of the said Labbadie [Labadie], who declared that the said Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte came into the Oto post, and were forced to stay there by the savages of this nation, to whom they made a reasonable present in order to be allowed to pass through, but having received the present and having promised to let them pass the next day, the said savages became opposed to it. That the said Moran talked to the savage chief, so that he would let the said Duchesne, LeCompte and Larche pass, but that he could not obtain anything, that the savages ran after and brought [them] back to camp, along with their oars. That the said Duchesne, being able to leave, had left the said Larche with merchandise for about eighteen hundred *livres* to be traded with the Otos. That next Mr. Duchesne and LeCompte continued on their way to the Mahas.

Another deposition by the named Frédéric, of the June 28th, which says that after Mr. Duchesne, LeCompte and Larche were held by the Otos, seeing the impossibility of passing through, they agreed to leave behind Mr. Larche with merchandise with the Otos. That he knows for sure that the savages held them by force in these imprudent circumstances, where it was impossible for the defendants to [illegible] enough.

Another deposition by the named Janvier, of July 5th, who declares that he has a perfect knowledge that the said Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte were held at the Oto post by the savages of this nation, and that it was impossible for them to pass through. That in order to placate the savages and continue on their way, they gave a little merchandise to the savages by way of presents. That in spite of that, the savages did not want to let them through, that in order to placate them they had to leave merchandise behind for trading. That Mr. Larche stayed to trade and for other motives, which proves that the defendants did not have any role in their detention, and that [illegible] of the savages who held them.

Another deposition by the named Renaud, from the same day, who declares that Mr. Duchesne and LeCompte were held by the Oto savages, that not being able to pass through to get to the Mahas, their place of destination, the said Duchesne, LeCompte and Larche entered into partnership and that they left behind Mr. Larche to trade [with the Otos]. That he remained one month with Mr. Larche, without the latter trading anything, that Mr. Larche sent him to the Mahas post to tell Mr. Duchesne to come and get the merchandise, but that Duchesne found himself in an impossible situation and told him that, as the merchandise had remained behind with the Otos, it should stay there.

Another deposition by Francois Larche on July 6th, who declares that the Oto savages held them. That in order to pass the rest of their merchandise to the Mahas post, the place of destination, they gave presents to the savages, but that even after doing this he was obliged to remain with the Otos, to placate the savages who were complaining that they did not have enough merchandise at their post. That he was forced to stay there with four pieces of cloth, two kegs of gunpowder and other little trinkets, the whole thing amounting to around fifteen hundred *livres*. That he did not trade at all during the fall, when the best peltry is available. That he asked a man named Moran, *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] to help him transfer his merchandise to the Mahas post after the savages had left to hunt, but that the said Moran refused to help him. That he sent a man to the Mahas post to tell Mr. Duchesne to come and get the merchandise, but that the said Duchesne could not send for them, the river being filled with ice and the tracks being impassable, because of the snow and other inconveniences. That the said Moran, *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], found himself lacking in merchandise to trade, and thus he had sold him a part of his own, and wanted to turn over all of it, seeing that he could not sell it to the Mahas, but that the said Moran did not want to. And that it was in no way his fault, nor that of Mr. Duchesne or LeCompte, if he remained behind with the Otos.

Another deposition by the named LeCompte on July 8th, who declares that it was impossible for them to pass through the Otos post without leaving behind some merchandise, that they left behind Mr. Larche with around fifteen hundred *livres* of merchandise. That Mr. Larche, after the Oto savages departed to hunt, had sent a man to tell Mr. Duchesne to come and get the merchandise at the Otos post, but that the Missouri River was covered with ice and the tracks were impassable owing to the advanced season, and that the merchandise would have been lost and that it would not have sufficed to pay for the price of transport. That, besides, the Mahas savages did not want to go there with their horses, the route being too long and too difficult, and they being fearful of the other nations. That they had done no wrong to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], as his *commis* did not have enough merchandise, since Mr. Larche had sold him a part of his own merchandise. That in no way it was their fault that they had been held up, and that [illegible].

Another deposition by Jean Baptiste Duchesne, of July 9th, who confirms that he was held by the Oto savages and that he had no part in the detention of their merchandise, and that this proves the impossible situation in which he found himself to send from the Maha post to the Oto post, because of the ice, the poor tracks and other motives explained in the deposition.

Also in the matter of the attestation of Frédéric, of the named Janvier, and of the named Renaud, all three witnesses who have declared in the inquiry above, and of the other eleven persons who have signed the said attestation, making a total of fourteen persons who attest all truly that there was nothing at all to throw suspicion on Mr. Duchesne to have left merchandise behind at the Otos post out of his own free will, that he had not had any bad words with the savages, that they [the witnesses] neither saw nor heard anything, and that if he left merchandise behind he was forced to do so by the savages. The said attestation, dated at the wintering place of the named Moran, *commis* of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] October 28th of last year.

Everything duly examined and attentively considered, we have rejected and dismissed everything that Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] and Chouteau claim and petition against Mr. Duchesne, Larche and LeCompte, concerning the accusation by the said Labaddie and Chouteau in their petition of last June 4th. We dismiss and vacate the seizure order, made at their behest, of the peltries that Mr. Larche brought down from the Otos, and was placed in trust in the hands of Mr. Papin. We declare it without basis, and wrongfully sought by the said Labbadie [Labadie] and Chouteau. We order that all the peltries which have been held in trust by Mr. Papin, according to the said inventory signed by him and by Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], after the equipment of Mr. Duchesne and LeCompte have been paid, will be turned over without delay to Mr. Larche, Duchesne and LeCompte, in the same nature and value that Mr. Papin received them, and if any damage resulted, other than which could result from their being held in trust, and according to the said inventory, we order also Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] to support them and reimburse them without delay to the said Larche, Duchesne and LeCompte. And besides, we command the said Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] and Chouteau to assume the charges and expenses of the trial that they have occasioned. Given in the government chamber in St. Louis, the said day and year.

Fernando de Leyba

[Box 1, Folder 11]

[Original in French]

Inventory of the various pelts held in trust by Mr. Papin, belonging to Mr. Larche, LeCompte and Duchesne.

A packet of pelts beaver	94
A ditto weighing	82
A ditto weighing	79
A small packet weighing	32
27 otters at 6	
2 packets of wildcats	
1 ditto male	
45 skins of cows at 3e	
8 robes [illegible] 5e	
105 skins of good does at [illegible]	
19 dittos bad	
a packet of pelts of buckskins	90
one ditto	99
one ditto	99
one ditto	100
one ditto	87
one ditto	105
one ditto	84
one ditto	84
one ditto	99
one ditto	80
one ditto	84
one ditto	80
one ditto	87
one ditto	99
one ditto	96
one ditto	96
one ditto	102
one ditto	84
[page break]	2214
continuation of the above	2214
one packet of perf. Buck	99
one ditto	<u>33</u>
	2366

Precapitulation of all and supposing that the whole thing is right

287 beavers at 3e	861
27 otters at 6e	162
360 wildcats	180
declared to be	
45 cow skins at 3e	135
8 doeskin robes at 4e	40
105 doeskins at 4e	420
1 g skins of [illegible] 2e	38
2366 buckskins at 20e	<u>2366</u>
	4202

I certify having the pelts mentioned in this present inventory in my hands. Copy made. St. Louis, June 4, 1779
M. Papin

[Box 1, Folder 11]

[Original in French]

...men being arrested by [illegible] at the wintering of Mr. Moran, no longer being able to pass in any way, having given a lot of plunder, we are obliged to let go in spite of ourselves a part of our merchandise in order to pass. We certify all of we French that it is not the fault of Mr. Larche or of Mr. Duchesne, and that we neither heard nor saw anything that could carry prejudice to anyone. We certify this declaration to be sincere and truthful, and we have all signed.

Toison Frederic, first witness, commander of the nation of crying water this 25 October 1778.

Ordinary mark of Tome, Barille, Renoir, Larche, Cadun[?], Livert, Detie, [illegible]

Solomon Pettit, witness

André Feneti, witness

[Box 1, Folder 12]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[Original in Spanish]

To Mr. Lieutenant Governor of the Illinois.

In order to keep peace and order in the Missouri, and to impede discords and the loss of the [fur] trade, and according to a just set of rules for both the traders [*voyageurs*] and the merchants who equip them [*bourgeois*], you Sir have assigned to each trader a post where he must trade, and thus, you Sir have also granted him [each trader] a permit that only he can enjoy. The deponent humbly represents to you that Mr. LeMuene Martiny, against his permit and your orders, and dismissing all warnings he has received, has trespassed into the post of the Republic [Indians?], which you have assigned to Mr. Benito Basquez, with all the beaver, otter, and [illegible] of that nation. Owing to this fact, Mr. Benito Basquez's trader has been forced to abandon his post and try his luck elsewhere, as he cannot make enough profit to cover his expenses and satisfy his merchant. I humbly request that you Sir order Mr. LeMuene Martiny to return all the [fur] packets that he made within the deponent's post, and this deponent will return to him all the merchandise that he might have given in exchange for the packets.

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 5, 1783

The deponent, not knowing how to sign, made his mark. Mark of Antonio Vencent [Venzan]

[In French]

I order that this petition be sent to Mr. Lemuene Martiny so that he can respond within two days. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 5, 1783.

Cruzat

I have notified [illegible] Mr. Lemuene Martiny at his home [illegible]. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 5, 1783.
Demers, bailiff.

[Box 1, Folder 12]

[Original in Spanish]

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 6, 1783

I, Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant of these parts, in the company of witnesses Josef Hortiz [Ortiz?] and Fernando Lisoro, owing to the arrival of Mr. Lemuene Martin's boats from the Missouri river, loaded with pelts, and owing to the petition presented by Antonio Venzant [Venzan], inhabitant of this town, I have gone to the Mississippi river bank around seven in the morning to seize all the pelts and deposit them wherever is more convenient until this matter between the said Lemuene Martiny and Antonio Venzant [Venzan] is decided. Having ordered the said pelts to be unloaded, we have found the following:

10 packets big and small of [illegible]

36 packets big and small of beaver

2 packets of otter, one big and one small

5 packets of bear pelts

1 small packet of deer [illegible]

4 medium sacks of tallow

2 small barrels of butter not filled

4 packets of [illegible] belonging to the hired hands [*engagé*]

Not having found any other pelts or goods than the above mentioned, we have given them to Mr. Juan Bautista Martiny, captain of one of the militia units of this town, who is responsible for them with his own person and property, who should take care of them until Justice decides the matter, and who is signing with me, the Lieutenant Governor, the same day and year.

Fernando de Lisoro J.B. Martiny Josef Hortiz Francisco Cruzat

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 12, 1783

I, Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, and the witnesses Joseph Hortiz and Fernando Lisoro, are now going, being about four in the afternoon, to the domicile of Mr. Juan Bautista Martiny, captain of one of the militia units of this town, where I have cited Mr. Josef Lemuene Martiny, in order to give him all the pelts belonging to him that were seized and deposited with the said Juan Bautista Martiny. He declares that he has received them, and to be satisfied, before the witnesses that have signed with me, the Lieutenant Governor in the said day and year.

Francisco Cruzat

Joseph Hortiz

J. Martigny

Ferando Lisoro

[Box 1, Folder 12]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[Original in Spanish]

Sr. Lieutenant Governor of the Illinois

Josef Lemuene Martiny, in due form and with all due respect, responds to the petition presented before you by Antonio Benzan [Venzan] on the fifth of this month, in which he accuses this deponent of having taken all the packets of pelts that were within the nation of the Republic [Indians?]. That you have given [the deponent] a permit to trade with the Panimaxa [Omaha] and Choto [Otoes] Indian nations. That going up the Missouri river he found, at the post of the Little Osages, a savage of the Panis [Pawnee] nation who told him that the war among the nations upriver was raging and bloody, and particularly in all the towns of the Panis and Chotos, and that it was impossible for him to go to his post up the said river, and that all the Panis were getting together upriver from the Canzes [Kansa?] to pass the winter. This deponent, seeing that it was impossible for him to reach his post, decided to send the same savage with one of his hired-hands [*engagé*] named Larrochelle to tell the Panimajas to come and get him with enough horses to transport the merchandise up to the entry of the river of the Canzes, and so to avoid, by following a different route, that other nations might find and destroy him. The deponent camped downriver from the river of the Canzes. After two months, seeing that neither his hired-hand nor the Panimajas came, he entered the said river to continue his route to his assigned post, and when he went through a Canzes village, they took him and arrested him.

This nation was at war (which the deponent did not know) with that of the Panimajas, where this deponent has his post. Wanting to continue on his route, he pleaded with the Canzes that they let him pass through, and offered them a good gift, but they refused. They told him that their idea was that, now that they had the merchandise, the Panimajas would have to come and submit to them, and ask for peace, which was what they wanted.

Three months after the said Larrochelle had left with the savage, he went through a Canzes village with ten savages of the Republic and a son of the Great Chief, and as the said Larrochelle was passing through their village in his ways to the Panimajas, [the Canzes] arrested him and sent a savage of their nation to that of the Panimajas to communicate the news that the said hired-hand was carrying, and they sent the said hired-hand with the said eleven savages to look for the merchandise, only to find this deponent arrested in the Canzes village. These eleven savages implored to the Canzes that they let a Frenchman with some merchandise go to their town, that they were worthy of pity, they supplicated twice but failed. The third time, having the Republican Indians [*los Republicanos*] promised that they would make the Panimajas come to the village to ask for peace, and upon returning they would bring this deponent with his merchandise to his assigned post, they [the Canzes] gave in, and the Chiefs ordered this deponent to send a Frenchman with a little merchandise. This deponent did so, only because he knew that if he did not, the Republicans would come with the Panimajas and others to destroy the Canzes nation, and thus the deponent and all his hired-hands would have been killed. In consequence, if the petitioner [Antonio Venzan] had continued his route this would not have happened, because the Republicans would not have lacked merchandise, and I would have been able to reach my post with no problem whatsoever. This is all I can say in answering the said petition, and having done all I could to keep peace and harmony among the Indian nations of His Majesty.

I humbly request that you Sir declare null the petition presented by Antonio Benzan [Venzan], and condemn him to pay the expenses of this trial.

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 6, 1783

J. Martigny

I order that this answer be sent to Antonio Venzan, so that he can respond within three days from today. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 7, 1783.

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified [illegible] Antonio Benzan [Venzan] at his home [illegible]. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 7, 1783.

Demers, bailiff.

[Box 1, Folder 12]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In Spanish]

Sr. Lieutenant Governor of the Illinois.

Antonio Venzant [Venzan], inhabitant of this town of St. Louis, in due form and with all due respect says, in response to Mr. Lemuene Martiny's answer, which has been presented to this deponent on this day by the town's bailiff, that the second time that he left this town of St. Louis to trade in the post that you Sir have assigned to him, when he arrived to the Little Osage nation, he came to know, through the Big Osages, that Mr. Martiny had gone outside of his route, entering in the river of the Canzes, against your orders. This deponent, when he learned about this, decided with Mr. Chouteau to go overland and thus reach faster the nation that had been assigned to him to prevent the said Martiny from trading there, leaving orders to his hired-hands to continue up the Missouri to the old village of the Canzes, and to wait for the deponent in that post. This deponent did this to comply with your spoken orders, which were not to go to the village of the Canzes. Having arrived by land to the town of the said Canzes with the said Mr. Chouteau, we found that two days ago Mr. Martiny had sent to the Republic enough merchandise to get all the pelts of that nation and some more, which he obtained from the Canzes with the excuse of giving them a gift so that they would allow him to send [merchandise] to the Republicans, and he told them that this gift was on behalf of the Commander, and that the merchandise sent to the Republic was also on behalf of the Commander, and telling them as well that he also had merchandise for the nation of the Panimaxas, which the said Canzes did not allow to go through because they wanted the Panimaxas to come and get it, and ask for peace, and thus they kept that merchandise together with the merchandise [that Martiny] had brought for them.

Having arrived to the said town with the said Mr. Chouteau, the deponent asked Mr. Martiny why he had sent merchandise to the Republic, when he knew that such post was not his but belonged to this deponent. And he answered, before the said Mr. Chouteau, that he knew what he was doing, and that he had as good as a permit as that of this deponent, and this deponent answered "here each one does as he wants, but in St. Louis I will find justice," and then he went downriver.

Mr. Martiny alleges that the Pani savage told him, at the Little Osages, that there was a raging war upriver, but he does not say that he [the Pani] also told him that the Canzes had been at war with the Panimajas for a long time. And in addition, Mr. Martiny does not ignore that it is more difficult to reach his post through the river of the Canzes than through the Missouri, as [the former] cannot be penetrated.

Mr. Martiny also says that he sent one of his hired-hands, named Larrochelle, with the Pani savage to warn the Panimajas, but he does not say that he also sent word to the Republic, making them lose their home so that they could come and get the merchandise he told them was for them.

After this deponent complained to Mr. Martiny, the latter, instead of complying, sent word to the man he had sent with merchandise to the Republic, that he not only should trade the merchandise but "melt" it [*fundirla*], which means sell it all to the highest bidder, so that when and if this deponent arrived he could not carry any trade, because having Mr. Martiny the first turn he could trade it at a rate that this deponent could not, which made the deponent decide to go downriver at once, as he saw that there were no more pelts anyway, and his merchandise had not arrived.

I humbly request that you Sir order Mr. Martiny to return to this deponent all the pelts he obtained from the said nation, giving him his merchandise, and condemn him to pay the expenses of the trial.

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 7, 1783

Mark of Antonio Bazan.

I order that this answer be sent to Mr. Lemuene Martiny so that he can respond within two days counted from this date. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 9, 1783.

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Mr. Lemuene Martiny at his home [illegible]. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 9, 1783.
Demers, bailiff.

[Box 1, Folder 12]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In Spanish]

Sr. Lieutenant Governor of the Illinois

Josef Lemuene Martiny, in due form and with all due respect before you, says, in response to the answer presented by Mr. Antonio Venzan before you on the seventh of this month, that all he says does not prove that I violated your orders or that I was the cause of the little profit that the said Venzan made in his post, as I will prove to you.

First, Mr. Venzan knows that I could not have gone up the Missouri to reach the village of the Panimajas, the nation where you Sir had assigned my trading post, because of the war that was raging upriver, as I have explained in my first statement. The river of the Canzes was the only possible road available to me; I was forced to take it owing to critical circumstances, and I believed it was the most reasonable and necessary decision to take care of my interests; taking into account all the expenses that I had for this year's trade in two consecutive equipments, the first having produced no benefits to pay for all the expenses, and thus the second would have caused my ruin if it did not produce some profit.

Mr. Venzant [Venzan] would like to ignore the fact of a nation that sees a trader going through their village on his way to another, and confiscates the merchandise that this nation wants for its own village, as they do not have [merchandise from] the trader that has been assigned to them. All the people trading on the Missouri can give proof of this. This deponent, having come upon the town of the Canzes (without knowing that he would), was certainly arrested and tried to defend his merchandise, saying that the Panimajas were his sworn enemies, what else could I do, and what Mr. Venzant [Venzan] would have done in a similar situation other than to conform to the will of the savages, who insisted that the Panimajas had to come to get the merchandise and submit to them asking for peace. In my first statement I said to you, Sir, that I had sent one of my hired-hands [*engagé*] with a Pani savage to the town of the Panimajas to let them know that I was there, I am not guilty if the Republic [Indians?] arrested my hired-hand, although Mr. Venzant [Venzan] affirms that I sent him with that purpose; his guide was the Pani, and this one without knowing the road came upon the village of the Republic, where they were arrested, as my hired-hand is ready to declare, as well as that after three months they [the Indians] brought them to the village of the Canzes, and they had to submit to their fate without being able to make any resistance.

When he [the hired-hand] arrived to the village of the Canzes in the company of the Republicans, how could I resist the continuous demands from the chiefs, Canzes and Republicans, as the latter promised that they would make the Panimajas come and ask the Canzes for peace, I could only oblige to their demand which was to send a little merchandise to the said nation. If out of fear to Mr. Venzant [Venzan]'s indignation I had not agreed to the demands of the savages, they and other nations with whom we are trading would have come down to the Canzes (and this would have certainly happened). Would not Mr. Venzant [Venzan] have given the merchandise in a similar situation? Likewise, would not he have saved the life of this deponent and his hired-hand, the [death of whom] was otherwise unavoidable? And if out of deference to Mr. Venzant [Venzan] I had not agreed to the demands, was I the owner of my hired-hands and so had the right to make them lose their lives? I would have been a savage man deserving reprehension if I had not behaved the way I did to avoid the cruel fate that was waiting for us.

Mr. Venzant [Venzan] cannot deny this, as he witnessed that a large party of Panimajas and other nations, all armed for war, arrived to the Republic to destroy the Canzes, as the said Mr. Venzant [Venzan], being unable to contain the furious impetus of these savages, pleaded with me that I arrest my hired-hand who was in the town of the Republic with the merchandise, which he did and gave them a big present, out of my merchandise. Mr. Venzant [Venzan] should know that through this means my hired-hand and merchandise saved his life, and that he as well as all of us could have been the victims of the said savages.

Mr. Venzant [Venzan] argues that I am a criminal because I gave gifts to the savages in order to be in peace and harmony, but he does not ignore that these were necessary, as he knows that when dealing with the savages there is no other means than gifts to calm them down. My accuser says that I made these gifts in the name of the Commander, but he does not ignore that when a trader goes through a town of the savages, if they do not allow him to pass or make trouble, the custom is to make them a present in the name of their Father, so that to avoid

any trouble and ensure the trade. If this is a crime, it is general among all the traders since the time of the discovery of the Missouri.

Mr. Venzant [Venzan] says that this deponent should not have violated the orders that you Sir had given of not going to the village of the Canzes. This deponent did not know the situation of this village, as when he came upon it he did not know which nation they were. But Mr. Venzant [Venzan] went to this village out of his own will, with horses loaded with merchandise and in the company of Mr. Chouteau, who also brought merchandise to the said village of the Canzes, and traded as much as he could, and then left the named Basilio Bachor so he could trade the remaining merchandise, and he traded so much that this deponent brought the pelts in his own boats, and gave them to Mr. Chouteau soon after his arrival in this town.

Mr. Venzant [Venzan] also accuses me of answering him, when he arrived to the village of the Canzes and asked me why I had sent merchandise to the Republic when I did not have a permit to trade with this nation, and that I answered that my permit was as good as his. Can he ignore that the permit that you Sir gave me to the post of the Panimajas had the same circumstances that the permit that you Sir gave to the said Venzant [Venzan]? Consequently, I had my right to give him this answer. And besides, Mr. Venzant [Venzan] knows that I said clearly that what I had done was because I was forced to by the Indians. The said Venzant [Venzan] also says, in his second statement, that I wrote to the hired-hand that I had in the Republic to not only trade the merchandise but to melt it, or give them for lower prices, because I had them first-hand. How come that Mr. Venzant [Venzan] is so knowledgeable? I believe that if he had read the letter he would not have given such an absurd account, as the letter's content was to tell my hired-hand that he should try to get the merchandise to the Panimajas, which he could not do. Besides, I was not under Mr. Venzant [Venzan]'s tutelage or orders, and I did not have to give him any explanation about my equipment or plans.

Why does Mr. Venzant [Venzan] blame me for the little profit he made in his post? His memory might be so frail as to forget that while he enjoyed the delights that the Carnival provides to those who lose sight of their interests, I was on the road to my post. Why he did not part from those enjoyments and went on the road with me? If he had reached his post in due time, I would not have been arrested, and now he would be able to fulfill his obligations towards the merchants who equipped him [*bourgeois*]. His desire to obtain my pelts is his only motive, as he says that he came down only for that effect. It is very wrong to make your demand upon reasons that are so weak, he would have done better by trying to stay there and sell his merchandise instead of pushing his doubtful claims and try to wrong someone who has never done anything to him. In his first statement Mr. Venzant [Venzan] only speaks about maintaining the peace and order on the Missouri, and impeding any disorder, envy, and loss of trade, but he himself has not followed this principle. Owing to the bad dealings he had had with the Indians, Mr. Venzant [Venzan] has caused the Republicans to divide into two groups that are irritated at each other. This proves that Mr. Venzant [Venzan] speaks of virtue without practicing it, and that his actions have been opposed to the just intentions of this Government. Thus I plead with you Sir that you lift the confiscation of my pelts, and deny Mr. Venzant [Venzan] his petition, and condemn him to pay the expenses of the trial.

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 11, 1783

Martigny

Having seen the two statements presented by Antonio Vensan, and the two responses given by Lemuen Martim, both traders of the Missouri river, and having everything duly examined, I conclude that owing to the said Antonio Vensan's negligence in leaving this town, as he stayed in it throughout the winter to no advantage, the said Muen Martin went without the government's permit or knowledge into the nations of the Canzes and the Republic, to trade the merchandise that he was supposed to trade with the nations of the Hotos and Panimaha, where the said Venzan has sent his merchandises, which were assigned to the said nation of the Republic. Thus we have condemned the said Lemuen Martim to pay a fine of a hundred pounds in pelts, to be given to the parish church of this town of St. Louis, and to pay the expenses of the trial, for the lack of respect he has shown towards the orders given by this Government, being warned from now on that if he does not do as he is told he will be considered as a re-offender, and be punished accordingly.

St. Louis of the Illinois, June 12, 1783.

Francisco Cruzat

[Note of Bailiff Demers, in French, not translated]

As [illegible] of the parish church of the town of St. Louis, I certify to have received from Mr. Lemune Mariny, by orders of Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor, one hundred pounds in pelts to be used for the benefit of this church. I have signed with witnesses Joseph Hortiz and Fernando Lisoro, in St. Louis on June 13, 1783.

Cerre

Fernando de Lisoro

Joseph Hortiz

[Box 1, Folder 13]

[Original in French]

To Mr. Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Joseph Labunier takes the liberty of exposing that he has accepted a promissory note on said account from Louis Vachart, inhabitant of this post for the sum of six hundred ninety one *livres*, two *sols*, two *deniers* in pelts in order to pay in full the account of M. Perault the said note below, for a long time. This deponent has requested the said Vachart to satisfy his obligation but he did not have any other answers that he would pay it when he had the time. As his response is a positive refusal to pay, this deponent has resorted to you, Sir, to request that if it pleases you, you mandate the appearance of the said Lardoise in order to force him to pay his note, and that in default of payment may it please you to grant to this deponent the seizure of his goods, to be sold through the courts to the highest bidder, and the money resulting from the sale to be delivered to this deponent until the [illegible] of his interests, charges and expenses.

In St. Louis, May 3, 1779

Labunier

In the matter of the present request, a copy will be passed to Louis Vachart, so that he responds within nine days. In St. Louis, May 3, 1779.

Leyba

In St. Louis, May 13, 1779.

In the case of Joseph Labunier versus Louis Vachart *dit* Lardoise.

In the matter of the plaintiff's request, dated the third of this month, about the sum of six hundred ninety one *livres*, two *sols*, two *deniers*, in skins due to him by the said Vachart, according to his overdue promissory note dated June 19, 1779. Our decree of the third of this month, stating that a copy of the said request will be certified to the said Lardoise so that he can respond. After the specified time in our decree has expired, and that the said Vachart has made no appearance or furnished any response or defense, we have granted the plaintiff his request. In consequence, we order that all the goods of the said Vachart will remain seized, privileging the said sum of six hundred ninety one *livres*, two *sols*, two *deniers* in pelts, which will be sold at auction next Sunday, the 16th of this month, and adjudicated to the highest and last bidder to the third cry [illegible] to be used to liquidate the above mentioned note [illegible] for the entire payment, charges, and expenses. In St. Louis, in the chamber of government, by Don Fernando de Leyba, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor, the said and year.

Fernando de Leyba

Certified copy of the notification of the present sentence to Louis Vachart *dit* Lardoise at his home, speaking to his person so that he [cannot] pretend ignorance, by me, Demers, bailiff, in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois. In St. Louis, May 13, 1779.

[Box 1, Folder 14]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In Spanish]

1784

Criminal case against the sailors Benito de Aponte and Josef Martin, accused of being accomplices of the named Callou in the theft this latter did of some merchandise that was saved from the ship of Gabriel Serré, merchant of this town, ship that was wrecked on the western banks of the Mississippi river, twenty-five leagues downstream on the Arkansas river.

Lieutenant Governor Francisco Cruzat acting as judge

[In French]

To Francisco Cruzat, Captain of the Grenadiers of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, Lieutenant Colonel, Lieutenant Governor and Commander in Chief of the western part of the District of the Illinois.

Gabriel Cerré humbly represents to you that he had diverse effects stolen from the belongings he had by the Mississippi after the shipwreck, either by two of his hired-hands, one called Compadre and the other Pepe Martine, the two of them now living in this village; or by the named Caillou, a hunter whom this deponent had hired to transport by canoe the effects saved from the shipwreck; a fact discovered by a hired-hand of the same Caillou in Arkansas. The Commander of the post, Mr. Dubreuil, having sent [people] to the place where the cache of stolen effect was, they found seven rifles, one decorated with silver, and several other pieces of merchandise that were remitted to the skipper of the deponent's ship. As this deponent is missing several effects of those that were saved from the shipwreck and put under the care of the skipper and of five *engagés*, and as this deponent cannot legally accuse the persons named above, he resorts to your justice so that it may please you to make them appear in court to name their accomplices, if there were any, so that you can condemn the guilty ones to pay for expenses, damages, and interests of this deponent. [illegible] whatever you would advise to be good, for the civil reparation and [illegible] right.

In St. Louis, September 2, 1784

Cerré

[Box 1, Folder 14]

[Original in Spanish]

In St. Louis of Illinois, on September 3, 1784, as a consequence of the present petition, in which Mr. Gabriel Cerré, merchant of this town, accuses the named Benito de Aponte and José Martín, rowers of the ship that was wrecked on its way upriver from New Orleans, of being accomplices of the named Callou, in the theft that the latter did of the merchandise of the said ship. The said Mr. Gabriel Cerré requests that Benito de Aponte and José Martín be summoned and their declarations taken, and likewise with the skipper of the said ship, Balentín Dublin, and that all the necessary inquiries be made. In consequence, I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry, Captain of Grenadiers of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of this western part and district of the Illinois, have made appear before me, and in the presence of legal witnesses Mariano Izaguirre and José Bermeo, corporal and soldier of this fort, the said Balentin Doblin, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I have asked if he swears by God and promises the King to tell the truth about everything he was going to be interrogated about.

He answered that he swore and promised.

I asked his name, religion, country, and occupation.

He answered his name was Balentín Doblin, was a Roman Catholic, his country was the city of New Orleans, and his occupation hunter.

I asked how long had he been in this town, and where was he coming from.

He answered that he was coming up from New Orleans, as skipper of the ship belonging to Mr. Gabriel Cerré, which had wrecked on the western banks of the Mississippi river, next to the Island of the Little Cut Point [*la Isla de la pequeña Punta Cortada*], twenty-five leagues downriver from the mouth of the Arkansas river. And that he had arrived in this town on August 30th, in a ship that Mr. Gabriel Cerré sent to him from this town to transport the merchandise saved from the shipwreck, which had been put under the care of the deponent, and for which good care and guard the said Gabriel Cerré had put under the deponent's orders five rowers of the wrecked ship.

I asked if he knew Benito de Aponte and José Martín, if he knew that they were imprisoned in this town's jail, and if he knew the cause.

He answered that he knew them very well, as they had come up with him as rowers of the wrecked ship, and that they were part of the five men who stayed to care for the merchandise saved from the shipwreck, and that he knew that they are in jail, accused of having stolen some goods in agreement with the named Callou.

I asked if he knows anything about the stolen goods he mentions, if there are any other accomplices, and that he should give a detailed account of everything he knows, so that we can find out if the said Benito de Aponte and José Martín are really guilty of their crime.

He answered that when Gabriel Cerré's ship was lost, he had stayed behind to take care of the saved merchandise (as he already said), and that with this end the said Cerré had put five rowers under his orders, so that they could haul by canoe the goods from the shipwreck to a camp they had set up. That the said merchant [Cerré] had chosen the said Callou to help the deponent and the five hired-hands with the transportation of the goods by canoe. That the deponent, being the skipper and person in charge, decided that said Benito de Aponte and José Martín, who were under his orders, should be all the time on the canoe with the said Callou, as he was coming and going with his canoe loaded with merchandise, and that they did so. That during all the time necessary to save the goods, the deponent did not realize that Callou or any other person stole anything, as when Callou went with his canoe, people, and the rowers Benito de Aponte and José Martín to make a trip to the site of the shipwreck, the deponent stayed in the camp with the other three rowers; and when the said Callou returned, the deponent with the three rowers and two hired-hands of the said Callou went to unload, leaving the said Callou guarding the goods that had already been transported to the camp. But that after all the goods had been recovered, the commander of the Fort Charles the Third of Arkansas, Mr. Jacobo Dubreuil, sent a troop detachment to arrest Callou and confiscate his canoe and everything that was in it. And that having done that, the said troop detachment carried Callou and all his men to the said fort, in his own canoe, that a few days later the said commander Jacobo Dubreuil sent one of the hired-hands of the said Callou in a canoe that under the care of the named Jardela was going down to New Orleans, so that the said hired-hand show to this deponent the site in the woods where the said Callou had hidden many goods when he was transporting the merchandise from one site to the other. But as these goods were located a quarter of league up from the campsite where this

deponent was, the said Jardela made the hired-hand show him the hiding site, and then he and his people recovered the goods and brought them to the deponent. These goods were five rifles for trading [*de treta*], one good-quality hunting rifle and another with silver trimming, a small box full of sugar, four jars of fruit in brandy, four jars of brandy, a big iron pot without legs, two straw hats, two iron shovels, three tin jars. That in the canoe of the said Jardela there was a mulatto named Luis Lecler, who was one of Callou's five hired-hands, but that he had always stayed with this deponent while the goods recovered from the shipwreck were transported. And that he [Lecler] had told this deponent that when he was going up with the said Callou to the Arkansas fort, after he [Callou] had been arrested, the named Juan Monpierre, Callou's partner, came to his bed to wake him up, and told him "Here you have this piece of fabric" (which was about one fathom [1 fathom = six feet]), and that when the mulatto saw the fabric he said that he did not want to accept it, because he realized it was stolen and he did not want to be an accomplice in the crime, because he had been free for many years and he did not want to lose his freedom, to which the said Juan Monpierre answered "Take it and do not worry because nobody knows anything," and that the said mulatto thought that in order to report the theft to the commander of the Arkansas fort and deceive the thieves it was convenient that he accepted the fabric, so he took it, and when he arrived in the said fort he went before the commander and reported what had happened. That the said mulatto also told this deponent that the piece of fabric he had received was from a whole piece that the said Callou and his people had stolen at the campsite at night along with some blankets that the said José Martín had stolen and given to Callou, forty-five and a half *varas* of Bramante fabric. And that the said Benito de Aponte, called "Old Compadre" by everyone, had collaborated with the other thieves in hiding the stolen objects, and that Callou and his partner had distributed the piece of fabric between themselves and their five hired-hands, so that each could hide his part in his bed. And that when Callou stole the piece of fabric at the campsite, he took the gunpowder out of his box and hid the fabric there. This is all what this deponent has learned from the mulatto Luis Lecler, and that the hired-hand who came to show this deponent the hiding place for the goods had told him the same thing, that the name of this hired-hand of Callou was Luis but that he does not know his last name. And that the commander of the Arkansas fort, Jacobo Dubreuil, told this deponent when he went to present his passport in order to be authorized to come to this destination in the ship that the said Gabriel Cerré had sent, that in order to find out where the stolen goods had been hidden and how many accomplices there were, he had been forced to pardon the said Luis, hired-hand of Callou, as he had participated in everything and thus knew all the details, that the deponent does not know if there are other accomplices besides the one he has named, or if there were more goods stolen than the one he has referred to.

I asked what had happened to the mulatto Luis Lecler, to Luis, hired-hand of Callou, and to Juan Monpierre, partner of Callou.

He answered that the mulatto was going down to New Orleans in Jardela's canoe (as he had said), that Luis the hired-hand had stayed in the Fort Charles the Third of Arkansas, and likewise Juan Montpierre.

I asked if he had anything to add or retract, and what was his age.

He answered no, and that he is thirty years old.

Having read his declaration to him, he said it was the same that he had provided, and that he corroborated it under oath, and as he does not know how to sign he made his mark before me, the Governor, in the presence of the legal witnesses, who also signed, in the same day and year.

Mark of Balentin Dublin

Josef Bermeo

Mariano Izaguirre

Francisco Cruzat

Confession of the defendant Benito de Aponte

Subsequently, I, the Governor, and the legal witnesses, went to this town's jail, where I made Benito de Aponte, first defendant in this trial, appear before me, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked him if he swears by God and promises the King to tell the truth about everything he was going to be interrogated about.

He answered yes, that he swears and promises.

I asked his name, religion, country, and occupation.

He said his name was Benito de Aponte, his religion Roman Catholic, he was from the town of Carnido in the Kingdom of Portugal, and his occupation sailor.

I asked for how long has he been in this town, and where is he coming from.

He said he had been in this town since August 30, and that he was coming from the city of New Orleans as a rower in Mr. Gabriel Cerré's ship, up to the place in the Mississippi river where the said ship was wrecked, and from there he came to this town in another ship that the said Cerré had sent to transport the goods saved from the shipwreck.

I asked why he was in jail.

He said he is entirely ignorant of the cause of his imprisonment.

I asked if he was one of the five rowers that the said Cerré left after the shipwreck under the orders of the skipper, Balentín Dublin, to guard and transport the goods that were saved.

He said that he was one of them.

I asked if he stayed with the skipper or went with the named Callou when the latter and his hired-hands went with the canoe back and forth from the campsite to the site of the shipwreck.

He said that many times he went with the said Callou from the site of the shipwreck to the campsite.

I asked how he can say that he is ignorant of the cause of his imprisonment, when it is clear from this trial that the said Callou and his hired-hands, and with the help of José Martín and of the deponent, stole some of the goods that were saved from the shipwreck, five rifles for trading [*de treta*], one good-quality hunting rifle, one good-quality hunting rifle and another with silver trimming, a small box full of sugar, four jars of fruit in brandy, four jars of brandy, a big iron pot without legs, two straw hats, two iron shovels, three tin jars, all of which they hid in the woods, about a quarter of a league up from the said campsite.

He said that all the accusations against him are false.

I asked if he knows the aforementioned Luis, a hand hired by Callou, and if he was with the deponent in the canoe of the said Callou when they were transporting the goods from one place to the other.

He said that he knows him, and that they were certainly in the same canoe when they were transporting the goods.

I asked him how it was possible, given that the said Luis has declared that all who were in this canoe committed the said theft and hid the goods in the woods, which has been proved because Luis has shown the hiding place where the said goods had been found, how it was possible that the said theft was committed without the deponent knowing about it?

He answered that he has not seen anything stolen or being hidden.

I asked if he knows that José Martín had stolen in the campsite at night a piece of fabric of Bramante of forty and a half French *varas*, and that he gave it to Callou.

He answered that he does not know about that.

I asked if he likewise had not seen, or known, that Callou, while in the campsite, took the gunpowder out of his box, and hid in it a piece of the stolen fabric.

He answered that he does not know about that either.

I asked if he had anything to add or retract, and what was his age.

He answered no, and that he is thirty years old.

Having read his declaration to him, he said it was the same that he had provided, and that he corroborated it under oath and signed it before me, the Governor, in the presence of the legal witnesses, who also signed, in the same day and year.

Joseph Bermeo Benito Laponte Mariano Izaguirre Francisco Cruzat

Confession of the defendant José Martín

Subsequently, I, the Governor, and the legal witnesses, went to this town's jail, where I made José Martín, second defendant in this trial, appear before me, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked him if he swears by God and promises the King to tell the truth about everything he was going to be interrogated about.

He said that he swears and promises.

I asked his name, religion, country, and occupation.

He said his name was José Martín, his religion Roman Catholic, he was from Port Cavello, in the province of Caracas, and his profession sailor.

I asked for how long has he been in this town, and where is he coming from.

He said since August 30, and that he came from the city of New Orleans as a rower in Mr. Gabriel Cerré's ship, up to the place in the Mississippi river where the said ship was wrecked, and from there he came to this town in another ship that the said Cerré had sent to transport the goods saved from the shipwreck.

I asked him why he was in jail.

He answered that he does not know, but assumes that it is because of the confusion surrounding the shipwreck.

I asked what confusion is he talking about, and that he should give an exact account of everything he knows.

He answered that he only knows that one day, when he went with the named Callou and his hired-hands in the canoe to help them transport the goods saved from the shipwreck to the campsite that they had set up one league down from the wreck-site, as he was diving into the water, the named Luis told him that Callou said that he should get everything he could out of the water, that he [Callou] would put it in his canoe, and that later they could distribute the goods among themselves, among whom there was also Benito de Aponte. That the deponent got three rifles out of the water, one of which seemed to have silver trimming, the other to be a good-quality rifle, and the other to be for trading [*de treta*], that he also got a big iron pot, a barrel with about a *tercio* of sugar, and that Callou put these goods in his canoe when they returned to the campsite.

I asked what Callou did with these goods.

He answered that Callou made his hired-hand Luis hide them on land, by the river, as they were going to go down to the campsite, but that he did not know where exactly they hid them afterwards. That a few days later he saw the same rifle that he had taken out of the water in the hands of the skipper Balentin Dublin, but that he does not know how it could be in his [the skipper's] possession.

I asked if he saw Callou taking any other goods besides the ones that the deponent said he took out of the water. He answered no.

I asked how can he say that he did not see Callou taking any other goods, when it is clear from this trial that the said Callou with his hired-hands and that, helped by Benito de Aponte and the deponent himself, he stole five rifles for trading [*de treta*], one good-quality hunting rifle and another with silver trimming, a small box full of sugar, four jars of fruit in brandy, four jars of brandy, a big iron pot without legs, two straw hats, two iron shovels, three tin jars; all of which they hid in the woods, about a quarter of a league up from the campsite.

He answered that he did not see any other goods taken than the ones he has mentioned, and that he ignores where in the woods Callou and Luis hid them, as when he [the deponent] asked the latter, he [Luis] did not want to tell him.

I asked why when he arrived in the campsite he did not report the theft to his skipper Balentin Dublin.

He answered that he did not report the theft because he did not want to be a tattletale among all those thieves, and that he did not benefit at all from the theft.

I asked how can he say that he did not benefit at all, when he certainly had some benefit from a piece of Bramante fabric of forty-five and a half French *varas* that he stole at the campsite, and gave to Callou.

He answered that he did not steal the piece of fabric, that one day he was with another rower, a hired-hand of Callou named Antonio, and that both saw the piece of fabric next to a tree, and thus the said Antonio gave word to Callou, who took it.

I asked what happened with the piece of fabric that was stolen at night at the camp, and which Callou hid in his box after taking the gunpowder out of it.

He said he did not know.

I asked if he had anything to add or retract, and what was his age.

He said no, and that he is twenty years old.

Having read his declaration to him, he said it was the same that he had provided, and that he corroborated it under oath and signed it before me, the Governor, in the presence of the legal witnesses, who also signed, in the same day and year.

Josef Bermeo

J. Martin Mariano Izaguirre

Francisco Cruzat

Confirmation by the witness Balentin Dublin

On September 4, 1784, I the Governor made Valentin Dublin, first witness in this trial, appear before me, in the presence of the said legal witnesses, and making him take a new oath I have read his deposition and asked if he has anything to add or to retract from, and if he confirms it.

He answered that the declaration is the same he had provided, that he did not have anything to add or to retract from, that he confirmed it under the new oath, and as he does not how to sign he made his mark in the presence of the said witnesses and of me, the Governor, on the same day and year.

Balentin Dublin mark Mariano Izaguirre Josef Bermeo Francisco Cruzat

Confirmation by the first defendant Benito de Aponte

Subsequently I, the Governor, and the said legal witnesses went to the town's jail, and made Benito de Aponte, first defendant in this trial, appear, and making him take a new oath I have read his deposition and asked if he has anything to add or to retract from, and if he confirms it.

He answered that the declaration is the same he had provided, that he did not have anything to add or to retract from, that he confirmed it under the new oath, and he signed in the presence of the said witnesses and of me, the Governor, on the same day and year.

Benito da Ponte Mariano Izaguirre Josef Bermeo Francisco Cruzat

Confirmation of the defendant José Martín

Subsequently I, the Governor, and the said legal witnesses went to the town's jail, and made José Martín, second defendant in this trial, appear, and making him take a new oath I have read his deposition and asked if he has anything to add or to retract from, and if he confirms it.

He answered that the declaration is the same he had provided, that he did not have anything to add or to retract from, that he confirmed it under the new oath, and he signed in the presence of the said witnesses and of me, the Governor, on the same day and year.

J. Martin Mariano Izaguirre Josef Bermeo Francisco Cruzat

Cross-examination between the witness and the first defendant Benito de Aponte

Subsequently, I, the Lieutenant Governor, and the said legal witnesses went to the town's jail, and made Benito de Aponte appear and take a new oath. And cross-examining him with the witness Balentin Dublin, I asked Benito de Aponte if he knew the man before him, and if he was aware that he [Dublin] had any hatred or ill-will against him, or if he [Dublin] had expressed that in any occasion.

He answered that he did not believe that [Dublin] had any hatred or ill-will, as since he has known him, he [Dublin] has always shown fondness for him.

And having read to him [Aponte] the deposition of the said witness, he said that he did not have anything to say against Dublin, but that he affirmed that the declarations of the said witness and the named Luis Lecler and Luis, hired-hand of Callou, were untrue in regard to what they say about him [Aponte].

And the defendant signed and the witness made his mark, before the said legal witnesses, who signed next to me in the said month and year.

Mark of Balentin Dublin Benito da Ponte Mariano Izaguirre Josef Bermeo Francisco Cruzat

Cross-examination between the witness and the second defendant José Martín

Subsequently I made the second defendant, José Martín, appear before me and the legal witnesses, and take a new oath. And cross-examining him with the witness Balentin Dublin, I asked Benito de Aponte if he knew the

man before him, and if he was aware that he [Dublin] had any hatred or ill-will against him, or if he [Dublin] had expressed that in any occasion.

He said that he knows the witness very well, and that he is not aware that he has any hatred or ill-will against him.

And having read to him [Martín] the deposition of the said witness, he said that he did not have anything to say against Dublin, and that he stands by the deposition he made.

And the defendant signed and the witness made his mark, before the said legal witnesses, who signed next to me in the said month and year.

Mark of Balentin Dublin
Francisco Cruzat

J. Martin Mariano Izaguirre

Josef Bermeo

Sentence

As per the information, depositions, confirmations and cross-examinations above, and the charges against the sailors Benito de Aponte and Josef Martín, rowers of the ship belonging to Mr. Gabriel Cerré, which wrecked on the western coast of the Mississippi river, by the Island of the Little Cut Point, twenty-five leagues downriver from the Arkansas mouth, I sentence the said Benito de Aponte and Josef Martín to lose the part of their salaries that the said Cerré still owes to them, and to be barred forever from the western parts of the Illinois, under penalty of extraordinary punishment. Thus, this sentence will be read to them, and they will be freed, warning them that they can only stay in this town of St. Louis until the departure of the first boat or canoe going downriver to the city of New Orleans.

St. Louis of the Illinois, September 20, 1784.

Francisco Cruzat

I, Josef de Mars, as bailiff, under the orders of the Commander and Lieutenant Governor Francisco Cruzat, have read the preceding sentence, in person, to the said Benito de Aponte and Josef Martín.

St. Louis of the Illinois, September 23, 1784

Demers

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Joseph Robidou, inhabitant of this post St. Louis, takes the liberty of representing to you that he finds himself shamefully dishonored in his person and in his family [illegible] meanly invented [illegible] by people always ready to harm and tarnish the most steady reputation.

The deponent has for a long time been frequenting the daughter of Mr. Becquet, the post's blacksmith, with a view toward marriage, and being in accord with her, he made the request to her father for her hand in marriage. This apparently pleased him, and he asked this deponent for three days to think about it. The deponent was extremely surprised when, at the end of the three days, Mr. Becquet told him that he would not consent to the marriage, and that there were some in his [the deponent's] family who had sold their souls to the devil, and that he would not [illegible] in the Becquet family [illegible]. The named Pierre Becquet, the daughter of Mr. Becquet's uncle, had said to Mme Laroche, sister of the said daughter, that someone had told him that one uncle of the deponent had killed his wife and, having fled, he killed his boss to whom he was the *engagé*, and that after these murders he had escaped to Cahokia on the American side [of the Mississippi] and that he had stolen and kidnapped the wife of the named Agon and that he had taken her to the post of Vincennes.

The deponent, having found the occasion to talk to the daughter of Mr. Becquet, she told him her fathers' accusations and remarks against him. This forced him to ask Mr. Becquet where this talk had come from, in order to discover the sources, but Mr. Becquet refused to tell him. This forced the deponent to gather the information by himself, from the older inhabitants and *voyageurs* of Canada, who knew his family, in order to find out if there was any dishonor. These persons gave him attestations, included herein, which prove that there has never been any stain of infamy in his family, nor any dishonor, and that his family has never been reprimanded nor blackened by justice [illegible] had said against him were false and calumnious.

The deponent, seeing that he could not force the persons who had given him the attestations to talk to Mr. Becquet, determined to seek out clarifications by himself. He addressed himself to old man Tabeau, a Canadian residing presently at this post, who knew the deponent's family, and he said to him "What are you accused of? There is nothing more to say about your family. I know them, and it is only out of meanness that someone is making these remarks about your family." So the deponent replied to him "Pierre Becquet told his niece that one of my uncles had killed his wife and his boss, and kidnapped a woman." Tabeau to him, "It might be true that Pierre Becquet got his information to her, but he got the answer and it was false," and that he did not know of any stain in the deponent's family. The deponent asked Pierre Becquet who could have said these bad remarks, and he gave as his only answer that he had not gotten that information, which proved the answer of the said Tabeau that Pierre Becquet did not want to cite the persons who have so unjustly calumniated the deponent. This is why [illegible] the deponent requests that he [Pierre Becquet] be held to name them before you. The deponent [illegible] knows by Mrs. Becquet, mother of the girl, that the named Marly, blacksmith of this post, and Mr. Robert Sr., farmer of this post, were the ones who had made these calumnious remarks in public and that is was [line missing].

He has forbidden his daughter to speak to the deponent. As the deponent finds himself [illegible] by the most harmful [illegible] and that his honor has been entirely ruined, that the said Marly and Robert have covered him with opprobrium and infamy, he has recourse to your justice so that it may please you to order these two men to prove what they have so meanly advanced against the deponent's family and honor, and to these [illegible] that they may be held to publicly restore the damage that they have done to his honor. The deponent assures himself of your well-being and hopes for your justice that the said Robert and Marly will be reprimanded for all their unfortunate calumnies against him. He continues his wishes for your prosperity. In St. Louis, January 28, 1780

Joseph Robidou

In the matter of the present petition, let there be passed a copy to the Mr. Robert Sr., and Marly, in order that they may answer within three days, dated from the present decree.

In St. Louis, January 28, 1780

Fernando de Leyba

[Certification by bailiff Demers]

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

I, Pierre Sourait, certify that, being in the same parish here as Mr. Robidou, I have known both him and his family as honest people for whom I give my attestation.

In St. Louis, December 29, 1779

December 27, 1779

I certify that Mr. Robidou for whom I [profess?] to be a [gentle]man. Everything that one can [do?] for the named has been done. Vernon Quenel

I, Louis Lafleur, certify that I know the Sieur Robidou and his whole family as honest people for whom I give my attestation.

In St. Louis, December, 1779

I, L'Ardoise Combette know the family of Mr. Robidou, both his father's and his mother's side, and there is no stain, and I have known them all as honest and good people. Louis Vachard for *dit* L'Ardoise.

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

I certify to know the Robidous as honest people.
Bajocien Tabeau

I certify to know the Robidous as honest people.
Grigué

I certify to know the Robidou family as honest people.
Paul Bruber, the [illegible]

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Luc Marly has the honor of representing very respectfully that the depositions of the named Robidou are false and without proof and only the invention of a malicious spirit, in that he imputes to me to have said that one of his uncles killed his wife, and even [missing line] unfortunate, false, Monsieur Tabeau's allegation without proof, I protest that I have never heard [illegible] that in his petition he dares to present against me. It is true, Sir, that I live at the Mr. Robert's house. One day I found myself there in the house, and it happened that someone said to Mr. Robert, "Do you know the news?" "What?" answered Mr. Robert, "What is this piece of news?" "The daughter of Becquet is going to get married." "To whom?" asks the said Robert. That someone responds "To Robidou" [illegible] "Why this marriage?" replies the said Robert, "This Robidou, would not he be a relative of the Robidou whom Mr. Gagnon, the priest and pastor at Fort de Chartres, told us about before, in his pulpit of truth, that he had occasioned an outrage against Christ?" I replied [illegible] a Robidou of advanced age, half-blind, who held the Office of Alcohol for trading with the savages. I assure that I have a perfect knowledge that a great rumbling and tumult came about in the suburb of St. Joseph, which spread around in the entire city. At the same time that Christ had just been profaned for a sum of money that the said Robidou had lost [illegible] said that's why he fled from his parents. For on the same [night?] but for that they are not his parents, since they only knew Robidou in passing. I do not know where he is coming from. This considered, Sir, I hope for your benignity and equity, the right due to the false depositions of which someone [illegible] me. Wishing for the conservation of your days. In St. Louis, January 31, 1780

Luc Marly

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

Monsieur Don Fernando de Leyba, captain of the regiment of infantry, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Louis Robert, deponent, has the honor of representing before you that the petitions of the named Joseph Robidou against me, where he says that this deponent publicly spread injurious calumnies about his family. Nothing could be more false. I, the deponent, do not consent that this man [illegible] these depositions are only invented, without proof, and only come forth from a malicious and vindictive spirit. This deponent has no knowledge of the murders which he [Robidou] mentions in his petition. The said Robidou, constrained by these supposed [illegible]. This deponent learns one day that Mr. Becquet is going to marry his family to the named Robidou. This deponent, relative of the said Becquet, went to his relative's house, believing to be within his rights to represent to the said Becquet, his relative, to pay attention to this alliance, to know where this Robidou comes from, as it is usually done. That many people bear the same name, without being relatives. The deponent's interest is in an advantageous alliance for the daughter of the said Becquet. This deponent's representation to the said Becquet was based on what the deponent had heard from the mouth of Monsieur Gagnon, priest and pastor of the parish of Fort de Chartres, who announced from the pulpit that a great calamity had happened in Canada, that someone named Robidou had insulted Christ. This deponent was present in the church when this announcement was made, together with others. Their attestations are adjoined. Let me add more proofs, under your orders. The deponent hopes that since the said Robidou has had the vanity to impute him to have spread around remarks so atrocious against his family, which are going to be found to be true in research that the said deponent has been constrained to do [illegible] Louis Robert, to condemn the named Robidou to charges and expenses.

Wishing to heaven for the prolongation of your days. In St. Louis, January 31, 1780

Louis Robert

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

Deposition of Pierre Borgne de St. Belfeu

Having left with the said Jacques Robidou in 1772, at the end of three days he had a problem with his wife, and took his gun to fire upon her. I immediately took his gun away, but at the same time he pointed a knife that he had on him in order to stab her, and I opposed this. Having left with a [illegible], we arrived at the home of Madame Parent, at the top of Long Saut, he had [illegible] in difficulty [line missing] gun and of the knife, having left Madame Parent's house. Upon arriving at Grand Calumet, my son being present, told me that the said Robidou gave his wife three stabs of the knife, the son of Madame being present there, Mr. Chole, told me this. The present given to be used as need be. In St. Louis, January 28, 1780

Mark of Pierre Borgne St. Belfeu

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

The undersigned, residents of the village of Cahokia, have come to know that Mr. Robert Sr., farmer of St. Louis, is being harassed by the named Robidou, who demands that the said Mr. Robert restores his honor [illegible] given the present attestation that we have made together, each one examining his knowledge without bias. This is why [illegible] we will not take [illegible] to state, in order to see [illegible] even but only to see it said, on the strength of which the named Antoine Lussier, *dit* L'Aventure, declares by the same vague knowledge that this same family Robidou has been entirely banished from all contact with honest people and is even incapable of the power to appear in any court of justice, even in order to reclaim their own rights [illegible] their bad conduct, having them [illegible] in the eyes of everybody from the sweetness [illegible] in man's society. Such is the declaration of the said Antoine Lussier.

In addition, the named François Chevalier and Pépin declare and avow to have heard it said by people of probity and sheltered from all criticism, that a Robidou of this same family and cousin of the [illegible] who will make [illegible] the said Mr. Robert, who has profited from the banishment of the named Bourbonnière, a perfectly honest man, an *engagé* of Mr. Pierre in Milwaukee [illegible], he wickedly broke him with kicks, why the said Mr. Pierre did not believe it to be the duty of the one to fear saying that the said Bourbonnière was dead only from the blows that Robidou had given him. On the strength of which we have delivered the present [illegible]. Cahokia, January 30, 1780.

François Pépin

Mark of François Chevalier

Mark of Joseph Deloge

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

By the above witnesses undersigned in the village of Cahokia, Mr. Joseph Deloge, inhabitant at the above mentioned village was personally present, and has voluntarily certified to have heard it said by a number of people of probity, that the entire family of the Robidous has never been sheltered from the greatest criticism by anyone else. He knew by several people that Jacques Robidou must reproach himself for the death of Jacques Bourbonnière, one of the *engagés* of Mr. St. Pierre in Milwaukee, who said, by [illegible] that he only died by the blows of Robidou. In Cahokia. January 30. 1780

Mark Fr. Pépin, witness

mark of Joseph Deloge

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

I, Baptiste Cantara, under my mark with an X, declare with truth to have heard that the named Couvillon reproached the named Robidou, arriving from Kansas, of the Prairie du Chien, in the house of the Cross and [illegible] that the said Robidou had killed his wife and a *bourgeois*, and blasphemously said to Mr. Couvillon "Be quiet, for I will do as much to you." Given the present to serve if need be. In St. Louis, January 28, 1780.

[illegible]

Demers, witness mark Cantara

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

I, Michel Godimière, in the village of Cahokia, employed as a domestic by the governor, Guitton Morpeau, Lieutenant General of the Civil and Criminal Courts of Lafayette near Montreal, which governor M.L. Morpeau, having [illegible] that there was a report in Zecolle, suburb of the said Montreal, of the most horrible things, for this reason he rapidly went to the same house that his [illegible] between the place of the retreat of his [illegible] to the [illegible] with a number of well-armed troops [illegible] surrounding the said house. That the undersigned was serving as a coachman to the said Mr. Marpeau, the common troops [illegible] Charles Robidou, *dit* Mignon, and that Charles and François Robidou, accomplices in the most heinous crime, escaped before justice could detain them. And after thoroughly searching the said house, the remains of a Christ were found in the fire, it was not completely burned, which goes to prove clearly that the above mentioned Charles Robidou had crushed it underfoot and thrown it in the fire in order to condemn it, enraged because he was not able to recognize the person who had robbed him 38 [illegible symbol], after having [illegible]. As the undersigned [illegible], he offers to appear himself if anyone wants a report on the present attestation, on its strength.

In Cahokia, January 30, 1780.

Michel Godimière Witness present.

[Box 1, Folder 15]

[Original in French]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, February 2, 1780.

Joseph Robidou, inhabitant of this post of St. Louis, seeking restoration of his honor, versus Louis Robert, Sr., and Luc Marly, inhabitants of this said post.

In the matter of the petition in the form of a complaint of the said Robidou, of January 28, our decree below, stating that a copy will be given to the said Robert and Marly so that they respond within three days, everything certified by the bailiff Demers. In response to this, seven attestations produced by the named Robidou in the thirty-first of January, of various persons of this post who declare to know the said Robidou's family and that they have never known or heard that there was any stain of dishonor in the family of the said Robidou. Eight other attestations of several witnesses produced by the said Robert and Marly, which attest and declare to have knowledge and have heard about a family bearing the name of Robidou [illegible line] covered with opprobrium and infamy for a crime of [illegible] and for which this said Robidou family has found itself attacked and convicted, and other aggravating cases of which the said attestations declare this family guilty of. Everything duly and attentively examined, and since the attestations produced by Robert and Marly cancel out those produced by the said Robidou, which prevents us from establishing any certain judgment about the truth or falsehood of the facts advanced in the petitions on both sides, we have thrown the present parties out of court and out of trial; we impose silence upon them on both sides on this subject, under pain of punishment. We allow the said Robidou to furnish proof by authentic documents taken from the clerk's office and the archives of Canada, fully and duly legalized, from persons in place, that they will not be related to this family of which he bears the name, and that in his own [family] there had not been any legal proceedings, arrests or defamatory sentences against it. Everything should be done in a year dated from today, of the present proceedings in order to decree to whom it may concern. Until such time we have declared a reprieve on all other judgments and we forbid the said Robert / Marly to impute Robidou on both sides under pain as was stated above, to be reprimanded according to the seriousness of the case. After the year has passed, we reject all requests made by the said Robidou toward the said Robert and Marly. We temporarily condemn the said Robidou to the expenses of the present instance. Given in the chamber of the government by us, Don Fernando de Leyba, commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, the said day and year as above.

Fernando de Leyba

Certified copy of the present sentence to the named Robert, Marly and Robidou to each separately, at their homes, speaking to their persons by me, Demers, bailiff, in the royal jurisdiction of the Illinois, February 8, 1780.

Demers

[Box 1, Folder 18]

[Original in French]

We the undersigned, arbiters named by Mr. François Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers, Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

In order to end the differences that have occurred between Mr. Ichabod Camp [Campbell] and Mr. Clarhmorgan [Clamorgan], we [illegible] to make payable an [indemnity?] to the [interceded?] parties with a [illegible] of one thousand gourd *piasters* [Spanish currency] against whoever comes forth because of our sentence, to the advantage of errors and we have made them sign, the 23rd of the current month.

In consequence, we have examined all of the accounts and notes which have been presented to us, and we have found and decided that Mr. Clarhmorgan [Clamorgan] owed to Mr. Ichabod Camp [Campbell] the sum of seventy-four *livres* and twelve *sols*, currency of the Illinois, as a balance of the accounts that they have had together, since the Creation of the World until this day, and that [illegible] to Mr. Clarhmorgan [Clamorgan] is required to give to Mr. Camp [Campbell] [illegible] for the sum of two hundred eighty-three *livres*, currency of the Illinois, presently in the hands of Mr. Carton, residing in the Kaskaskias. And should Mr. Carton refuse to remit the said promissory note, Mr. Clarhmorgan [Clamorgan] will be held to pay to Mr. Ichabod Camp [Campbell], in addition to the balance mentioned above, the sum of two hundred eighty-three *livres*, currency of the Illinois. On the strength of which we have signed the present statement, in St. Louis of the Illinois, December 24, 1785.

C.J. Dumoulins
James Allen Matthews
[illegible signature]

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Francois Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers, graduated Lieutenant Colonel of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Elisabet Bizette Vachard, petitioner and acting on behalf of Jacques Vachard, her son, absent and working in the lead mine, has the honor to represent to you that her son sent and addressed to the petitioner a canoe loaded with fifty-four slabs of lead, approved by a prelate, a large covered cooking pot, ten cloth bags, and four oars for rowing. The quantity of lead was to pay and satisfy Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], a creditor of this petitioner's son. Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] was informed by Louis Vachard, pilot of the said boat, who remitted a letter of notice to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], coming from his debtor. Immediately the said conductor said "I'm going to the house" went down onto the banks to embark in the vehicle, and to conduct it, and to deliver it to this petitioner, to whom it was addressed.

The conductor got the vehicle, the *engages* [hired-hands] asked him "Where are we going?" He answered "We are going to put the vehicle into the stream of Roy [the King's stream?]: they pushed the boat into the mainstream, and just then a soldier arrived on the banks and cried out "Lardoise, Lardoise [the Vachard family's nickname], land under the Commander's orders," which they promptly did and put the boat in front of the house of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]. Immediately the said pilot went to the house of the said Labbadie [Labadie], saying "Sir, since you are stopping the boat, provide us with a man to aid in the unloading." He answered "I do not have any." The pilot went down to the boat and sent an *engagé* to ask for a rope. The said Labbadie [Labadie] gave him a [illegible] to moor the boat, even though it was already tied to a stake.

It appears, Sir, that the said Labbadie [Labadie], having stopped the loaded boat without orders from the Commander, and having refused to provide a man to unload it, is accountable for the loss of the said boat and of its load.

This petitioner hopes, Sir, that you will assign the charges and expenses to whom they may be due.

In St. Louis, June 8, 1785

Elisabet Vachard

[In Spanish]

I have notified Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] of the present petition at his home, speaking to his person, so that he can respond in writing to its contents within three days.

St. Louis of the Illinois. June 3, 1785.

Francois Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] of the present petition at his home, speaking to his person, so that he can respond in writing to its contents within three days.

St. Louis of the Illinois. June 3, 1785.

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Francois Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers, graduated Lieutenant Colonel of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie], respondent to the petition of Mme Elisabet Bizette Vachard on behalf of her son, Jacques, has the honor of giving you an account, Sir, that Jacques Vachard sent him a pirogue loaded with lead through Mr. Louis Vachard, his *engagé*, to whom he gave the guardianship and the piloting of the said pirogue. The said Louis Vachard, upon arriving in the village toward nine o'clock in the evening, went to the respondent's home to give him a letter of notice, and said to him that he would deliver the lead to him, if he consented, but he had observed that he could not unload at night and that he would probably need the permission of the Commander, but that he would wait for morning and would deliver the load.

A short time later after he had left the respondent's house, he had asked for a rope through his *engagé* named Leconte. The respondent gave it to him, persuaded that he would use it to tie up the pirogue, and that the said pilot and guardian of the load would watch over its safety during the rest of the night. This he did not do, as the pirogue was not found in the morning. Who should we blame, if not on him? The [illegible] or rope that moored the said pirogue had not been broken, as no piece of it was found in the morning, even though it was twenty-five or thirty fathoms [1 fathom = 6 feet]. It was negligence of the said guardian not to have moored the rope to my stake, or something else solid. If he had done so, the pirogue would not only have been filled but stayed where it was moored, admitting a burst of wind, and would have not gone adrift as it did.

The said lady says that the respondent had the pirogue grounded, by using your name through the sentinel's call, and that Mr. Louis Vachard, seeing that, asked for a man to unload the pirogue. This is absolutely false.

The respondent dares to take the liberty, Sir, of begging you to be willing to interrogate the soldier who grounded the pirogue, and to ask him if it is true that the defendant told him to stop it under your orders. Why would he have done so since the pilot was leaving his house, bringing him the letter of notice? She says that her son wanted to put the pirogue into Roy's stream, implying that there it would have been safer. She then has not paid attention, or she does not want to, to the fact that behind the respondent's house there is one [a stream] where the boats are as safe as in Roy. All the said lady's claims are only subterfuges that prove her bad procedure, addressing herself to the respondent rather than to her son Louis, who is the pilot of the said pirogue and who, consequently is responsible for everything that happened owing to his negligence, as he should have delivered all the objects that were under his care, which is customary in this country. We must believe that the said lady Elisabet Vachard wants to prove that she is a good mother and does not want to lose her son Louis in order to give to her other son Jacques a good reason, according to all appearance, which prevented her from asking you that the said Louis Vachard, pilot and guardian of the said pirogue, be held responsible for its loss. In the matter of the present account, the respondent humbly begs you, Sir, that you declare the said Louis Vachard to be responsible for the lead and the pirogue that he lost owing to his negligence, and to immediately pay the sum of it to the respondent, or to give him a good and sufficient security deposit, and to the said lady Elisabet Bizette Vachard to pay for the court expenses and charges.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, this June 11, 1785.

Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie]

[In Spanish]

Notified the present to Madame Lardoise, so that she responds in writing to its contents within three days. In St. Louis, June 13, 1785

Cruzat

[In French]

Notified the present to Madame Lardoise, so that she responds in writing to its contents within three days. In St.
Louis, June 13, 1785
Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Francois Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers, graduated Lieutenant Colonel of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Elisabet Vachard, on behalf of her son Jacques, very humbly represents to you that Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] asks, in his response, that if it pleases you, you hear the deposition of the soldier who had the boat loaded with lead grounded at Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]'s port, and who caused the boat's loss for not having put it in a safe place, such as Roy's stream, where the pilot wanted to lodge it in order that it would safely spend the night. Your justice, Sir, will permit me to indicate that the soldier in question, being an interested party by the fault he committed in using your name, absolutely cannot be heard [illegible] the deposition of a man who can suffer the repercussions of the event that happened.

Consequently, this petitioner, who only asks for truth from your justice, has the honor of begging that you find agreeable to hear the deposition of the *engagé* of the said boat, who cannot be suspect in any way, as he has no interest in declaring to the benefit of the parties involved, and upon which deposition of the *engagé* of the said boat, your justice will have the confidence that the demands of the case can permit. After which, if it pleases you, to render Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] responsible for the cargo and the said boat toward Mr. Jacques Lardoise, my son, and condemn him to the charges and expenses of justice.

In St. Louis, June 14, 1785.

Elisabet Vachard

[In Spanish]

Notified the present to Mr. Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie], speaking to his person at his home, so that he can respond to its contents under the terms of three days. In St. Louis, June 15, 1785.

Cruzat

[In French]

Notified the present to Mr. Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie], speaking to his person at his home, so that he can respond to its contents under the terms of three days. In St. Louis, June 15, 1785.

Demers, bailiff[Statement above in French, written and signed]

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French]

To Francois Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers, graduated Lieutenant Colonel of the regiment of Infantry of Louisiana, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

What does it matter to the respondent that the boat was in Roy's stream or in the one behind his house? The pilot was in charge, was not he responsible up until that moment?

The lady Elisabeth Bizette Vachard does not fear to put forth that the respondent was in conspiracy with the soldier who had the boat grounded, who is found to be an interested party by her, disguising the truth. How could the respondent have done it, since the boat arrived only at nine o'clock at night? Had he been where Lardoise was looking for a soldier, one would have seen him there and even before he acknowledged this thing, Mr. Louis Vachard, would not he have had the time to push off into the river and to go wherever he wanted? This is not what he thought, since his intention was always to unload at the defendant's home, as proven by the adjoined attestation by François Arnaud, his *engagé*.

What soldier, who knows subordination, would have dared to conspire with an individual, using the name of his superior in order to stop a boat that wants to pass! How would he not have feared that the pilot would have lodged a complaint, and by that to bring a punishment upon himself. There is all appearance and room to believe that if the soldier had observed the rules, he would have complained. Thus please, Sir, have the goodness to be willing to make a judicial inquiry about this subject, and after the truth will become known, to ask the said lady Elisabeth Vachard to withdraw the calumny that she dares to put forth in her petition.

The said lady would desire that one take depositions of the *engage*. It is surprising that she does not notice that they are a part of this affair. There is every appearance that she believes herself to be living at the time of the judgment of this famous wolf who in a trial had left judged and... but she should know that this only exists in fables [likely a reference to a fable by La Fontaine entitled "Le Loup Plaidant contre le Renard par-devant le Singe"].

The respondent persists still in begging you, Sir, to condemn the said Louis Vachard, pilot and guardian of the boat, to be responsible for the lead, pirogue after [illegible] that he lost owing to his great negligence, and to pay the bill for it immediately to the defendant, or to give him a good and sufficient security deposit, and to force the said lady Elisabeth Vachard to pay the court costs.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, June 17, 1785.

Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie]

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French]

I, the undersigned, in favor of the truth and under oath, having arrived in this post St. Louis in the boat of Mr. Lardoise, loaded with lead that Mr. Louis Lardoise, pilot of the said boat, said en route that it was necessary to unload at Monsieur Labbadie [Labadie]'s house, as the said lead had been sent. And that at its arrival at this post, the said pilot did not give any order to unload, on the strength of which I have signed an order to serve and to be valued to whomever it concerns.

In St. Louis, June 15, 1785.

I approve the handwriting.

François Arnaud

[Box 1, Folder 19]

[Original in French and Spanish]

June 27, 1785

We Gabriel Cerré and Jacques Clamorgan, named and assembled in the house of Monsieur the Commander by his order, to serve as arbiters in the pending affair between Mr. Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie] and Elisabet Vachard, *ditte* Lardoise, acting in the name of her son Jacques, who sent from Prairie du Chien a boat loaded with several slabs of lead to be remitted to the said Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], which in effect arrived in the present month, toward nine o'clock in the evening. Having heard the attestations of the two parties before the Commander, we, having been appointed to decide, and having the arbiter Mr. Louis Dubreuil in case of a tie vote, heard the depositions of the named Pierre Leconte, paddler on board the said boat, and of the named François Arnaud, who have conjointly avowed and been sworn in, in our presence, under the oath of truth. [They say] that after the named Louis Lardoise, pilot of the said boat, was brought to the Government [house] to give an account of his voyage, he embarked on his boat in order to set off for his destination but, having been shouted at from the shore that on the part of Monsieur the Commander he should put the boat in front of Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]'s house, he did it and sent to the house for a rope capable of resisting during the night in order to serve as a boat hook, which they obtained from Mr. Labbadie [Labadie], which according to the depositions made, the said boat was moored a second time to a faraway stake in five or six feet of water. With this new mooring, during the night the said Pierre Leconte and the pilot of the said boat slept on the ground nearby, in order to keep watch, which the said Leconte declared to us to have done, and which he repeated several times. Nevertheless in the morning, they noticed that the water had greatly risen [illegible] and had carried away the stake with the boat in a gust of wind that came up during the night, for they said they had not seen even a vestige of the place or the stake which had been planted, which was holding the above mentioned boat, they swore with assurance.

We, François Arnaud, and Pierre Leconte, under my ordinary mark, certify the present declaration as conforming to the truth and have signed at the request of the arbiters.

François Arnaud

mark of Pierre Leconte

We, the arbiters and overseer arbiter in the affair of the deposition of the witnesses whom we have interrogated, and still that of the named Borman, whom the pilot of the said boat hired to spend the night near the boat with him in order to take care that [illegible] the cargo of which should have been [unloaded] to the said Mr. Labbadie [Labadie]. We have judged it fitting that the boat and its load remains and resides entirely under the responsibility of the guardian of the same, as he did not give it over to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] the same evening, if it is true that the said Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] forced him to moor at his port the above mentioned boat loaded with lead. The appearances of which leads us to believe that the guardian did not regard himself as discharged of his duty, as he took precautions to put it there and to take care of it during the night and in this case, we condemn the petitioner to court expenses, if there are any.

In St. Louis, June 27, 1785

Dubreuil

Cerré

Jacques Clamorgan

[In Spanish]

Notified the present sentence to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] and to Elisabet Bizette, speaking to their persons, at their homes.

In St. Louis of the Illinois. June 27, 1785.

Francois Cruzat

[In French]

Notified the present sentence to Mr. Labbadie [Labadie] and to Elisabet Bizette, speaking to their persons, at their homes.

In St. Louis of the Illinois. June 27, 1785.

Silvestre Labbadie [Labadie]

La Lardoise

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 20]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Francois Cruzat, graduated Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois and its dependencies.

Sir:

The petitioner has the honor of explaining to you that there are several differences to settle between himself and Mr. Gabriel Cerré, merchant of this village. Unable to settle them by mutual agreement, this petitioner begs you to put all their business affairs through arbitration, and to name expert negotiators who can decide, as a last resort, the state of the accounting between the parties in accordance to the justice of the laws established by commerce. St. Louis, February 18, 1786.

J. B. Guillon

[In Spanish]

I order Gabriel Cerré to be informed of this petition so that he can respond in writing within three days counted from this date. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 20, 1786

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Gabriel Cerré at his home, speaking to his person. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 20, 1786.
Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 20]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers of the fixed regiment of Louisiana and Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois.

The respondent has the honor of explaining to you that he received a petition on the twentieth of this month certified by you on the same day, and ordering to respond to its contents in writing within three days.

Mr. Guillon explains to you that there are several differences to settle. This respondent does not agree to any at all, having finished and concluded all of the affairs concerning him with his son, by virtue of the sufficient powers he held. This is why the respondent has the honor to represent to you that, as a citizen of this side of the river [Guillon lived in Fort de Chartres, Illinois, on the American side of the Mississippi], if as he [Guillon] says, he aspires to have the accounts examined once again, as much for him as for his son, then the plaintiff will always be ready to take to him, once again, his accounts so that all the supposed differences that he says there are between him and this respondent can be decided. This considered, he has recourse to your authority, in that it would please you to order his adverse party to personally represent his son to this side of the said river, and that before entering into detail of any account both of them give a security deposit. I thank you with all the respect [illegible] in honoring God.

Your very humble and very obedient servant

Cerré

In St. Louis, February 22, 1786

[In Spanish]

I order Mr. Guillon to be informed of the above response so that he can respond in writing within three days counted from this date. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 22, 1786

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Mr. Guillon at his home, speaking to his person. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 22, 1786.

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 20]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Francois Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois and its dependencies.

Sir:

The petitioner has the honor of explaining to you that, having several accounts to settle with Mr. Cerré, which he does not believe can be settled without disagreement, he only begged you to name expert persons who can settle the accounts according to the laws and equity. It is surprising that Mr. Cerré intends to involve my son in affairs regarding which he is not even mentioned. Since I am asking and aspiring to settle only affairs that concern us mutually, it is even more surprising that he is in the case of requiring that I give him a security deposit for my son, since I do not talk to him about any business affairs concerning this same son, that I make no demands upon him, and that there is no law that can condemn me to be responsible for the crazy things that he could have done without proving that I am the author by express orders that grant me the authority to commit them. Therefore, if Mr. Cerré has contracted some business affairs with my son, let him settle them as best as he can, without attempting to complicate them with my own, and requiring me to give him a security deposit for affairs which do not concern me in any way [and] for which no one can reasonably hold me responsible. As for giving a security deposit for that which does not concern me personally, I am required to pay quickly and without delay to Mr. Cerré for the request he makes, if condemned to it. This considered, Sir, may it please you to assemble as I have requested in my first petition, a group of expert negotiators who can decide as a last resort and settle all accounts between me and my adversary, and this done, you can decree [upon it].

In St. Louis, February 24, 1786.

J. Baptiste Guillon

[In Spanish]

I order Gabriel Cerré to be informed of this petition so that he can respond in writing within three days counted from this date. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 24, 1786

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Gabriel Cerré at his home, speaking to his person. St. Louis of the Illinois, February 24, 1786.

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 20]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers of the fixed regiment of Louisiana and Commander in chief of the western part of the Illinois.

Sir:

Gabriel Cerré, respondent to the petition by Mr. J. Baptiste Guillon, has the honor of begging you, Sir, to be willing to accord him a period of fifteen days, so that during this time he can procure the necessary papers in order to respond to the petition that was certified the twenty-fourth of this month. He would dare again to pray you to be willing to send for the person of the said Duquet, the assistant of the said Guillon, to your government [house], and to have him give his deposition under oath, as he was an eyewitness when the said Guillon made his resolutions regarding the affairs that he had in this country, and gave his son J-B, who normally managed them, a bill and other obligations that were his in this country. And this in the presence of the said Duquet and LaCroix, his assistants, this done and you will make your decree.

In St. Louis, February 28, 1786.

Cerré

[In Spanish]

In St. Louis of the Illinois on March 2nd of 1786, I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of the western part and districts of the Illinois, in the company of the legal witnesses Mariano Izaguirre and Joseph Bermeo (in place of a notary), and acting upon the request of Mr. Gabriel Cerré, a merchant in this town, in the above document, I have made Francisco Duquet appear before me and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the subject I was going to ask him about.

He answered that he swore and promised.

I asked where was he from, what was his religion, what is his current state and profession.

He answered he was from the city of Quebec, province of Canada, his religion Roman Catholic, his state single, and his profession merchant.

I asked if he knew Juan Bautista Guillon, and if he knew if he had given to his son any orders to retrieve from Mr. Gabriel Cerré several promissory notes that he had left so that [Cerré] could collect payment on his behalf, and that he should make an exact and detailed account of anything he might know.

He answered that he knows Mr. Juan Bautista Guillon very well, as he has been in the service of his son for the past three years, running all the errands necessary for his commerce. And that around October of 1784 this deponent was in the post of Michel Maquinac, in the company of the father and the son. Having the said Juan Baustista Guillon Sr. fallen gravely ill, he sent this deponent to fetch all the papers of promissory notes, receipts, and accounts that he [Guillon] had in this country of Illinois, so that he could set them apart to give them to his son, so that he could collect all the payments that were owed to him in this country. Having this deponent done so, the said Juan Baustista Guillon Sr., in the presence of this deponent, gave the said papers of promissory notes, receipts, and accounts to his son. With them [the papers], he [Guillon Jr.] left the post of Michel Maquinac in the company of this deponent and of his cousin Isidoro Lacrois, to trade with the Indians nations of the Mississippi. That this deponent does not know that the said Juan Bautista Guillon Sr. gave [his son] any written order or powers to retrieve the promissory notes that he had left in the hands of Mr. Cerré, and that he [the deponent] can only say that when he [Guillon Sr.] gave all the said papers [to his son] he verbally said that it was for him to collect all the payments that were owed to him in this country, and that if he could not do it in person for any reason related to his commercial occupations, he had to try to give the said papers to his cousin Isidoro Lacrois, so that he could collect the payments.

I asked if he had anything to add or take out.

He answered that he did not have anything to add or take out, and that he is twenty-six years old. Having read him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it under oath, and he signed it with me the Commander and the legal witnesses.

Josef Bermeo

François Duquette

Mariano Izaguirre

Francisco Cruzat

Immediately I made Isidoro Lacroiz appear before me and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the subject I was going to ask him about.

He answered that he swore and promised.

I asked where was he from, what was his religion, what is his current profession.

He answered he was from the Cap. of Magdalena [*el Cap. de la Madalena*], his religion Roman Catholic, and his profession merchant.

I asked if he knew Juan Bautista Guillon, and if he knew that he had given any powers, promissory notes or other (related) papers regarding his business in the posts of the Illinois to his son, so that he could collect the payments that were owed to him, and that he should make an exact and detailed account of everything he knew. He answered that he knew Juan Bautista Guillon very well, but he did not know that he had given any orders, powers, or notes so that his son could collect payment in this country of Illinois. He only can say that, when he was at the post of Michel Maquinak, the said Juan Bautista Guillon Sr. told him that he was determined to give this deponent a [written] power so that he could come to this country of the Illinois to collect payments owed to him, but that he did not follow upon that, and that he knows that he [Guillon Sr.] gave to his son all the necessary papers to collect payment in this country. And that after this, the deponent left the post with the said son and three canoes loaded with merchandise, which the said father had given to the son to trade with the Indian nations established in the place named Huisconsá [Wisconsin]. And that during the wintering, the said Guillon Jr. went down to this post of the Illinois with the papers that his father had given him. And that having returned from his trip, he met the deponent in Prairie du Chien, and told him that it was necessary to go down to the Illinois to collect the payments owed to his father, but that the deponent refused because he was sick, and the said Guillon decided to go back again to this country. And that the deponent loaded his boats with the pelts he had made during the wintering, and a few others that the said Guillon had brought to him, and that he transported everything to the post of Michel Maquinak, and delivered it to Guillon Sr. That this is all he can say. I asked if he knew whether or not the said Juan Bautista Guillon had given to his son a verbal or written order to retrieve several promissory notes from Mr. Cerré's hands, where he had left them.

He answered that he did not know that Mr. Guillon Sr. gave his son any order particularly concerning Mr. Cerré, and that he can only say that the father told his son to get all the papers regarding Illinois, so that he could act upon them.

I asked if he had anything to add or take out, and what was his age.

He answered that he did not have anything to add or take out, and that he was twenty-seven years old. Having read him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it under oath, and he signed it with me the Commander and the legal witnesses.

Josef Bermeo

Isidore Lacrois

Francisco Cruzat

Mariano Izaguirre

Immediately I made Jacinto Sencir appear before me and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the subject I was going to ask him about.

He answered that he swore and promised.

I asked where was he from, what was his religion, what is his current profession.

He answered that he was from the city of Quebec, province of Canada, his religion Roman Catholic, and his profession merchant.

I asked if he knew Juan Bautista Guillon, and if he knew that he had given any written or verbal powers to his son, for him to retrieve several promissory notes that the said Guillon had left in the hands of Mr. Gabriel Cerré before leaving for Michel Maquinak, and that he should make an exact and detailed account of everything he knows.

He answered that around June of the previous year he was in the post of Michel Maquinak, where the said Juan Bautista Guillon had told him that he had given his son all the papers and account books concerning his business in the Illinois, but that when this deponent asked him if he had given his son any specific power to retrieve the promissory notes that he had left in the hands of Mr. Cerré, he answered no, that he had not given him any powers over that particular business, that he had only given him, as this deponent has said, all the papers and account books regarding the business he had in this country, as he himself could not collect the payments because he was sick.

I asked if he had anything to add or take out, and what was his age.

He answered no, and that he is thirty years old. Having read him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it under oath, and as he declares not to know how to sign he made the mark of the cross in the presence of the legal witnesses, who have signed with me the Commander.

Mariano Izaguirre Mark of Jacinto Sencir Josef Bermeo Francisco Cruzat

In the same day and year I made Antonio Reil Sencir appear before me and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I asked if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth about the subject I was going to ask him about.

He answered that he swore and promised.

I asked where was he from, what was his religion, what is his current profession.

He answered that he was from the Montpellier, province of Languedoc in France, his religion Roman Catholic, and his profession merchant.

I asked if he knew Juan Bautista Guillon, Sr., and if he knew he gave to his son powers for him to collect payments that were owed to him in the country of the Illinois.

He answered that he does not know anything, and that he can only say that when he was in the place named Chicagou [Chicago], on August 15, 1784, he gave a promissory note to the said Juan Bautista Guillon Sr. for the amount of four hundred and nineteen *libras* and two *sueldos* in money, and that the said note was presented to him in this town by Mr. Guillon Jr., who received the said amount from this deponent.

I asked if he knew if the said Juan Bausita Guillon had given any written or verbal powers to his son, for him to retrieve promissory notes that the said Guillon had left in the hands of Mr. Cerré.

He answered that he did not know anything about that.

I asked if he had anything to add, and what was his age.

He said no, and that he was fifty years old. Having read him his deposition, he confirmed it and ratified it under oath, and he signed it with me the Commander and the legal witnesses.

Josef Bermeo [illegible signature] Francisco Cruzat Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 1, Folder 20]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, and Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois.

Gabriel Cerré has the honor of explaining to you that he was given a certified petition by Mr. Guillon, that as a consequence of your decree, copied at bottom of this document, there is a response by this respondent who has had the honor to present to you on last February 28th, after your decree accorded him fifteen days to produce the necessary proofs to justify the accounts that he has with Mr. Guillon and to find the truth of the matter.

Mr. Guillon, in his petition of February 20th, requests you, Sir, to be willing to have all the affairs related to this case go through arbitration. This is what, Sir, this respondent is submitting so that you can judge for yourself better, to which case the respondent will submit, always with respect for your judgment and if, on the other hand it pleases you, to send back the parties in front of the arbiters. May it be permitted that he [the respondent] names each one among whom that they will judge necessary, they will produce all the necessary paperwork for the greatest clarification in order to decide with equity and according to their consciences all their difficulties and accounts which are the object of this disagreement and to render their sentence definitive, so that you will get a report and official copy so that it may be known the plain and entire effect for the one and the other of the parties. This is what the respondent concludes.

St. Louis, March 15, 1786.

Cerré

[In Spanish]

Having seen the petition presented by Juan Bautista Guillon on February 18 against Gabriel Cerré, and the responses given by him, each of them will name an arbiter intelligent and informed in commercial matters, so that, after the arbiters get acquainted with the details of the case, they can decide the case according to the laws, and together with a third arbiter named by the Justice [system]. St. Louis of the Illinois, March 23, 1785.

[In French]

I, Joseph Marie Demers, acting as bailiff, have certified the present decree, given by Monsieur Francois Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois to Mr. Cerré and Mr. Guillon at their homes, speaking to their persons.

St. Louis of the Illinois, March 23, 1786

J M Demers, Bailiff

[In Spanish]

In the town of St. Louis of the Illinois, on March 23rd of 1785, before me, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant of this western part of the Illinois (in place of a notary), there are present in their persons Juan Bautista Guillon and Gabriel Cerré, who, by virtue of the preceding decree, had named as arbiters to settle the differences between them: Mr. Gabriel Cerré has named Mr. Santiago Cler Morgan [Clarmorgan], and Mr. Juan Bautista Guillon has named Mr. Juan Bautista Touson, and I, the said Commander, have named Mr. Louis Dubreuil as third arbiter, so that he decides in case that the first two do not reach an agreement. And thus, they have signed with me and the legal witnesses.

J. B. Guillon

Cerré

Mariano Izaguirre

Josef Bermeo

Fran. Cruzat

Before me, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant of this western part of the Illinois (in place of a notary), and in the presence of the legal witnesses Mariano Izaguirre and Josef Bermeo, there were present in their persons Mr. Santiago Clarmorgan [Clamorgan], Mr. Juan Touson, and Mr. Louis Dubreuil, arbiters appointed for the settlement of the accounts between Gabriel Cerré and Juan B. Guillon. I have notified them of their appointment, which they agreed to and swore to carry out their task according to their intelligence and understanding of the matters of commerce, and have signed with me the Commander and legal witnesses. St. Louis, March 23, 1786.

[In French]

Gabriel Cerré, resident of this part of the Illinois, and J. Baptiste Guillon, residing presently at this place, has agreed and are in accord of what follows.

Given the difficulties remaining between us regarding the liquidation of our respective accounts, we the undersigned, intended [illegible] the one countering the other as it appears in the former paperwork. In order to avoid more lengthy difficulties, and regarding the arbiters whom the Commander has permitted us to appoint in order to end our differences, we have by the present agreement and arrangements consented to accord that, in order to give more certitude to the sentence of the arbiters who must act on our behalf, it will be paid without delay a sum of twenty thousand *livres* in silver, by the one who will contravene the sentence of the arbiters in order to benefit the other of us without which, for a few causes the present sum can be repeated by the contravener. For reasons that, if they take place, we both renounce as of this moment, and promise to stop and to pay everything that might be decided by the arbiters herewith named.

St. Louis of the Illinois, March 23, 1786

We, the arbiters and overseer arbiter named by Mr. Francois Cruzat, Lieutenant and Governor of the western part of this province of the Illinois, have the task of settling the differences between Mr. Gabriel Cerré and Mr. J. Baptiste Guillon. Each of the parties has given us all of the paperwork that they believe can help us to make a decision. Following the laws and justice, and after the examination that we have made, we have seen that the essential disagreement that remains between the two parties is to know whether Mr. Gabriel Cerré was in fact duly authorized to empty his hands into those of J. Baptiste Guillon Sr., which papers we have under our eyes. In none of the papers that have been given to us, there appears that Mr. Cerré had to keep a [illegible], favoring all others for the [illegible] of Mr. Guillon Sr. of the bills of Mr. Robidou and Benite and one other, Mr. Cerré, sufficiently armed with power to remit into the hands of Mr. Guillon Jr. the bills in question, without regard to any other paper, since Mr. Guillon Jr. until today has not set foot in the Illinois as the assistant of Mr. Guillon Sr., who appears to have all the confidence in himself for management and his business affairs in these places where he could not set foot.

This is why we have judged that Mr. Cerré must be validly discharged of the [illegible] that Mr. Guillon Sr. had made [illegible] of the bills of Mr. Benite and J Baptiste Guillon Jr., his representative in business to the separation which would [illegible]. In St. Louis, March 23rd, 1786.

Touson

Jacques Clamorgan

Dubreuil

[In Spanish]

The bailiff of this town will notify the preceding sentence by the arbiters to Mr. Gabriel Cerré and Mr. Juan Bautista Guillon, so that they can conform to it. St. Louis, March 24, 1786.

Francisco Cruzat

[Certification by bailiff Demers follows in French, dated March 24]

[Box 1, Folder 21]

[Original in French and Spanish]

To Mr. Francois Cruzat, Captain of the Grenadiers, Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed Regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor of the western part and district of the Illinois.

Motard humbly pleads and has the honor to explain that I was entrusted in New Orleans by Mr. Reynaud and Mr. Meronne, merchants of the said place, and by Mme. Langlois, also resident of New Orleans, with collecting payments on their behalf in this country, and with bringing the funds to the said place, which is what I did in part. But Mr. Sarpy has since alleged that he is not at all responsible for my demands that he pays a commission to me, which is legitimately due to me as in every country the merchant takes it, and lives only by it. This is why, Sir, this petitioner has recourse to your justice and to the [illegible] of the people, so that it may please you to transfer the accounts of the collections that I have made for the said persons, to order Mr. Sarpy to withdraw, by his power of attorney, my own funds from their accounts for my commission, as it is usual in this country as well as in the others from where the bills are included herein. And in case Mr. Sarpy wants this case to be put through arbitrage, this petitioner begs you to please name the arbiters so that justice can be done. St. Louis, February 25, 1786

Joseph Motard

[In Spanish]

I order Mr. Silbestre Sarpy to be notified of this petition so that he can respond in writing within three days counted from today's date. St. Louis, February 25, 1786.

Cruzat

[In French]

I have notified Mr. Silvestre Sarpy of the present petition in his house, speaking to his person. February 25, 1786

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 21]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

Mr. Francisco Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry, Captain of the Grenadiers of the fixed Regiment of Louisiana, Commander in chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western part and district of the Illinois.

Sarpy very humbly has the honor to explain that Mr. Reynaud and Mr. Meronne, merchants of New Orleans, as well as Mme. Langlois, living at the said place, have entrusted him with collecting payments on Mr. Motard for diverse sums in conformity with the acknowledgement and obligations of the said Motard. Having entered into settlement of debts with him as well as for that of Mr. Reynaud and Mr. Meronne, and the said Mme. Langlois, the said Mr. Motard has demanded a commission for the management of several affairs of the said persons, who have not sufficiently warned this respondent to have this compensation included in the liquidation of the accounts with Mr. Motard. And as today Mr. Motard has appeared before you, Sir, may it please you to put the case through arbitrage to decide on the commission that the said Motard request [illegible] may it please you, consequently, to name such persons who will give a verdict on the commission that Motard requests and that this respondent refuses to pay by default of the persons who [illegible], may justice be done.

In St. Louis, February 27, 1786

Silvestre Sarpy

[In Spanish]

Having seen the petition and response by Mr. Motard and Mr. Sapry, each of them will name an individual intelligent in business matters, so that they, together with a third one named by the Justice, can decide this case and solve the difficulties between Sarpy and Motard.

St. Louis, February 28, 1786.

Cruzat

[In Spanish]

Before me, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of this western part and districts of the Illinois (in place of a notary), there is Mr. Josef Motard and Mr. Silbestre Sarpy, who by virtue of the decree above have named as arbiters for the solution of the difficulty between them: the said Josef Motard has named Mr. Gaspar Rouvieu, and the said Silbestre Sarpy has named Mr. Santiago Clar Morgan [Clamorgan], both merchants and inhabitants of this town. I the Commander name Mr. Agustin Choteau [Chouteau] as third arbiter, to decide in case the first two are in disagreement. They have signed with me in St. Louis, March 2, 1786.

Joseph Motard

Sarpy

Francisco Cruzat

[In French]

We the undersigned, arbiters and over-arbiter, following the orders of Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the province of the Illinois, to give a verdict to and settle the differences that remain between Mr. Motard, merchant of this place, plaintiff against Mr. Sarpy, also merchant in this same place, defendant, relative to the commission on diverse debt collections that Mr. Motard claims was entrusted to him by Mr. Reynaud and Meronne as well as by Mme. Langlois, all residents of New Orleans, and [all]

represented in this place by Mr. Silvestre Sarpy, merchant. We the said arbiters have given a verdict and have arbitrated and settled the commission due to the said Mr. Motard in relation to his debt collection for the sum of five percent in silver at the silver rate, and at five percent in peltry at the peltry rate, with a special sum of one hundred thirty-two *livres*, ten *sols* in [illegible] for the expenses of his voyage from St. Louis to Ste Genevieve, and again for the expenses of the trial charged aboard the [illegible] and upkeep of his peltry. We have settled as well the commission due to the said Motard for the collections done on behalf of Mme Langlois for the sum of ten percent at the going rate, as much as the [illegible] and collections of the price of which as well as a sum of one hundred *livres* in silver for the expenses of his trip from this place to the village of Kaskaskia. This is why we have given to you our present opinion at the home of Mr. Chouteau [illegible] the Commander who has named us to this effect, and will do so after having signed and passed an agreement between the parties in order to hold our decision agreeable. In St. Louis, this March 4, 1786.

Gaspard Roubieu

Aug. Chouteau

Jacques Clamorgan

[In Spanish]

I order the arbiters' decision above to be reported to Mr. Silberstre Sarpy and Mr. Josef Motard, so that they conform to its content. St. Louis, March 6, 1786.

Francisco Cruzat

[In French]

I, J. Demers in my capacity as bailiff, have certified to the Srs. Sarpy and Motard the present definitive sentence of the arbiters. In St. Louis, March 6, 1786

Demers, bailiff

[Box 1, Folder 21]

[Original in French]

The undersigned Silvestre Sarpy, merchant living in this post on the one hand, and Joseph Motard, also merchant and in the same place on the other hand, do say that as there remains a disagreement between them over the payment of a commission asked by Mr. Motard by reason of his management of the debt collections entrusted to him by Mr. Reynaud and Mr. Meronne as well as by Mme Langlois, all residents of New Orleans, who for a time have begged Mr. Sarpy to take out the said affairs out of the hands of the said Mr. Motard. In order to give a verdict on the request of each one of us, Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor ordered Mr. Clamorgan and Gaspard Roubieu to settle and arbitrate on the point of the disagreement between us, and in case of disagreement between the arbiters, Mr. Chouteau, merchant of this place, was, as over-arbiter in this affair, to terminate all differences between us. We are presenting this compromise that we hold everything well and agreeable, that it may please to you to decide according to the law [illegible] pay by the one to the other, he who will contradict the present conventions, a sum of five hundred piasters in silver, and that before providing it a possibility in any other manner.

In St. Louis, March 6, 1786

Silvestre Sarpy

Joseph Motard

[Box 2, Folder 1]

[Original in Spanish]

In the town of St. Louis of the Illinois, on April 25, 1786, I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel, Captain of Grenadiers of the Infantry Regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor of these establishments of Illinois: By virtue of the petition presented by Gabriel Cerré, merchant and inhabitant of this town of St. Louis, in which he requests that we interrogate the rowers hired by Mr. Montardy, in order to find out the destiny of several packets of peltries that they received from the said Montardy to be delivered to the petitioner [Cerré].

In consequence, I have named legal witnesses Eugenio Alvarez [Alvarez], inhabitant of this town, and Mariano Izaguirre, corporal of the troops that protect this town. I have subsequently called Juan Portais before myself and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I ask him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth in the interrogation that would follow.

He answers that he swears and promises.

I ask where is he from, what is his religion, his state, and his profession.

He answers he is from Montreal, province of Canada, his religion Roman Catholic, his state single, and his profession traveller.

I ask who he was engaged with in his last trip to the Missouri.

He answers that he was engaged by Mr. Gabriel Cerré, merchant of this port, to bring several goods [to the Missouri] under the orders of Mr. Rigoch, who, upon reaching the nation of the Gotó [Otoes] delivered the goods to Mr. Montardy, to whom they were addressed, together with this deponent, so that they could winter there and trade with the said nation of the Otos.

I ask if the said Montardy gave the deponent and his companions several packets of pelts and other goods for them to bring them to this town, what quantity, when this happened, and what were the instructions given.

He answers that on March 27, in Paca's point [*la punta de Paca*], approximately two hundred leagues from this post, the said Montardy gave to this deponent and his companions, in two canoes tied together, sixty big packets of striped venison pelts, sixteen big packets of beaver pelt, two big packets of cat pelts, one big packet of river otter pelts mixed with beaver, another big packet of various small pelts, approximately thirty-seven deer pelts, some bear pelts the exact quantity of which the deponent does not know, eight hundred pounds of tallow according to Montardy's estimation at the time of boarding them, and a packet of trading goods the details of which the deponent does not know, together with a sack with some goods to be delivered to Montardy's wife.

These are all the goods that Montardy gave to them to be delivered to Mr. Cerré, with the orders that they should obey the named Amiot as their boss and that they should take good care of the goods until they were delivered.

I ask why they had not delivered the goods, and that he should make a detailed account of how they had abandoned them.

He answers that fifteen days after they had left their camp they arrived, shortly before sundown, in a site named the little river of the Canzes [the Kansa Indians]. As the weather was about to turn bad, they went into the said little river, for about two *arpents*, to seek refuge, and they were forced to stay there for two days on account of the blowing wind and rain, which made navigation impossible. The last day, in the afternoon, the deponent left the camp to see if he could kill a turkey, and while he was at this he heard two or three fusil shots that came from the camp's surroundings, and then he heard more shooting together with Indian cries, and thus the deponent fled to some mountains that were nearby, where he spent the night. The next day, around nine in the morning, he went to investigate what had happened in the camp. As he approached the camp, he saw that about twenty or twenty five men were boarding the canoes that were moored [on the river bank], and were pushing them into the river. The deponent was witnessing all this, and he heard talk in the Indian language of the nations of the Mississippi that they were going to come back to land, and thus the deponent, afraid of being discovered, returned to the said mountains, where he stayed until three or four in the afternoon when, being perplexed as to what to do, he decided to return to the camp. He arrived in the camp very confused, with his knife in his hand, resolved to do anything, and going around the camp not finding anyone, he embarked in one single canoe that he found, and, cutting the mooring rope with the knife he had in his hand, he went downriver. He saw, before leaving, that there were cut up pelts scattered on the ground. Going downriver (as he has declared), he saw the canoe that the Indians had taken, about three [*puntas?*] down from the river of the Canzes. The deponent did not dare to land and register the canoe, as he was possessed by terror and panic caused by the preceding events, and was afraid to be killed by the Indians, and thus he let the boat go downriver through the night. The next day, around nine in the morning, three other *engagés* who had escaped on a small canoe joined the deponent, and

they went together until they reached the nation of the Missouri Indians, and from there they came to this town, where this deponent delivered all the goods that he could save to whom they were addressed. That this is all he can say.

I ask whether, upon arriving to the Missouri nation, they had told this nation what had happened, what they had answered, and what they deliberated.

He answers that after they arrived [to the Missouri nations] they told them everything, and said that it was the Big Osages the ones who had committed this crime, and that they did not have any deliberation.

I ask what were their reasons for not returning up the Missouri river, and look for the boat that was missing and all the goods.

He answers that it was impossible to return upriver, as they did not have provisions, paddles, or any of the other necessary things.

I ask if Joseph Hever, a merchant who is with the said nation of the Missouri or Little Osages, offered their assistance and promised that he would accompany them to the camp.

He answers that he does not know that Josef Hever had offered his assistance, only that he said he would go with the Little Osages to check their camp and see what had happened.

I ask if he has anything to add, and what is his age.

He answers he is thirty-three years old, and that although he said that they did not go upriver for lack of provisions and paddles, after they joined the Little Osages they could have obtained the necessary utensils, but neither the boss nor anyone thought about that. And that he affirms the rest under oath, and signs together with me, the Governor, and legal witnesses.

Jean Portais Mariano Izaguirre Eugenio Alvarez Francisco Cruzat

Declaration of the second witness

At three in the afternoon of the said day, month, and year, I subsequently called Agustin Amiot before myself and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I ask him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth in the interrogation that would follow.

He answers that he swore and promised.

I ask where is he from, what is his religion, his state, and his profession

He answers his name is Agustin Amiot, he is from the parish of St. Agustin, in Quebec, Canada, his religion is Roman Catholic, he is single, and his profession traveller.

I ask who he was engaged with in his last trip to the Missouri.

He answers that last fall, as he was hunting, the named Montardy hired him for three hundred pounds of striped venison pelts to winter with him and make the canoes that he needed, and to serve as skipper when delivering the pelts to Gabriel Cerré in the spring.

I ask how many packets of pelts the said Montardy gave him to deliver to Cerré, what quality, what other goods did he transport, what orders Montardy gave him, and whether he followed them.

He answers that he does not know the exact number of packets transported in the canoes, as they were not given to him but he only was in charge of transporting them to this town, but that he believes there were about eighty big packets, sixteen of which were of beaver and the rest of venison and other pelts, together with a quantity of tallow of which the exact pounds he does not know, and some trading goods of which he also ignores the details. That these were all the goods that the said Montardy gave to the deponent as well as to his mates, so that they would deliver them to Mr. Cerré in this town.

I ask which day did he leave the camp with the said packets of pelts, and how the packets were arranged.

He answers that on last March 27, in Pac's Point [*la Punta de Pac*], about two hundred leagues from this town, the said Montardy gave this deponent and his mates all the mentioned goods, arranged in two big canoes tied to each other, in the manner of a raft, together with a small canoe for them to use in case they needed it.

I ask why they did not deliver the packets to whom they were addressed, that he should make an exact account of everything so that we understand why they abandoned the packets.

He answers that about fifteen days after they left Mr. Montardy's camp, a little before sundown, they reached the entry of the little river of the Canzes [Kansa] nation, and as there were signs of bad weather, they entered it to avoid a possible shipwreck. They were forced to stay there for two days, owing to the wind, rain, snow and

sleet. The last day, about four in the afternoon, the *engagé* named Juan went out to see if he could kill a duck. Shortly after sundown, the deponent and his companions heard two fusil shots near the camp, and immediately after more shooting and noises of people coming towards them. They thought that their companion Juan was dead, and fearing to meet the same fate they fled, quickly boarding the canoe they had next to the raft, bringing with them a little sack of corn and a kettle. Leaving the river in which they were, they cross the Missouri and hide on the other side of the river, in a reed bed where they stayed until the moon came out, when they embarked again with the aim of checking on the camp. As they were reaching the entry of the said river, they discover a rather large party of Indians, who had taken the camp and the canoes, and who were arguing among them, although the deponent could not understand anything, owing to contrary winds. This deponent and their companions only saw that they went around with burning sticks searching for something, and those who were on the canoes did nothing but count the skins and throw them into the water. Seeing this, they decided to quietly return to the Missouri river, and go up to a certain distance, where they hid again, and stayed until an hour before sunup, where they went back to check on the camp, and seeing that the Indians were still there and everything was quiet and calm, they did not dare to get too close, and decided to hide again where they had hid the first time, where they stayed until eight or nine in the morning. After discussing the matter, they decided to go downriver to find a better hiding spot, which they did an hour before sundown, in a more comfortable site where they spent a quiet night. The next day, after discussing the matter again and seriously reflecting upon it, seeing that they did not have enough provisions, paddles, and other necessary utensils to go up the Missouri river and reach the camp, the deponent decided that all of them should go downriver to the Missouri nation, where they could decide the best course to follow. As the said Juan said that everything was lost, they did not make any further decision, the deponent only consulted with Josef Heven, to see if he could set a party of Indians, either of the Missouri nation or the Little Osages, to go check on the camp and see if they could recover the lost canoe together with the other goods. But neither of the two nations wanted to go, and thus they went downriver until they reached this town, and this is all he can say.

I ask if the said Josef Hever did not offer to go with them to recover the lost goods.

He answers that he is not aware of that, that he [Hever] only said what he has already declared.

I ask if he has anything to add, and how old is he.

He answers that he is forty six years old. And after his deposition is read to him he says it is the same he gave, and that he affirms it under oath, and as he does not know how to sign he makes his mark, and the witnesses have signed with me, the Governor.

Eugenio Alvarez

Francisco Cruzat

Mariano Izaguirre

Mark of Agustin Amioz

On the 26th of the said month and year I, the Commander, called Carlos Arny before myself and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I ask him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth in the interrogation that would follow.

He answers that he swore and promised.

I ask where is he from, what is his religion, his state, and his profession.

He answers he is from the River Jarby, jurisdiction of Montreal in Canada, his religion Roman Catholic, his state single, and his profession *voyageur*.

I ask who he was engaged with in his last trip to the Missouri.

He answers that he was engaged by Mr. Gabriel Cerré, merchant of this port, to bring several goods under the orders of Mr. Rigoch [Rigauche] to the nation of the Otos, and upon arriving deliver them to Mr. Montardy, to whom they were addressed, and under the condition that this deponent had to return to this town, with the first packets of pelts that the said Montardy was to send to Mr. Cerré.

I ask how many and what kind were the pelts that Mr. Montardy gave him, and what were his instructions.

He answers that on March 27 the said Montardy gave to this deponent and his companions, in two canoes tied to each other, eighty packets of different kinds of pelts, the details of which the deponent ignores, he can only say with certainty that they included sixteen packets of beaver, and that they were also given approximately eighty pounds of tallow and some trading goods, everything to be delivered to the said Cerré, with the instructions that they should obey the named Amiot, the canoes' skipper, and fulfill their duties as good rowers.

I ask what their reasons were not to deliver the said pelts, and that he should make an exact account so that we understand why they had abandoned them.

He answers that after leaving Mr. Montardy's camp, they arrived a little before sundown to the entry of the little River of the Canze [Kanza] nation, and as the weather was turning bad, the skipper Amiot decided to camp there to avoid a shipwreck. They stayed there for two days, owing to the blowing wind, snow and sleet that fell and make navigation impossible. The last day before sundown, the named Juan left the camp with the aim of hunting some ducks, and a little after sundown the deponent and his companions heard two fusil shots near the camp, and then more shooting, about thirty shots, as well as death cries, as is the savage custom of the Indians. The deponent and his companions, surprised, believing that their companion Juan had been killed, and fearing to have the same fate, quickly fled in a canoe they had next to the raft, taking only a bit of corn and a kettle, and leaving the little River they crossed the Missouri and hid the canoe in a swamp, hiding themselves in a reed bed, where they stayed until the moon was out. After discussing the matter, the skipper decided that they should return to the camp, and as they were at the entry of the Little River, they saw that the Indians had lit several fires, and that they went from one part to another with burning sticks, searching for something, and that others were on the canoes, counting the pelts, but that they could not understand anything of what they said owing to the contrary winds. They went back to the Missouri and hid themselves again until the next morning, when they saw that there was a great fire in the camp, according to the smoke that they could see, so they assumed that the Indians had set the tallow on fire. They again discussed the matter, and seeing that their lives were at risk, they decided to go downriver, which they did until about an hour before sundown, when they found a proper site to hide until the next day, when they talked again and decided that their only option was to continue downriver to the Missouri nation, and that the skipper said "How are we going to return to the camp, if we lack the provisions, paddles, and other necessary utensils, and we think that our companion Juan is dead and the canoes burned by the Indians. Let's go downriver to the Missouri nation, and there I could take some Indians and go overland or by the river and check what happened with the camp." As they were going downriver, they found the said Juan, who was in one of the canoes that formed the raft, and that he gave them news about the state of the camp, and thus after deliberating they decided to go downriver to the Missouri nation. Once there, the deponent stayed on the river bank guarding the canoe, and the skipper together with the others went into the village, so the deponent cannot say what the skipper said or did in the village. He only heard that the skipper had said that they had been attacked by a party of sixty men of the Big Osages, and that after the skipper returned they immediately continued downriver to this town.

I ask why, when they fled in the canoe, they did not cut the mooring rope of the raft, and go downriver with it. He answers that they were about two *arpents* inside the Little River, where there was little to no current, and that if they spend time cutting the rope, turning the raft, and getting to the Missouri they risked being killed by the Indians, and that's why they decided to take only the canoe.

I ask if he has anything to add, and what is his age.

He answers he is twenty four years old. And after his deposition is read to him he says it is the same he gave, and that he affirms it under oath, and as he does not know how to sign he makes his mark, and the witnesses have signed with me, the Governor.

Eugenio Alvarez

Francisco Cruzat

Mariano Izaguirre

Mark of Carlos Arny

In the same day and year, at four in the afternoon, I called Francisco Marruá before myself and the said witnesses, and making him raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross, I ask him if he swore to God and promised the King to tell the truth in the interrogation that would follow.

He answers that he swore and promised.

I ask where is he from, what is his religion, his state, and his profession.

He answers he is from the parish of St. Enrique, jurisdiction of Montreal in Canada, his religion Roman Catholic, his state single, and his profession *voyageur*.

I ask who he was engaged with in his last trip to the Missouri.

He answers that he was engaged by Mr. Gabriel Cerré, merchant of this port, to bring several goods under the orders of Mr. Rigoch to the nation of the Sotos [Otoes], and upon arriving deliver them to Mr. Montardy, to whom they were addressed,

I ask if the said Montardy gave him and his companions some packets of pelts and other goods to bring to this town and deliver to Mr. Cerré, in what quantity, and when.

He answers that on March 27th the said Montardy gave them two canoes tied to each other, loaded with eighty big packets of different kinds of pelts, that he ignores the details, he can only say with some certainty that there were sixteen packets of beaver. He also gave them eight hundred pounds of tallow and some trading goods, everything to be delivered to Mr. Cerré, under the authority of the skipper Amiot.

I ask what their reasons were not to deliver the said pelts, and that he should make an exact account so that we understand why they had abandoned them.

He answers that more or less fifteen days after leaving Mr. Montardy's camp with the pelts mentioned above, they arrived a little before sundown to the entry of the little River of the Canzes [Kanza], where the skipper Amiot decided to camp owing to the bad weather, and where they stayed for two days, owing to the blowing wind, snow and sleet, fearing a shipwreck if they left. The last day, two hours before sundown, the named Juan left the camp to see if he could kill a turkey, and at dusk, before the said Juan's return, the deponent and his companions heard two fusil shots near the camp, followed by more and death cries, as is the custom of the Indians. The deponent and his companions thought that the said Juan had been killed by the Indians, and immediately, seized by terror and fearing to have the same fate, they quickly fled in the canoe, taking only a bit of corn and a kettle, and with this they went downriver, crossing the Missouri and hiding the canoe in a swamp and themselves in a reed bed, where they stayed until the moon was out, when they decided to return to the camp. As they were at the entry of the Little River, they saw that the Indians had lit several fires, and that they went searching from one part to another with burning sticks, while others were making a lot of noise while counting some things that the deponent could not distinguish, and that they could not understand anything of what they were saying owing to the contrary winds. They went back to the Missouri and hid themselves again until the next morning, when they saw that there was a great fire in the camp, according to the smoke that they could see, so they assumed that the Indians had set the tallow and the canoes on fire, and as they saw that their situation was unsafe they consulted with each other and decided to go downriver, which they did for about twenty-four leagues, and then camped about an hour before sundown, when they found a proper site to hide until the next day, when they decided to go downriver to the Missouri nation, as they lacked provisions, paddles, or other utensils to go back to the camp. As they were going downriver they found the named Juan, whom they believed dead, with one of the lost canoes and ten big packets of beaver. He said that there was nothing left in the camp except many cut up pelts together with the tallow, and as seeing this and that they did not have any food they unanimously decided to go downriver to the Missouri nation. As they were there, this deponent and the skipper together with the named Juan, said that they thought the attackers were about sixty Indians of the Big Osage nation, and that they embarked immediately after and continued their trip until they arrived in this town. And that this is all he can say.

I ask why, when they fled in the canoe, they did not cut the mooring rope of the raft, and go downriver with it. He answers that, as they were about one *arpent* into the river [of the Kansa], and as they had the enemies practically unto them, it was impossible to do so without being attacked and killed.

I ask if he has anything to add and how old is he.

He answers no, and that he is thirty four years old. And after his deposition is read to him he says it is the same he gave, and that he affirms it under oath, and as he does not know how to sign he makes his mark, and the witnesses have signed with me, the Governor.

Eugenio Alvarez

Francisco Cruzat

Mariano Izaguirre

Mark of Francisco Marrua

In the town of St. Louis of the Illinois, on July 14th, 1786.

Before me, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry and Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, there are, present in their persons, Mr. Pedro Montardy, Lieutenant of one of the militia companies of this town, and Agustín Amiot and Carlos Anrry, all of whom have convened here under common agreement that in order to end the differences among them regarding the raft that was lost or stolen by the Indians in the Little River of the Canzes in the Missouri river, they will choose three arbiters. And they chose them as follows: Mr. Pedro Montardy chose Mr. Benito Vazquez, lieutenant of one of the militia companies of this town; and on their part Agustín Amiot and Carlos Anrry chose Mr. Silbestre [Silvestre]

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel, Commander and judge of the western part of the Illinois.

Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Charles Sanguinet have the honor of representing to you, Sir, one in his role as guardian and the other as brother-in-law of Miss Constance Condé that, given the poor treatment that Mr. Gaspard Roubieu, her stepfather, daily uses [with her], either swearing at her or striking her, calling her by the most odious names, names that one only would use toward the most shameless hussy. He hit her [illegible] twice in the same day, all this bad treatment is known by the neighbors. As this young woman is grown and of an age to find [illegible] bear her a large disservice [illegible] by a blow of the tongue and worse by a blow of the lance. This considered, Sir, the petitioners beg you to be willing to order that Miss Constance Condé immediately leave the house of Mr. Gaspard Roubieu, her step-father, and be put in an honest house, that she should not be held to pay for her food [until?] being of age to earn it, that her income serve uniquely for her maintenance and [illegible] if possible, to procure for her an education [and?] that the said Mr. Gaspard Roubieu does not dare continue cashing in the income of the said young woman Constance Condé. She is lacking everything, even shoes to put on her feet, he [illegible] nevertheless held to give back to her the few rags of clothing that she has. The petitioners flatter themselves, Sir, that you would want to show consideration to their just demands, they will not cease to make wishes for your prosperity.

In St. Louis, February 3, 1786

Dubreuil

Chs Sanguinet

[In Spanish]

Having seen the previous petition, and as its contents have been confirmed by the verbal depositions of several witnesses about the mistreatment of Miss Constanza Condé by Mr. Gaspard Rouvieu, we order the said Miss Condé to be given to Mr. Luis Dubreuil, her tutor, so that he can take the needed measures to give her the instruction and education required by our religion. As for the expenses, they will be paid from the said Miss Condé's funds, which are under the control of her tutor, and which should be counted from the June first of the last year of 1785, and without any of her relatives having any right to reclaim her or have her under their care, unless sufficient and justified reasons make a competent judge make another decision.

Likewise, we order the said Mr. Gaspard Rouvieu to immediately hand over to Miss Condé's tutor her clothing and any other belongings that have been of her use until now.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, February 4, 1786.

Francisco Cruzat.

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel, fixed Regiment of Louisiana, Captain of the Grenadiers and Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois.

Gaspard Roubieu, citizen of this post, very humbly explains to your authority, Sir, that as he transported himself to the house of Mr. Louis Dubreuil in order to receive, as is custom, the annual income of funds that he receives from the minor Condé (the wife's petitioner is Mme. Marianne, mother of the said minor) the said Dubreuil was opposed, unburdening himself unto you, Sir, saying that you have forbidden him [to give the funds], and furthermore he specifically mentioned a legal case.

This petitioner was ignorant until that moment that there was a legal case, presented a few months ago, about this subject. He asks your authority, Sir, to deliver a copy to him with the intent that, becoming informed on the subject, he can conform himself if he is accused under the law, there will be justice. In St. Louis of the Illinois, July 10, 1786.

Gaspar Roubieu

[In Spanish]

Having seen this petition, I order a copy of the case to be sent to the petitioner. In St. Louis of the Illinois, July 12, 1786.

Francisco Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel, fixed Regiment of Louisiana, Captain of the Grenadiers and Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois.

Gaspard Roubieu, citizen of this post, responding to the legal proceedings of Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Mr. Charles Sanguinet, explains to your authority, Sir, that far from having mistreated and slandered the young woman Constance Condé, his step-daughter, he has always showed the full regard, goodness and kindness of a good and tender father, which has earned the gratitude of her mother (wife of the petitioner) and of many persons worthy of faith who have frequented the house, not being so lacking in reason and good sense to have treated her in the manner that his adversaries have described to you, not even having beaten her, although it would be permitted to a stepfather to correct with civility a child that he has raised since the age of six years.

This petitioner made an honest reprimand or correction to this girl about the duties of her state and her attitude, on the last February 2, at about ten o'clock in the evening, her mother being very sick with childbirth. She answered back very badly, raising her voice extraordinarily and repeating this several times in a persistent and querulous tone. The petitioner put the back of his fingers lightly and with restraint on her head kerchief, with which one could not kill the feeblest fly. This, Sir, is the way that this petitioner has corrected her, and at most four or five times in this way in the last ten years, and in the same way he corrected her two times in the same day, which his adversaries conclude to attribute a crime.

As the petitioner does not believe himself guilty of what he is accused, he requests your authority, Sir, in mandating the appearance of the said young woman before you in your courtroom to take her deposition under oath, as well as that of all his neighbors, since his adversaries allege that they have full knowledge of all these so-called mistreatments, and that this petitioner be confronted with all the deponents at the reading of their depositions, and that following this, copies be delivered and certified, the whole thing at the charges and expenses of whom it may concern and without prejudice of the annual income of the funds that Mr. Dubreuil has under his care, belonging to the said young woman whom the plaintiff reclaims, having continuously care for her necessities. Providing to sentence his adversaries to all expenses and charges and justice will be done.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, October 23, 1786.

Gaspard Roubieu

[In French]

I order this petition to be sent to Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Mr. Carlos Sanguinet, so that they can answer in writing within three days from this date. St. Louis of the Illinois, October 26, 1786.

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, Sergeant of the troop that guards this post (in place of a bailiff), have communicated the preceding decree to Carlos Sanguinet and Louis Dubreuil, talking to them personally. St. Louis, October 26, 1786

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[In French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel, Commander and judge of the western part of the Illinois.

Louis Dubreuil and Charles Sanguinet, in response to Mr. Gaspard Roubieu, have the honor of explaining to you that if the [illegible] before your court in order to protest the treatment carried on by Mr. Gaspard Roubieu toward the young woman Constance Condé, it is only in part [based] on the reports of this young woman, who complained daily about her state, and was lamenting in the arms of her brother-in-law and of her guardian. These reasons, Sir, are sufficient enough to have implored the honor of your justice, which you have had the goodness to provide by ordering the removal of the said young woman into any other honest house, and as a consequence [illegible] which could be heard to serve to put the said young woman.

This is why, Sir, in order to avoid the development of a scandal unpleasant to the sense of modesty of this young woman, these petitioners would like that it would please your justice, in conforming to the sentence that you have rendered upon our first petitions, and to avoid affairs and difficulties, to order an assembly of relatives and friends in order to put an end to all disagreements, and to take steps that can be suitable for the interests and the conduct of the said young woman in order to reestablish harmony and friendship.

In St. Louis, October 27, 1786

Louis Dubreuil Chs Sanguinet

[In Spanish]

I order this petition to be sent to Mr. Gaspar Rouview, so that he can answer in writing within three days of this date. St. Louis, October 27, 1786

I, Mariano Izaguirre, Sergeant of the troop that guards this post (in place of a bailiff), have communicated the preceding decree to Gaspar Roubieu, talking to them personally. St. Louis, October 27, 1786

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[In French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco de Cruzat, graduate Lieutenant Colonel, Captain of the Grenadiers fixed Regiment of Louisiana, and Commander in Chief of the western part of the Illinois.

Gaspard Roubieu, defendant in the case presented by Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Charles Sanguinet, his adversaries, humbly represents to you that their reply has very little to do with their first petition, as they say that their appeal against this defendant before you, Sir, was based in part on the reports made to them by this girl, and they say not one word about the other part. It is surely based on the reports of my neighbors, since they allege and assure that they know very well about this and that they have full knowledge of all the supposed bad treatment.

Consequently, Sir, this defendant reiterates and asks for grace from your equitable justice and that you mandate an appearance before you of all his neighbors, to take their depositions in writing, of everything that they could have seen or heard, and the same for the girl that she declares on her soul and conscience the pure truth about this proceeding, and that this defendant be confronted with the deponents at the reading of their depositions, and that next copies be delivered and certified to him.

If my adversaries have believed the reports of this motherless girl, to whom they should have explained themselves and balanced things out before appealing in court, if this defendant had been capable of mistreating her, the mother would have never put up with this. And regarding the assembly that my adversaries are asking for, why have not they asked for this in their first court proceedings? The defendant asks your authority, Sir, to terminate the affair out of justice and recused from all arbitrage and assembly, that if there are a few relatives or others worthy of faith, that they must depose themselves on this subject about all the supposed poor treatments alleged by my adversaries, that they present themselves.

On the terms of the honest house, mentioned in their first court proceedings (even though they are repeating themselves), apparently they do not know the consequences or they ignore that the defendant's house is as honest as their own houses in every regard.

On the subject of this food budget, at what time did the defendant impose this? This guardian has put back and delivered more than the modest income of three hundred twenty *livres* in pelts, per year, since that it has been reduced to eight percent, while he takes out ten percent, shouldn't he in good conscience put back in the surplus to the mother in order to help in the maintenance of this girl who had thus maintained and delivered this girl who has had the inconvenience of her illnesses, if not her mother, who has paid the surgeon? This modest income has never been sufficient for clothes, the defendant is ready to do it, if it is required, even though he has never reclaimed and has always been provided with the surplus, and in the last war the pelts were less sought after than silver and merchandises carried an exorbitant price, what could one do with three hundred twenty *livres*, hardly to buy shirts?

Why does Mr. Dubreuil want to hold back a pension under the pretext that the girl is lacking necessities? Her mother has always maintained her and dressed her honestly, the means not permitting to furnish her with a wardrobe.

This considered, may it please you, Sir, to accord to the defendant the depositions asked for in his preceding petition and reiterated in this one, to order Mr. Dubreuil to pay without delay to the defendant this annual pension as usual, that he is legitimately owed, to condemn my adversaries to all charges and expenses and justice will be done.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, October thirtieth, 1786

Gaspard Roubieu

[In Spanish]

I order the present petition to be sent to Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Carlos Sanguinet, so that they can answer in writing within three days from this date. In St. Louis of the Illinois, October 31, 1786.

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, Sergeant of the troop that guards this post (in place of a bailiff), have communicated the preceding decree to Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Carlos Sanguinet, talking to them personally. St. Louis, October 31, 1786

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western province of the Illinois.

Louis Dubreuil and Charles Sanguinet on the one hand, and Gaspard Roubieu on the other hand, all living in this place, humbly have the honor of explaining to you that, in agreement, and wishing to end all the difficulties and procedures pending before you in regard to the young woman Constance Condé, they give you the present in order to beg you to be willing to stop and dull entirely all of the legal proceedings against both sides in order to remain and stay without effect to the dismissal of any of the plaintiffs who renounce conjointly; and at the same time ask your justice that, if it would be agreeable to him, to order an assembly of relatives and friends in such quantity that they judge rightly in order to be able to settle the future of the pensions of the said young woman Constance Condé and to be able to direct and manage them in such a way that they may provide for the reimbursement of a sum of eighty *piasters* that Mr. Dubreuil and Mr. Sanguinet have just advanced to serve as payment of the pension and maintenance which was due to the Mr. Gaspard Roubieu, the space of eight months [illegible] and justice will be done.

Gaspard Roubieu

Dubreuil

Charles Sanguinet

[In Spanish]

Having seen the previous petition, I order the assembly of relatives and friends of the late Agustín Condé to be carried out, so that they can arrange the affairs related to the minor Miss Constanza Condé. The parties involved should be notified, so that they can name the relatives and friends who should assemble. In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 6, 1786.

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, Sergeant of the troop that guards this post (in place of a bailiff), have communicated the preceding decree to Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Carlos Sanguinet, and Gaspar Rubieu [Roubieu], talking to them personally. St. Louis, November 6, 1786

Mariano Izaguirre

In place of a notary: Before me, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, and in the presence of legal witnesses Pedro de Santos and Mariano Izaguirre, sergeants of the troops that guard this post, there were the following persons: Mr. Louis Dubreuil, Mr. Carlos Sanguinet, and Mr. Gaspar Roubieu, all of whom, by virtue of today's decree given by Governor Francisco Cruzat, have named the following persons to attend the assembly to solve the affairs regarding Miss Constanza Condé: Mr. Benito Basquez [Vasquez], Mr. Santiago Clar Morgan [Clamorgan], Mr. Agustin Chouteau, Mr. Antonio Reilh, Alexos, Marie, Annique Duchuquet, all of them relatives and friends of the late Mr. Agustin Condé, the father of the said Constanza Condé. And consequently they have signed with me, the said Commander and the said legal witnesses. In St. Louis, November 6, 1786.

Gaspar Roubieu

Ch. Sanguinet

Louis Dubreuil Pedro de Santos

Mariano Izaguirre

Francisco Cruzat

[In French]

In response to the order by Mr. Cruzat, rendered above, about the convocation of an assembly of relatives and friends of the young woman Constance Condé, here present, in order to settle the demands by Mr. Louis Dubreuil and Mr. Charles Sanguinet on the one hand, and Gaspard Roubieu on the other hand, and again to

settle on the particular requests, dated this day, that Mr. Charles Sanguinet has made in writing in favor of the young woman Constance Condé, and by virtue of the verbal demands of Mr. Benite Vasquez, the future surrogate guardian of the said young woman Constance Condé, and in order solve all things for the better, the lawsuit of the said young woman, we relatives and friends, named below, after having duly examined the means to come to avoid all contestations as well as [illegible] own to manage the interests of the said young woman Constance Condé, we have judged it fitting to settle that the reimbursement of the sum of eighty *piasters* that Mr. Dubreuil and Mr. Sanguinet should put in for the payment of the pension of the said young woman Constance Condé will be deducted from the sum of forty *piasters* from the pension that are due on the first of June of next year, 1787, and the other forty *piasters* will be taken out of the pension of the second [illegible] that will expire in the month of January of the year 1788, as a final and entire reimbursement of the above mentioned sum.

In order to settle the particular propositions of Mr. Charles Sanguinet, we have equally been in harmony and agreed that, without having regard to the interest of ten percent, that paying Mr. Dubreuil on the funds belonging to the said young woman Constance Condé and depreciating settlement by the family at eight percent, we have examined that it was more fitting that the interest of this young woman remains on the same footing and at the same rate that it is today, being above that which is authorized by law, so that Mr. Dubreuil enters and will remain guardian as he was before with the handling of the funds of the said young woman Constance Condé, by paying to serve her maintenance and education an interest of eight percent only.

In the third place, in order to satisfy the expenses that Mr. Charles Sanguinet would have that the one at his house the young woman Constance Condé establish her household and her residence by the advice of her surrogate guardian, guardians, relatives and friends who will become charged with the expenses for the said young woman Condé to do it visibly and legally by the guardian and surrogate guardians who approve or disapprove the employment of the pension of the above mentioned young woman and under prejudice in the reimbursement of the sums of which it is spoken in the first article.

In the fourth place, in order to end all of the demands formed in favor of the young woman Constance Condé, as well as for the good of her interests as for that of satisfaction of her person, and after having heard the propositions of Mr. Benito Vasquez the surrogate guardian, we, having demanded if each one could make a report and the duty that the said young woman Constance Condé still bears toward her mother, her step-father, her guardians, relatives and friends, they will be free to the said young woman to establish her home and her residence with her sister, with whom her character appears the more sympathetic [illegible]. There has not been raised any delay nor obstacle, and the whole thing will remain in the forms accorded by the present arrangement, properly between us, the undersigned and in the presence of Mr. Francois Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of this province, done and [illegible] in St. Louis of the Illinois, this November 6th, 1786.

Louis Dubreuil
A. Reilhe

Benito Vasquez
Aug. Chouteau

Charles Sanguinet
Henri Duchouquet

Gaspard Roubieu
Jacques Clamorgan Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 2]

[Original in French]

Request in favor of Miss Constance Condé to the relatives of the said young woman, here assembled in order to settle this [affair] for the future.

Be it known:

Before the year 1780 the interest on capital of the said young woman Constance Condé was paying at a rate of ten percent [but] since the time of the war, it was fixed at eight percent [St. Louis, under Spanish flag, was attacked by American forces]. This is why, sirs, that today, business affairs having taken up their normal course, it is fair that the interest on the capital of the said young woman be reset at ten percent, in accordance with the rate of all the tradesmen of this post, whether they are lending or borrowing, it is not reasonable that the said young woman can support so considerable a loss.

That he in whose house the said young woman will be placed by the decision of the relatives present here, will be held to submit every year, before two of her relatives to be named by this assembly, an accounting in detail of the said young woman's annuity, which will be uniquely used for her maintenance and education, the whole thing at the price or cost of this post, the said young woman being sensible enough to earn her pension at seventeen years of age.

That if it happens that this young woman were poorly treated by her tutor, the two relatives named by this assembly, after having presented their case to the authority of the government, will seek a house for her where she will be treated with more humanity and conforming to her situation as an orphan, which demands compassion rather than hardness.

The above mentioned points, once settled in favor of the said young woman by the relatives present here, and all other difficulties removed, one would have cause to hope that the union and the friendship among them will be inviolate, and such as they ought to be, among relatives.

In St. Louis of the Illinois, November 6, 1786

Charles Sanguinet

[Box 2, Folder 3]

Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western province of the Illinois.

Sir:

Mercier, surgeon at this place, humbly explains to you that he has powers against Mr. Tusson [Tesson], for the reimbursement of two protested letters of credit that he drew in New Orleans in favor of Mr. Layrone, merchant of St. Domingue in order to have him transfer the funds that the said Mr. Tusson [Tesson] owes him, and as a consequence of the default of payment until this day, he remitted the power of attorney to Mr. Galabert, merchant in New Orleans, which he paid to this petitioner, in order that he obtains the reimbursement of the sums mentioned in the above letters of exchange, of which the protests are joined here, legalized and in form. This is why, sir, this petitioner has the honor of calling upon you to grant me permission to not empty my hands in favor of Mr. Tusson [Tesson] of a sum for which he is accountable, if in the case of the said Mr. Tusson [Tesson] he has just raised some difficulties about the payment of sums stated in the said letters of exchange and not withstanding everything, to order Mr. Tusson [Tesson] to satisfy the reimbursement of sums which are stated by the protests done in order to arrive at payment of what the said Mr. Tusson [Tesson] owes to the said Mr. Layrone, as well as it appears by the different powers of attorney emanating from the default of payment of the above mentioned letters of change.

St. Louis, July 26, 1786

I order this petition to be sent to Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson], so that he can respond in writing within three days from today. St. Louis of the Illinois, July 26, 1786

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, second sergeant of the troop that guards this post of the Illinois (in place of bailiff) have communicated the petition and decree above to Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson], speaking to him personally. St. Louis of the Illinois, July 26, 1786.

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 3]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western province of the Illinois.

Sir:

Claude Mercier, surgeon at this place, humbly represents to you that Mr. Tusson [Tesson] asks that the pending affair before you for the reimbursement of the protested letters of exchange would [end?] in arbitrage, [but] this is not the case here, only in a litigious affair Mr. Tusson [Tesson] could ask for that, but as this petitioner puts again before your court the care to judge it and orders if you deem it, the payment of what Mr. Tusson [Tesson] owes, he hopes that in the case where your justice would find it fitting to name arbiters in spite of the fact that the plaintiff believes not to have need of them in order to arrive at a sum due by a protested letter of exchange, at least let freedom reign to each one to choose the performance of what they believe to be in a state to know their rights and [illegible] may it please you, name a third person in case of a tie vote on this and order that not withstanding on everything that Mr. Tusson [Tesson] will pay the court fees [illegible] due until this day.

Mercier

St. Louis, July 31, 1786

[In Spanish]

Having seen the petition presented by Mr. Claudio Mercie and the response given by Mr. Juan Bautista Tuson, I order the two parts to appoint arbiters that they deemed appropriate, so that they can decide the case according to the laws of commerce.

St. Louis of the Illinois, August 1, 1786

I, Mariano Izaguirre, second sergeant of the troop that guards this post of the Illinois (in place of bailiff) have communicated the decree above to Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson] and to Mr. Claudio Mercie, speaking to them personally. St. Louis of the Illinois, August 1, 1786.

Mariano Izaguirre

Acting as notary:

Before I, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, and in the presence of the legal witnesses Mariano Izaguirre and Josef Bermeo, there is Mr. Claudio Mercie and Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson], who in agreement and in accordance to the above decree have appointed the following arbiters to solve the disagreement between them: Claudio Mercie appoints Mr. Tunnie, and Juan Tusson [Tesson] appoints Mr. Louis Dubreuil, both merchants of this province and current residents of this town. And I the said Commander have appointed Mr. Agustin Chouteau as third arbiter. All of whom, having been informed of their appointment, have accepted it and have offered to fulfill it to the best of their consciences and intelligence in the laws of commerce, and all the interested parties and witnesses have signed with me the Commander.

St. Louis of the Illinois, August 1, 1786.

Mercier Tusson [Tesson]

Jacques Tunnier

L. Dubreuil

Aug. Chouteau

Josef Bermeo

Francisco Cruzat

Mariano Izaguirre

[In French]

We, the arbiters, and over arbiters, signed below, following the order of Mr. Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, in order to give a verdict and settle the differences which subsist between Mr. Tusson [Tesson] and Mr. Mercier, [who has] power of attorney funds of Mr. Galabert, merchant of New Orleans, who authorizes the said Mr. Mercier [illegible] to pursue and [illegible] Mr. Tusson [Tesson] and force him by the voice of justice to pay the two letters of exchange that have been protested, and which he drew on Mr. Olivier, merchant of the levee of St. Louis, in favor of Mr. Lagroues Brunet, merchant of the same place [illegible] the sum of two thousand five hundred twenty-six *livres*, one *sol*, six *deniers* in silver of the St.

Domingue, and the other for one thousand four hundred thirty-five *livres*, thirteen *sols*, six *deniers*, same money [illegible].

[Following page of the document not translated]]

[In Spanish]

I order the above decision to be communicated to Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson] and Mr. Claudio Mercie, so that they can obey its content. St. Louis of the Illinois, August 4, 1786

Cruzat

[In Spanish]

I, Mariano Izaguirre, second sergeant of the troop that guards this post of the Illinois (in place of bailiff) have communicated the petition and decree above to Mr. Juan Tusson [Tesson] and to Mr. Claudio Mercie, speaking to them personally. St. Louis of the Illinois, August 4, 1786.

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 4]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

No 8. Note of Mr. Huvert [Hubert] for 80

Separation to the order of Mr. Domingue Bargas [Vargas], due next October, the sum of eighty francs in pelts, subject to visit, value in merchandise. In St. Louis, this May 22, 1777

Huvert

No. 9. Note of Mr. St. Aman for 62

I, the undersigned, Simon St. Aman, under my ordinary mark, in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, I declare to owe and promise to pay at the return of my trading voyage to Domingue or at his demand the sum of sixty two francs in pelts at the income of this post for value received, demand in merchandise. In St. Louis, this August 18, 1778

Mark of Mr. St. Amant Benito, witness Rober, witness

Plus a bottle of rum 4 *livres*, I have received on the account of the other for 33 f for which I have drawn the [illegible] the *livre*, at the home of Benito Vasquez

No. 11. Note of Mr. Huvert for 50

I will pay to the order of Mr. Domingue during the course of the next month, the sum of fifty *livres* in deerskins, value in merchandise. In St. Louis, this October 15, 1777

Huvert

No. 14. Promissory Note of the Sr. Larrivee 75

I, Jacques Larrivee, in the presence of witnesses and under my ordinary mark, I recognize that I owe payment to Mr. Domingue either, on his demand, the sum of seventy-five *livres* in buckskins or beaver at the normal rate of St. Louis, and that I will pay at his demand at the return of my hunting trip. Done in St. Louis, this February 6, 1778

Mark of Jacques Larrivee Huge, witness Labu and Pierre, witnesses

No. 17. Note of Jacob Tardif 25

I, the undersigned Jacques Tardif, on my ordinary mark, in the presence of signed witnesses, I declare to owe to Mr. Domingue the sum of twenty-five *livres* in peltry, the said sum is payable at the return of my hunting trip. Done in St. Louis, August 22, 1778

Mark of Jacques Tardif Motard, witness Louison Frenon, witness

No. 18. Note of Francois Demante 124

I, Francois Filiatre, *dit* Demante, I recognize that I owe and promise to pay to Mr. Domingue Barbas the sum of one hundred twenty-four *livres* in buckskins or beaver the rate of this post, St. Louis, July 10, 1778. The said sum is payable at the return of my hunting trip.

F. Filiatre, *dit* Demante

No. 21. Note of Mr. Paran

I recognize to have received from Mr. Domingue in merchandise the sum of twenty-six *livres*, five *sols*, which I promise to pay him or at his demand during the course of next May, for received value of the said Mr. Domingue. In St. Louis, January 21, 1777

No 25. St. Cloud 30

I, St. Cloud, recognize that I owe to the Sr. Domingue the sum of thirty *livres* in peltry which I promise to pay him or at his demand during the course of May of the year 1786. St. Louis, this October 28. 1777

No. 30. Larrivee 30

I, Jacques Larrivee, I will pay to Mr. Domingue Bargas the sum of thirty *livres* of buckskins payable at the return of my trip. St. Louis, March 31, 1778.

Mark of Mr. Larrivee Huge, witness

No. 33 St. Louis, December 8, 1776

I acknowledge that I owe Mr. Domingo de Bargas the amount of thirty six *livres*, which I will pay on the return of my trip.

Mark of Louis Brunet

As Brunet does not know how to write, I, Bargas, have added that the note will be paid in pelts.
Leaufre Amable Guion

No. 35. Lapointe 46

I, Lapointe, *dit* Guyodet, under my ordinary mark, in presence of the undersigned witnesses, I will pay to Mr. Domingue or at his demand the sum of forty-six *livres* in buckskins of good rate, during the course of next May for value received of the said Mr. Domingue. In St. Louis, April 5, 1778

Mark of Lapointe Labuxiere, witness Huge, witness

More for a bottle; 5 *livres* more

No. 36. Huge 151

I, Josef Huge, under my ordinary mark and in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, I recognize I owe and I promise to pay to Mr. Domingo de Bargas during the next October the amount of one hundred and fifty one *livres* in buckskin pelts, at the rate of this town. St. Louis of the Illinois, April 14, 1779.

Joseph Huge Blanco, witness Joseph Hortis, witness

No. 43. Mr. Lasoudry 15

Good for fifteen *livres* in peltry that I will pay to the Sr. Domingue at the return of my trip for value received from the said Mr. in merchandise. In St. Louis, October 28. 1778

De la Soudray

June 2 for a bottle of tafia [rum], 3 *livres* received in the account or the other for 4 *livres* in peltry, for 4 *livres* in peltry this May 5, 1780 Ortes

No. 44. Mr. LaPointe 412

We the undersigned, Louis Lirette and Louis La Pointe, on our ordinary marks and in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, we declare to owe and promise to pay at the return of our hunt to Mr. Domingue or at his orders the sum of four hundred twelve in equipment for hunting of which we are responsible the one for the other. Done in St. Louis, July 22, 1778.

Mark of Louis La Pointe Mark of Louis Lirette Benito Teimoin, witness

J. Papin: I have received on account of the other part two hundred and one *livres* and ten *sols* on June 3, 1779.

No 45. Federico 123

I, Louison Federico, in the presence of witnesses, I recognize to owe to Sr. Dominigue Bargas the sum of one hundred twenty-three *livres* in peltry, beaver or buckskin at the going rate of this post, payable to him or at his demand during the course of next May, received from the said Sr. Contan, in merchandise. In St. Louis, this August 17, 1778.

Mark of Louison Frederic Jean Pierre, witness Veron, witness

I have received in account or the other by the mine of Mr. Chouteau eighty-two *livres* of buckskins, Domingue de Bargas.

No 49 Federico 50

I, Luis Federico, under my ordinary mark, promise to pay Domingo de Bargas when I return from my trip the amount of fifty *livres* in pelts, on account of merchandise that he has sold to me. St. Louis, March 30, 1778.

Mark of Luis Federico Diego Blanco, witness DeLaSoudray

I, Antoine Ladouceur, under my ordinary mark in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, declare to owe and promise to pay at the return of my trip on the Missouri, the sum of forty-eight *livres* and a half in buck skin at the going rate of this post to Mr. Domingue de Bargas or at his demand. In St. Louis, October 10, 1779.

Mark of Antoine Ladouceur Louis Vachar, witness Angel Izquierdo, witness

[In Spanish]

Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry and Commander and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois.

I certify that the above notes and letters of credit are exact copies of the originals presented before me by Eugenio Alvarez, the executor of the estate of the late Domingo de Bargas, who has kept the originals and made copies so that they stay in this government's archive to be used in any appropriate circumstance.

St. Louis of the Illinois, July 25, 1786

Francisco Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 5]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

Copy deposited in St. Louis of the Illinois in the archives of the government.

Seventeen consented notes in favor of Mr. Papin by Mr. Michel Perrault, one of the children and the legitimate heir of the late Louis Perrault and drawn this day, March 22, 1786, by the said Papin to the said Auguste Chouteau, his power of attorney, on the point of departure for New Orleans in order to solicit payment with Mr. Michel Perrault, testamentary executor of the said Perrault, his brother, on the part which comes back to the said heir.

To wit:

I promise to pay to Mr. Papin on his orders the sum of two hundred *livres* in silver for value received from Mr. Papin. In St. Louis, September 16, 1789

Furthermore, sent to him by Benito:

2 hands of paper		5 sols
3 gun powders at	12 sol	37 sols
33 beavers	65	
27 buckskins	40.10	
1 otter	5	
	<hr/>	
	215 livres = sols	

I received from Mr. Janis for the account of M. Jos. Papin three livres of vermillion [a red mineral dye] for which I will hold accountable to the said Papin.

At 12 *sols* in peltry.

Signed Mr. Perrault

I will pay to Mr. Papin on his order the sum of forty-five *livres* in silver for value received in Kaskaskia, October 24, 1789.

I promise to pay to Mr. Benito Basquez [Vasquez] and to Mr. Papin the sum of two thousand four hundred twelve *livres* in current silver of the place where peltry [is] at the price and receipt of this post for value received, from the said Mr. in merchandise. The whole thing payable next May. In St. Louis, September 16, 1789

Inventory of the diverse effects received to the account of the above mentioned notes and not in a dossier. To wit:

180 carrots of tobacco for the whole thing	600 livres, 2 sols	600.02
3 (__) of lard to Benito	25 sols	490
50 ditto	25 sols	69.10
2 minots of potatoes		20
1 minot ____ for		20
		<hr/>
		1202 – sols – den

[In Spanish]

As Commander and Lieutenant Governor of this establishment of the Illinois, I certify that the detail of the above receipts given by Mr. Miguel Perrault are exact copies of the originals that Mr. Juan Maria Papin has retired to use them as it is more convenient. St. Louis of the Illinois, March 23, 1786

Francisco Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 6]

[Original in Spanish]

In the town of St. Louis of the Illinois, on November 27, 1783, and before I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, and before the legal witnesses Fernando Lizoro and Joseph Bermeo: Mr. Josef Motard, merchant of the said town, presented himself to state that he had lost a note for the amount of four hundred *libras* in pelts, given by Mr. Juan Lafon, inhabitant of the neighboring town of Ste. Genevieve. Consequently, he states that if the said note is found and presented before any tribunals or judges, it will not have any value and it will not be payable under any form, as the said Lafon has already paid the whole amount to the said Mr. Motard; who commits himself, in case the note appears and the said Lafon were forced to pay it, to return the amount of four hundred *libras* in pelts, to what effect the said Motard pledges his property and offers Juan Bautista Sarpy as guarantor.

Joseph Motard
Francisco Cruzat

Josef Bermeo

Fernando Lisoro

Sarpy

[Box 2, Folder 7]

[Original in French and Spanish]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, on November 22, 1783, before I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry and Lieutenant Governor of this western part of the Illinois, and before the legal witnesses Josef Hortiz and Joseph Bermeo: Mr. Louis Dubreuille, merchant of this town, presented himself and stated that he had a receipt (which he presented) given by Simon Dubardo, merchant of the town of Ste. Genevieve, in favor of the said Louis Dubreuille, the content of which is as follows:

[Text in French not translated]

Signed by Simon Huberdau

Consequently, the said receipt is cancelled by this legal document in the archive of this government.

Joseph Hortiz

Josef Bermeo

Dubreuil

Francisco Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 8]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

We, Eugene Alvarez and Gaspard Roubieu, named arbiters with the effect of settling the differences which subsist between Mr. Joseph Motard and Mr. Charles Sanguinet, on the subject of the request made by the said Sanguinet of the said Motard, in favor of Mr. Grollé, the last having lent two *minots* of corn and twenty-five *livres* of lard to the said Motard, and having drawn up a mandate to the said Mr. Motard for an extraordinary sum of money. To this object, we have opined and do opine that the corn will be paid by Mr. Motard at thirty-five *livres* the *minot* in silver, and the lard at fifty *sols* the *livre*, according to the knowledge that we have of the price that corn and lard were sold for last year in Prairie du Chien [Wisconsin].

In consequence, the said Mr. Motard will pay to Mr. Sanguinet the sum of one hundred thirty-two *livres*, ten *sols*. In order to satisfy the said mandate or at the request of the Sr. Grollé.

In St. Louis, June 8, 1786.

Gaspard Roubieu

Eugenio Alvarez

[In Spanish]

I order the preceding decision made by the arbiters to be communicated to Josef Motard and Carlos Sanguinet, so that they conform to its content. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 8, 1786.

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, first corporal of the troop that guards this post (acting as bailiff), have communicated the above decree to Mr. Josef Motard and Mr. Carlos Sanguinet, speaking to their own persons. St. Louis of the Illinois, June 8, 1786.

Mariano Izaguirre

[Box 2, Folder 9]

[Original in French and Spanish]

[In French]

To Monsieur Don Francisco Cruzat, captain of the Grenadiers and graduate Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed regiment of Louisiana, Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois and Commander in Chief of the said part Louisiana.

Sir:

Antoine Reilhe, merchant in this village, has the honor of explaining to you that in the month of April of last year, he was in the village of Kaskaskia where Madame Camp [Campbell], his mother-in-law (residing there for awhile) charged him to settle, terminate and put an end to different affairs concerning her family, which the said Reilhe did, with all possible exactitude, never once deviating from the wishes and dispositions of the said Mme Camp [Campbell], to whom he wished to prove his esteem and his respect for her.

As this petitioner only received verbal orders from the said Dame Camp [Campbell], and as she was advanced in age and weighed down with infirmities attached to old age, he desires that you would, Sir, have the goodness to wish to bring her before you, under oath, and have her give her deposition concerning the affairs which this petitioner settled and terminated in the said village of Kaskaskia for her, as prosecutor, and also if he ever deviated from it in anything, that she is to declare it in the same way. This done, justice will be served. St. Louis, September 19. 1786

A. Reilhe

[In Spanish]

Having seen the above petition, I order the deposition that the petitioner request to be taken. And as Mme Campel [Campbell] does not know Spanish or French, I name Mr. Carlos Graciot [Gratitot], merchant and inhabitant of this town, as interpreter of English. St. Louis of the Illinois, September 21, 1786.

Cruzat

I, Mariano Izaguirre, first corporal of the troop that guards this post (acting as bailiff), have communicated the above decree to Mr. Carols Graciot [Gratitot], who has accepted his appointment as interpreter of English in the deposition that will be taken from Mme. Campel [Campbell]. St. Louis of the Illinois, September 21, 1786.

Mariano Izaguirre Ch. Graciot [Gratitot]

In St. Louis of the Illinois, on September 21, 1786, I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, by virtue of the petition presented by Mr. Antoin Reilch [Reilhe], inhabitant and merchant of this town, I have transferred myself in the company of the legal witnesses (acting as notaries) Mr. Silbestre [Silvestre] Labadie and Mariano Izaguirre, at about nine in the morning, to the house of Mrs. Ana Olivier, widow of the late Ichabod Campel [Campbell], to take her deposition requested by Mr. Antonio Reilhe. And being in the said house, through the interpreter, I made her put her hand on the Holy Gospels, and I asked her if she swore to God and promised the King to say the truth.

She answers that she swears and promises.

I ask what is her name, where is she from, and what is her current residency and state.

She answers that her name is Ana Olivier, that she is from New Scotland, and that she has resided, for the past four months, in this town of St. Louis, and that her state is widow of the late Ichabod Campel [Campbell].

I ask if she knows Mr. Antonio Reilche [Reilhe], and whether she knows if he took any actions to take Mr. Juan Bautista Guion out of this country of the western Illinois, when he [Guion] was in jail by the decision of the inhabitants of the town of Kaskakias, on the American side, and that she should make a detailed account of everything she knows.

She answers that she knows Mr. Antonio Reilche [Reilhe] very well, as he is married to one of her daughters.

That the said Juan Bautista Guion had killed her husband with a fusil shot, and for this reason the inhabitants of

the town of Kaskakias had put him in jail. That she immediately called him [Reilhe], who went down from St. Louis, where he lives, and that she appointed him so that on her behalf he would take the necessary measures for her to receive the satisfaction corresponding to the injury he had received. And that all the inhabitants [of Kaskaskia] had decided to leave Juan Bautista Guion in the hands of the deponent Mme Campel [Campbell], and that as she was afraid that he would do what he had done to her husband to any other member of her family, she decided to order the said Antonio Reilhe to take the necessary measures on her behalf to take [Guion] out of the country.

And he did so, and she does not know his whereabouts.

I ask if she had anything else to say, and what was her age.

She answers that she is fifty-nine years old, and as her declaration was read to her by the interpreter, she affirmed it and ratified it under oath, and signed together with the interpreter and witnesses.

Ana Oliver Camp [Campbell] Ch. Graciot [Gratiot] Labbadie [Labadie] Mariano Izaguirre
Cruzat

[Box 2, Folder 10]

[Original in English]

Travis Edwards to Dan. Keastler, Dr.

Item one pirogue 45 dollars

Item one chest 05 dollars

Item twenty-five days [illegible] of my family which consists of 6 persons
42 dollars

Item 25 days boarding said Edwards 7 dollars

Total amount ninety-nine dollars

[Box 2, Folder 11]

[Original in Spanish]

In the town of St. Louis of the Illinois on October 22, 1781, before I, Francisco Cruzat, Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry, Commander in Chief and Lieutenant Governor of the western parts and districts of the Illinois, and in the presence of the legal witnesses Fernando Lisoro and Juan Oliver, in place of a notary, appeared Joseph Hortiz in person to protest, on behalf of Maria Bequet, his sister-in-law. He declares he will embark today on the ship of the named Juan Bautista Duchon, bound to the city of New Orleans, so that he can present himself before the court of the General Government of this Province of Louisiana to request and demand definitive sentence against the named Froquier and Picard in the pending trial between these last two and the said Maria Bequet about an inheritance she received through marriage to her deceased husband Ignacio Larroche, which the named [Froquier and Picard] claim for themselves. The trial proceedings, as notified to the parts involved, are being sent to the named court. And as the said Joseph Hortiz requested this notification before the ship's departure, I have made it and I sign it together with the legal witnesses.

Joseph Hortiz

Francisco Cruzat

Fernando Lisoro

Juan Oliver

[Box 2, Folder 12]

[Original in French]

Livingston County, State of Kentucky Aug. 6. 1799

Whereas Joseph Mercer of the county of state aforesaid hath this day made complaint to me, Moses Shelby, commandant of the county aforesaid that a certain villain by the name of Jackson did about two weeks ago steal a bright or yellow Bay horse from him, then traveling to this county and camped on Pied River at Harris' Mill, that the said Jackson did pretend to set off on foot with a knapsack to go to Logan Courthouse in the morning, the horse being then taken by the said Jackson in the night before as he, the said Joseph Mercer believes was hid in the woods, that after searching diligently for the horse and not finding him, he suspected the said Jackson had been there but he had not. That when he came down in this neighborhood he heard of the said Jackson [illegible] to the Illinois. Viz James Ritchey, a reputable citizen, saw him at Smithland and he told him his name was Jackson and that he had come from the Red Banks, also said Ritchey's wife saw him and the horse – also John Johnson, a citizen of Smithland saw him and the horse going over the ferry, also Demsey Jarrell, a citizen of Station Camp in Tennessee State saw him mounted on the horse and had heard that the said Joseph Mercer had lost his horse and knew that the horse that Jackson was on was Mercer's horse and was trying to see the brand as they rode on but something's hanging over it. Jackson observing it turned up to a house pretending to inquire for another traveler then shortly came galloping by said Jarroll and said he was in a great hurry to overtake the traveler.

Jackson is so noted by having a piece out on the right side of his nose is the reason why they all so readily describe him. The said Moses Shelby commandant as aforesaid do believe the said Joseph Mercer to be an honest citizen and do give him authority as far as my authority reaches, to take his said horse whenever he can find him and also to apprehend the said villain and to have him carried before a Magistrate to be dealt with as the law directs – also I do hereby recommend him the said Joseph Mercer to his Spanish Majesty's officers to have his horse restored if found in the Spanish country and to have the said Jackson dealt with as they in their wisdom may think proper.

Given under my hand the day and year above written.

William Glass, a citizen of the County and State aforesaid, an honest man, goes with Joseph Mercer.

Moses Shelby, Ct
2nd Regiment
State of Kentucky

We the undersigned subscribers (some of us who saw Jackson and Mercer's horse) have thought proper to set our hands hereunto as a recommendation to the Spanish officers, believing him the said Mercer and also Wm Glass who goes with him and who knows the horses of the honest men.

James Ritchey	Demsy Farrell
Mary Ritchey	John Colp, Cap'n in Livingston
John Johnson, Jr.	A. Walke – a citizen of Tennessee State
Benjamin Titsworth	Uel Lamkin
Daniel Levin	Benjamin Hardin
James Russell	Joseph Barney
Spears Foante	Wm Niles

Seen by us, Civil and Military Commander of the post of New Bourbon, part of Spain, the present project with the requisition here written by Colonel Shelby, officer in the service of the United States of America, we permit the Srs. Wm Glass and John Ferry, bearers of the said passport in requisition to carry out over the entire extent of our post in the district the search for Mr. Jackson, accused of horse theft and even of [illegible] persons order

all inhabitants of our post and dependencies to give a reform [illegible] and to conduct in front of us the said [illegible].

Done in New Bourbon, August 14, 1799

DeLapur de Luziere [DeLassus de Luziere]

[Box 2, Folder 13]

[Original in Spanish and English]

[In Spanish]

To the Lieutenant General Governor.

Sir,

Sofia Shufer [Sophia Shafer?], widow of Juan Boily [John Boli?], represents that about twelve years ago her deceased husband, as a German, obtained from the then Governor of the Illinois Mr. Francisco Cruzat, a piece of land with an area of four hundred *arpanes* on the left banks of the Maramec [Meramec] River. This land has been continuously cultivated until the present day, without [us] having obtained the property title in due form. This petitioner thus humbly request to you, Sir, that you order Mr. Antonio Soulard, this jurisdiction's land surveyor, to formally measure the land that corresponds to her so that she can obtain title over her establishment, her fields, and other improvements that her deceased husband made on the site, the boundary of which should start on the line that separates it from the land of her son Juan, and run for twenty *arpanes* going down the said river Maramec, and twenty *arpanes* in [illegible]. There is no fault with this way of measuring as there are no neighbors that could object to it, and as these lands, outside of the requested are empty, prone to flooding, and useless for farming.

Mark of Sofia Shufer

St. Louis, September 14, 1796

As I am certain that the petitioner has been established for a long time on the lands she requests, I order Mr. Antonio Soulard, land surveyor, to formalize the measurement of the parcel of land in the manner she requests, so that she can obtain the title from the Governor General.

Zenon Trudeau

[In English]

August 3, 1814

Know all men by these presents that we the under named subscribers do sign over all our right and title to the within grant and as witnesses we here unto do set our hands.

[illegible names]

Heirs and Executors Administrators

James [illegible]

John [Lerry?]

William Boly

Amelia Boly

[Box 2, Folder 14]

[Original in French and English]

[In French]

In the absence of a public notary, has appeared before me, Don Zénon Trudeau, graduate Lieutenant Colonel of the fixed Regiment of Louisiana and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of the Illinois, and in the presence of witnesses, named hereafter undersigned, was present in his person N. Joseph Marie Papin, merchant of this village, who has recognized and confesses to owe very legitimately and promises to pay to Mr. Auguste Chouteau, merchant of the named village of St. Louis, the sum of one thousand four hundred and ninety-four piasters and seven shillings. This as the amount within the amount of the sum of one thousand two hundred five piasters and three shillings which he finds himself owing to Madame Widow Pelagie Labadie, which named accounts the said Joseph Marie Papin has approved and obliges himself to enter into a lease and to pay the said Auguste Chouteau during the course of May of the year 1797 and for any delay under pain of expenses, damages and interest and for the security of the said sum, the said Joseph Marie Papin obliges himself affected and as a mortgage generally all his goods: furnishings and funds present and to come and by special privilege to all other creditors his two mulattos named Henry, age approximately thirty years, and Jean his brother, around twenty years old, as well as his two mulatto women, their sisters Agathe, aged nineteen, and Pelagie of sixteen years of age, and this until the entire and perfect repayment of the above, for thus it is known and accorded, promising and obliging himself to do. Passed in the chamber of our government, 1786, July 30th. In the presence of the Sieurs Joseph Robidou and Joseph Oneille, witnesses of this transaction, who have signed with the said Auguste Chouteau and me, Lieutenant Governor.

Jos. Robidou

Jos. Papin

Jos. Oneille

Aug. Chouteau

Zénon Trudeau

Missouri Territory

County of St. Louis

[In English]

I do hereby certify that the above mortgage is duly recorded in my office. Vol. 1, pages 105 and 106. This seventh day of June. A.D. 1818

A Gamble