THE KOOTENAY FUR TRADE AND ITS ESTABLISHMENTS 1795 - 1871

by

David H. Chance

Submitted to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, in partial fulfillment of Purchase Order No. DACW67-81-M-0679.

The technical findings and conclusions contained in this report do not necessarily reflect the views or concurrence of the sponsoring agency.

Seattle

1981

ABSTRACT

This is the first stage of an historical study of the fur trade period and posts, 1795-1871, in the country of the Kutenai Indians. Of particular interest is the almost bewildering series of trading posts where the furs were exchanged for industrial products. We are also interested in the men who supervised and performed the trade, and how it was done. The impact of the fur trade on the Kutenai Indians is all too briefly considered. Some attention is given to the character of the evidence and the potential and means of obtaining more of it. Additional historical and archaeological researches are suggested with the objectives of filling in some of the gaps in our knowledge, of clearing up a few of the problems of location and chronology, and of consolidating the fund of detail that is needed to recover the texture, and even the weave, of our heritage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The need for this study was perceived by David Munsell, district archaeologist with the Corps of Engineers, and the work was supported by Steven Dice, supervisor of the district's environmental section. The oversight of the details of the contract fell to John Maas, who also provided a critical reading. David Rice has supported this study in several ways, and Lawr Salo has been also very helpful.

The current research on this project at the Northwest Collection of the Suzallo Library, University of Washington, was made immeasurably easier by Susan Cunningham, Glenda Pearson, and Andrew Johnson. Earlier research in the Hudson's Bay Company Archives was made possible by Jean Craig in London and by Shirlee Smith in Winipeg. Earlier research in the Provincial Archives of British Columbia was done through the assistance of the late Willard Ireland and of Inez Mitchell.

The collection of most of the archival material used in this report was privately funded. However, the Corps of Engineers helped to finance the additional library research and the writing of this report.

My wife Jennifer provided many kinds of help and critical comment, and also participated in the collection of much of the archival material. Gary Palmer of Las Vegas kindly gave a critical reading of the first chapter. The final version of the report was produced with remarkable efficiency by Margaret Henderson of Moscow, Idaho.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Purpose of this Study	1
	The Chief Sources and the Research	1
	The Fur Trade Setting	4
	The Cultural Background of the Kutenai	7
	The Population of the Kutenai	21
II.	NARRATIVE OF THE KOOTENAY FUR TRADE	28
	1792 - 1811	28
	1812 - 1826	39
	1827 - 1863	48
	1864 - 1871	69
III.	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TRADE	72
	The Logistics and Operations	72
	The Nature and Quantities of the Trade	75
	Synopsis of the Traders Assigned	77
IV.	THE IMPACT OF THE FUR TRADE ON THE KUTENAI	82
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
	The Economic and Historical Significance of the Kootenay Fur Trade	90
	Summary of the Kootenay Posts and Their Structures	92
	Archaeological Recommendations	97
	Historical Recommendations	100
	REFERENCES CITED	102
	OUTSTANDING ARCHIVAL SOURCES	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Population Estimates and Counts of the Kutenai	22
2.	Counts from Tribes Trading at the Flathead Rendezvous of November, 1824.	24
3.	Observations on the Number of Buildings at the H.B.C. Post and the Catholic Mission at the Mouth of the Tobacco River, 1858-61.	66
4.	Counts of Guns and Horses.	84

I. INTRODUCTION

The Purpose of This Study

The waters of artificial Lake Koocanusa, a ninety-mile long impoundment behind Libby Dam on the Kootenay River in northwestern Montana and southeastern British Columbia, cover the sites of two or three of the Kootenay fur trading posts in the United States and at least one in Canada. Another reservoir that may be formed by the proposed Libby Re-regulating Dam a few miles downstream will likely cover three or more others. In accordance with present law, it is incumbent on federal agencies such as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to find and compensate for damage to historic sites by archaeological and historical research. Hence this study has been sponsored to accomplish some of the latter.

Attempts thus far by the Corps of Engineers archaeologists to locate the sites of any of the Kootenay posts between Libby, Montana, and the Canadian border have proven unsuccessful. This was partly because the historical data were assembled and collated, and also because the sites themselves were small, perhaps obscured by vegetation, plowing, or possibly eroded away.

This study is a pilot attempt to gather both archival and published data on the various posts to elucidate their locations, their history, and their significance to the early recorded history of the Kutenai country. This study should make it a little easier to find the posts and to facilitate decisions on how much further research, both archaeological and historical, ought to be done.

To clarify a possible source of confusion it is needful to say that the name 'Kutenai' or 'Kootenay,' etc., appears in around a dozen or so spelling variations. In this study, the spelling 'Kutenai' will refer to the Indians and their country, while the variant 'Kootenay' will be used to designate the fur trading posts, the river and lake of that name, as well as the fur trade of the region. This may seem pedantic, but it follows precedents modern and ancient, respectively, and may help the reader in a situation where a large number of things fall under that name. All other variations will be avoided except where they appear within quotations.

The Chief Sources and the Research

Archival source material already in hand from earlier research on the history of Fort Colvile, the district headquarters of the Kootenay fur trade between 1826 and 1871, has been used, in addition to some of the library resources at the University of Washington and the University of Idaho Besides collating what is readily accessible, this study is also intended as a forecast of other sources less close at hand, or from which extracts have been incompletely or imperfectly made.

The primary orientation of the research has been toward determining the exact locations of the Kootenay posts and the number and character of the buildings they had. The secondary objective has been to outline the ethnohistory of the Kutenai Indians as it was related to the fur trade, especially the acculturation experienced by the Kutenai under the impact of the fur traders and the trade economy. Another aim has been to research the other influences on them under the Jesuit Rocky Mountain Mission, various explorers, and surveyors. We have also taken some interest in the relations of the Kutenai with the Piegans and other Blackfeet tribes, as well as with their allies the Flathead and other Interior Salish tribes. In these secondary concerns this study is quite incomplete. For reasons of practicality, this investigation stops at the year 1871 when the fur trade under the auspices of the Hudson's Bay Company ceased. The later history of the Kutenai could not be included because I had done no previous work on it, and such a new direction could not be included within the limits of this program.

Generally speaking, the method of research was to select notes from my files on the Kootenay fur trade, then to go into the published sources and make notes of them. In addition to that, photocopied material had to be reduced to notes though this was not completed due to the large amount of that sort of data. Not all available published material has been researched at this stage, but nearly all of the most promising sources have been used in some fashion, and all documents within reach have been searched to find every reference to the location or character of the Kootenay posts.

The areas that are most deficient have to do with biographical information on the traders and the ethnohistorical facts of the Kutenai. We have also left out some details of events in order that the study conform to the agreed scope. Archival sources that are known to remain outstanding are duly noted at the end of this study so that it can be enlarged in the future.

It needs to be emphasized more than once that the Kootenay fur trade and its establishments are very poorly documented by comparison with the larger fur posts of the Pacific Northwest. Especially after 1824, the fur trade in this region was organized in a well-rationalized hierarchy; the further up the ladder a post the more records were kept and preserved. The Kootenay posts were near the bottom.

Except for the period 1800-1812 when the Kutenai country was first opened to the trade by David Thompson, the men in charge were not well educated even though virtually all were literate in either English or French, could enter accounts, read and write letters, and keep journals. But no journal of a Kootenay post survives from the Hudson's Bay Company period though we know that at least one was ordered to be kept. It is probable that there were others. David Thompson's journals of course cover his periods of residence at the first Kootenay post on Toby Creek just north of Lake Windermere, but they remain largely unpublished. We possess extracts of only two or three letters written from Kootenay posts, but we do have many score written at other posts referring to affairs at Kootenay.

There are no ledgers or daily blotters surviving even though we know that they were kept, since summaries of accounts would often arrive in the spring at Fort Colvile on the Columbia River already made up. At least Hudson's Bay traders customarily recorded every transaction with each individual Indian, by name, and then made synopses or abstracts of various sorts. Such books and papers may well have been among the heap of records stored in the attic of the Chief Factor's house at Fort Colvile, which perished in a fire of July, 1910.

The chief sources for the early period are the *Narrative* of David Thompson (Tyrrell 1916; Glover 1962), and his journals both published (T. C. Elliott 1918, 1920, etc.; White 1950) and unpublished. Elliott Coues' (1897) edition of the journal of Alexander Henry the Younger, along with his footnotes drawn extensively from Thompson's manuscript journals, is also important.

For the period following 1812, the documentation is very sparse. North West Company records have not survived at all well; our chief sources for the Pacific Northwest during the period 1807-1821 are in fact published accounts. It is also clear that the North West Company was not as demanding as its successor, the Hudson's Bay Company, in the matter of keeping records. When we reach the Hudson's Bay Company period in the middle of the 1820s we are able to benefit from John Work's journals (Elliott:1914a, 1914b, 1914c, 1915) and the correspondence of the Hudson's Bay Company that survives in its archives, now in Winnipeg.

The early 1830s are once again marked by poor documentation, but in the late part of that decade we have a few letters containing remarks on Kootenay, and this carries over into the 1840s. This material derives chiefly from a couple of Fort Colvile letterbooks that were acquired by the British Columbia Provincial Archives not very long ago from an obscure source in the Yukon. During the 1840s we have also some references from Governor George Simpson's Diary (1841) and his published narrative (1847), the diary of Henry Warre (1845), and several letters of Peter DeSmet, S.J. (1844, 1848, 1863).

From the early 1850s we possess the usual short notices in Company letters until we reach mid-decade when a minor explosion of notices occurs. Starting in 1854 there are accounts from the second Sinclair expedition (Campbell 1916; Lent 1963), followed by the records of the Palliser expedition (Great Britain 1863; Spry 1968), the Thiebodo diary of 1859 (1940), the Hamilton account (1900), and writings of Charles Wilson (1866; Stanley 1970).

In the middle and late 1860s, testimony was taken from a number of British and Americans concerning the nature of the Kootenay House they had seen, mainly during the international boundary survey in 1860 and 1861. This resulted in a large body of conflicting information which illustrates how difficult it is to rely on the memories of mere men just half a decade old. Also from the 1860s we have a better than average run of H.B.C. correspondence concerning the Kootenay fur trade and gold mining trade, mainly from after 1863. Almost all of this, however, relates to activity north of the 49th parallel.

Recent work that is useful because of the pioneering nature of the research includes especially Olga Johnson's *Story of the Tobacco Plains Country* (1950) and her *Flathead and Kootenay* (1969), both of which contain significant information that can be traced to primary sources. Among those who have taken a scholarly interest has been the industrious T. C. Elliott who edited numerous selections from the Thompson journals, entire journals of John Work, and who provided footnotes for the editions of Tyrrell and others. Other twentieth century scholars have been Jacob Meyers of Kettle Falls, the Rev. John Pate of Libby, and Clara Graham (1945, 1963). Among the ethnographic works on the Kutenai the most significant have been those of Chamberlain (1892), Turney-High (1941), and Claude Schaeffer (1940, 1965).

Most of the primary material on the Kootenay fur trade consists of very short references, in many cases repetitious, but which can occasionally be juxtaposed to yield new information. Although it is rather doubtful that any large bodies of rich information exist in established archives of which we have no knowledge, that possibility cannot be entirely ruled out. Such a statement, though hazardous, is made with some confidence because it is possible to name virtually every literate man who spent more than a day or two in the Kutenai country before the year 1858. If the names are known the tracks can be often followed.

On the other hand, there are many small bits of information in both published and archival sources that have not been used here and many that are not yet known. The richest collection of such is no doubt scattered through the Hudson's Bay Company archives, despite the fact that I have spent over four months working in them. The Kootenay information is found in the Fort Colvile records and correspondence, in that of forts Vancouver and Victoria, in George Simpson's immense files, and under other headings. Potential sources that are known but not used fully in this study will be listed at the end.

The Fur Trade Setting

Over a period of seventy-two years, from 1800 until 1871, small parties of British and Canadian fur traders of three fur companies wintered among the Kutenai Indians of the Rocky Mountains with but a few breaks in the sequence. They also met them at places of summer rendezvous to exchange the products of the Industrial Revolution for the furs and hides of the forests and parklands. It was at all times a peaceful and mutually profitable relationship in which the Kutenai suffered from few of the disastrous effects often found in the contact of Western Civilization with primitive peoples. A major reason for this light touch of fate was the small number of traders usually employed in this commerce, seldom more than half a dozen, sometimes just one or two.

When quartered in the Kutenai country the traders sometimes occupied small, rapidly built establishments that went by the usual name of Kootenay House, or more rarely the Kootenay Fort. There was a long series of such posts, about fifteen in number, that were abandoned and replaced as the changing nature of the trade and the movements of the Kutenai required. Sometimes the traders just lived in tents or tipis, making it very difficult

for us to pinpoint these ephermeral sites. For it was a vast country, some 100 miles wide east to west and over 200 miles long from north to south, populated with not over a thousand Kutenai. Their geographical focus was the valley of the Kootenay River along its course south through the Rocky Mountain Trench, then along a great loop the river made to the northwest around the south end of the Purcell Range, until it widened into Kootenay Lake lying in the Purcell Trench. Around this elongated curve of river valley the various Kutenai bands found shelter in winter.

The vast ranges of mountains on all sides of the valley harbored a very rich animal population that made the country a principal source of prime furs and hides for the companies that purchased them. To do this, the companies had to be extremely flexible in their strategies. There were several reasons for the shift of posts from one place to another. These included the movements of the Indians themselves, the requirements of logistics and the changing pattern of fur company communication routes, the presence of competing American traders entering from the south and east, and the intermittent threat of the often dreaded Piegans whose war parties threaded the mountain defiles from the east in search of horses, other plunder, and even revenge. Finally, the abstractions of the international boundary and an ephemeral burst of gold mining in the 1860s influenced the location and eventual demise of the posts in the last years. The exhaustion of some animal species in parts of the Kutenai country probably also determined the locations of posts.

All of this made for an impermanence, a flux of history with few men present and able to record the changes and gradual transitions. This was one of the most isolated portions of the American West or of the Canadian West south of the Arctic. It was cut off by its high mountains, ice fields, and deep canyons; it was separated from the increasing tempo to the east by the arid Plains and the fierce tribes that roamed them, and from the west and south by lower mountain ranges and forests.

It was a romantic setting of magnificent scenery whose Indians seemed to fit the stereotype of the virtuous mountain Indian, but whose fur traders have, with the exception of Thompson, seldom excited the imagination in a sustained way for historical writing or fiction. That is perhaps because so little is actually known of these people. The Kutenai themselves might have struck the national consciousness of America had they bloodied themselves in a forlorn conflict like the Nez Perces did. As it was, the Kutenai battles were mostly with the Piegans and went largely unrecorded. They remain an obscure people, and the lonely traders who spent large parts of their careers among them, occupying themselves with completely unknown thoughts, are perhaps even more shadowy.

From the very beginning of European interest in North America, the fur trade was in most areas the attraction that led Europeans into new areas of the continent, from New England to the Pacific Coast. During the 1780s and 1790s the advance across the forest belt north of the grass-covered Plains in Canada was rapid. Between 1775 and 1793, traders of the North West Company of Montreal pushed all the way from Lake Superior through the Athabasca country to the Pacific Coast. South of that line, but still north of the prairies, others of that company moved up the North Saskatchewan River

during the 1780s. By 1799, and with the Kutenai clearly in mind, Duncan McGillivray had established Rocky Mountain House on the upper reaches of the river and in view of the mountains (Morton 1929; Winther 1969:24-38; Dempsey 1973).

In 1800, McGillivray and David Thompson found, with Kutenai assistance, a way to send men across the formidable divide to begin the southward thrust down through the Rockies into the Oregon Country. The route they took, establishing small posts as stepping stones, was through the Kutenai lands.

The North West Company had been trying to outdo its chief rival, the Hudson's Bay Company of London, by preempting the rich fur regions west of the hinterlands of Hudson's Bay. This was by a flanking movement to the right or north. And the North West Company's southerly penetration through the mountains had the appearance of another flanking movement to the left, or south, as if to block the Americans whose fur traders at least were temporarily slowed by the Great Plains.

Yet in 1800 the official claims of the United States were still confined to the area east of the Mississippi River, even though some like Thomas Jefferson were thinking in terms of a continental nation. It is possible, though apparently not proven, that the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804-06 was the catalyst that led Duncan McGillivray to order Thompson to finally cross the mountains in 1807 to establish a post among the Kutenai (Winther 1969:27-28).

In addition to belonging to the Indians, the Kutenai lands were also be 1807 within territory claimed by Spain, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. Although in hindsight the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 would seem to have extended clear American title to the very borders of the Kutenai country at the headwaters of the Missouri, such a definition was contested by Great Britain until 1818 (Fuller 1966:170-171). So in entering the Kutenai Valley and the rest of Oregon, the fur traders of the North West Company were also extending the British Empire, though without much determination or backing from their government. The fact is, of course, that the Empire usually expanded in this fashion, unofficially through trade and the initiative of men on the scene.

The Hudson's Bay Company was not far behind the North West Company in the push up the North Saskatchewan, and it built Edmonton House to oppose the North West Company's Fort Augustus, and Acton House in 1799 to oppose its rival's Rocky Mountain House built the same year (Nicks 1970; Dempsey 1973; Smyth 1978). However, the Hudson's Bay Company did not send men over the Rockies until Joseph Howse was dispatched in 1810 through the pass named for him, but discovered and used earlier by Thompson. This foray was not followed up, and the H.B.C. did not become involved again in the Kutenai country until the merger of the two companies in 1821. In this hesitance the H.B.C. displayed its more conservative way of doing things, a trait that persisted for decades.

The positions of the Kootenay posts and fur trade within the territorial organizations of the fur companies may be summarized as follows. From the 1790s until 1813, the Kootenay trade was an extension of the North West Company's operations on the upper stretches of the North Saskatchewan River. From 1813 until 1821, the headquarters of the Kootenay trade shifted to the opposite, southern pole of Spokane House and Astoria since the N.W.C. had shifted its supply routes for the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Ocean. This it accomplished in part by taking over the Astoria establishment of the Pacific Fur Company of John Jacob Astor in November of 1813, during the War of 1812 (Fuller 1966:93-108). Astor's attempt at starting an inland fur trade in the Pacific Northwest, 1811-1813, foundered because of disorganization, some questionable loyalty, and because of the war. But it did result in a post in the Kutenai lands in the winter os 1812-13, also dependent on a headquarters in the Spokan country.

Following the merger of the North West Company with the Hudson's Bay Company in 1821, and until 1826, the H.B.C. Kootenay trade remained headquartered at Spokane House, with higher headquarters still at Astoria, now called Fort George, then at Fort Vancouver after 1824. In 1826, the immediate headquarters for the Kootenay effort was moved to Fort Colvile where it remained until the 1860s then it was changed to Fort Shepherd on the Columbia 40 miles north of Fort Colvile and just north of the international boundary. By this time higher headquarters had shifted from Fort Vancouver to Fort Victoria on Vancouver Island in 1849, where it remained through the end of the trade in 1871.

The Cultural Background of the Kutenai

Numbering somewhere between about 600 and 1000 people in the early nineteenth century, the Kutenai inhabited their valley from the headwaters to the Kootenay Lake, as well as some of the Rocky Mountain trench north of the Kootenay River along the headwaters of the Columbia. Some of them also seem to have used the area around Flathead Lake as their base. Since the eastern branch of this ethnolinguistic group hunted bison on the Plains, they were to be found ranging from the headwaters of the North Saskatchewan through the headwaters of the Missouri and all the way south as far as eastern Idaho (Irving 1883).

The term 'Kutenai' is apparently of Piegan Blackfeet origin; they called themselves 'San'ka' (Turney-High 1941:11-12). The name 'Skalzi' was often used by Jesuit missionaries, and DeSmet (1863) claimed that this was the name the Kutenai used for themselves also. Among the fur traders, 'Kutenai' was used in its many variations from the very beginning in the North Saskatchewan fur trade. Once in the country, the traders under Thompson discovered another group to the southwest to whom they applied the terms 'Lakes,' 'Arc Plattes,' or 'Flatbows.' No French term for the eastern or upper Kutenai seems to have been used though 'Arc Platte' may well have covered all Kutenai for some users of French.

John Work (1829) gave all the Kutenai the alternative name 'Callesauilk,' but in the following year he labelled the eastern branch by the near-equivalent 'Callesouilk,' and the western or lower Kutenai were designated the 'Silaquilaque.' Lest some think we have confused the Kutenai with the Kalispel, we offer the quote: "The Kootanies of two tribes The Silaquilaque, (by the Whites called the Flat Bows,) and The Callesouilk. Their country lies on the Kootenay river from near its discharge to its sources, and on the head of the Columbia river" (Work 1830).

'Callesouilk,' however, appears to be a Salish name, 'souilk' being a term for water. 'Skalzi' may well be a cognate or corruption of 'calles.' John Palliser (Great Britain 1863; Spry 1968) was seemingly alone in labelling the lower Kutenai of the Bonners Ferry area the 'Paddlers' which may refer to their extensive use of canoes.

The Kutenai in the broad sense of the term have traditionally been divided into the two groups mentioned above, and they themselves recognized this two-way division as basic (Turney-High 1941:9). Like John Work, his contemporary, Chief Trader Francis Heron (Heron and Kittson 1831) differentiated between Arc Plattes and Kutenai, but said they were "friends of each other." A third, extinct, division was detected by Teit (1930:303) and called the 'Tunaxa' or 'Tunaxe.' Despite initial doubts, Turney-High (1941) confirmed the prior existence of this group that apparently was based on the Plains to the east of the Rockies. That 'Tunaxa' is a cognate of 'Kutenai,' or especially of the variation 'Kutenaha,' will seem obvious.

There follows here a most interesting comment by Alexander Henry, written between February and May, 1811, which to my knowledge has not been introduced before into the Tunaxa question:

> Along the Clearwater [tributary of the Saskatchewan] and near the foot of the mountains, are still to be seen the remains of some of the dwellings of the Kootenays, built of wood, straw, and pine branches. The same are observed along Riviere de la Jolie Prairie and Ram River. This gives us every reason to suppose that nation formerly dwelt along the foot of these mountains, and even as far down as our present establishment [Rocky Mountain House] near which the remains of some of their lodges are still to be seen [Coues 1897(2):703-707].

Henry goes on to say that the Kutenai were pushed over the Rockies by tribes to their east and that they in turn displaced the 'Snare' Indians who had inhabited the Kootenay Valley, forcing them north into uninhabited mountains where they eked out a miserable existence. In 1825, Alexander Ross met a Kutenai who told him, "My father . . . was a Kootenay chief; but in consequence of wars with the Blackfeet, who often visited his lands, he and a part of his people emigrated to this country about 30 years ago" (in Phillips 1974:42). This closely matches the observations of Alexander Henry with respect to the timing. Ross Cox (1831(2):153) writing of the period 1813-1817, says, "The Cootanais are

the remnant of a once powerful tribe, who like the Flatheads, were perpetually engaged in war with the Blackfeet for the right of hunting on the buffalo grounds." In this century, Turney-High (1941:10) collected data suggesting an eastward origin of the Kutenai, and further pressed the claim that those of the Tobacco Plains held some vague position of cultural primacy among the whole linguistic entity.

If we follow these leads provided by Henry, Ross, Cox, and Turney-High, we arrive at a compelling possibility, namely that the bulk of the eastern Kutenai were recent immigrants to the Kootenay Valley. If accepted, this would help explain a few anomalies. The most obvious one is that the upper valley and the Columbia headwaters to the north, as well as the mountains surrounding them, were extremely rich not only in the fur-bearing species but also in such animals as elk, deer, mountain goats and sheep, moose, and the perplexing wild horse bands in the early part of the last century (Work 1830; Tyrrell 1916). This alone suggests that the area had been but sparsely inhabited in the decades just preceding 1800.

Conversely, the eastern foothills of the Rockies in present Alberta were greatly depleted of game in the early nineteenth century (Smyth 1978), leading one to believe that the area had been well-populated not long before, as claimed by Henry. A third interesting point is that the Kootenay River, prior to being named McGillivray's River by Thompson, had the name Flatbow River, evidently a translation of not only the French 'Arc Platte' but of an Indian designation. We have already mentioned the fact that this term was usually after 1807 applied to just the lower Kutenai. So we can be pardoned for making the inference that the lower Kutenai may have been associated with the whole river and not just the lower part of it in the eighteenth century. Certainly, the adaptation of the lower Kutenai to the marshes of the lower river appears profound and of long standing.

If this reconstruction has validity, then we can say that the long-range effects of the fur trade in mid-continent contributed to the Blackfeet finding the means and desire to push some of the Kutenai into a relatively rich faunal environment, while the fur traders soon caught up and employed the Kutenai in harvesting this bonanza. The Kutenai experience would thus parallel that of the Plains tribes who were able to help decimate the buffalo by the aid of European horses and trade guns.

The two divisions of the Kutenai, especially the eastern, can be further subdivided, but the data at present seem to be confusing and incomplete. Suffice it to include here Coues' (1897(2):550n) somewhat puzzling breakdown as follows:

Kutenai proper (upper)
Akoklako or lower Kutenai
Klanoh Klatklam or Flathead Kutenai
Yaketahnok latak makanay or Kutenai of Tobacco Plains

Coues' source is not given. Wilson (1966:304) called the upper Kutenai the 'Akishkinookaniks' and the lower the 'Akuchaklacktas,' the latter being very similar to the term Coues used for the lower people.

If the general pattern of the Plateau be followed, then there would most likely have been a band centered at the mouth of each major tributary of the Kootenay River, but the coming of the horse and the buffalo hunting as a major element of the subsistence quest of the upper Kutenai would certainly have obscured an older arrangement of bands. DeSmet (1863: 104-105) claimed that the bands inhabiting Tobacco Plains and Flathead Lake were one and the same, the two locales being merely alternatives for one people numbering about 300.

In general, the upper Kutenai seem to have been usually observed in larger clusters of a score or more lodges, while the lower were more usually encountered in smaller settlements of from one to half a dozen lodges. Claude Schaeffer discovered the existence of land-holding by "extended family groups" among the lower Kutenai (Docket 154, Indian Claims Commission, in Horr 1974:347).

A very important fact about these people is that they were linguistically isolated, having no people around them who spoke similar languages. In fact, the historical affiliation of the Kutenai language continues to be a source of scholarly controversy. This isolation might have had the effect of making the Kutenai more inclined to be friendly with European interlopers. It also helps to explain the Kutenai facility in sign language (Hamilton 1900) and historic conflicts with the Piegans, Lakes, Colville, Okanagan, and Coeur d'Alene since language barriers are a prime ingredient of conflict.

Some Kutenai were multilingual, especially in the Spokan-Kalispel-Flathead language, but also in Piegan and surprisingly in Cree (Hector, 3 October 1859, in Spry 1968:461). As with surrounding tribes, the Kutenai spoke apparently little or no Chinook trade jargon. Most astounding is the assertion that in 1860 and 1861 no lower Kutenai could be found who could speak the Flathead-Kalispel language while most men of the upper division were able to from "the habit of hunting with them" (Wilson 1866: 305), which is possibly paralleled by earlier statements. This alone would lend support to a belief that even the lower Kutenai were recent arrivals.

The division of the Kutenai into two groups with differing economics and slightly different dialects is typical of a pattern that existed around them. It is a phenomenon that requires some thought. Similar polarizations were exemplified by the Colville-Lakes, the Kalispel-Pend d'Oreille, the northern and southern Okanagan, and the upper and lower Nez Perce. Exceptions may have been the Spokan, Coeur d'Alene, and the historic Flathead. One could casually explain the regularity by pointing out that some ethnolinguistic tribes occupied two alternative or contrastive ecological zones that complemented each other and enhanced the possibility of survival should the major food resources of one of them fail. Resources could be shared or traded between two groups that for cultural and linguistic reasons would not

be normally in conflict. This presupposes a slightly greater degree of conflict among the ethnolinguistic tribes of the Plateau than has been recognized in received ethnography, but it is a picture that can be supported by references to conflict in the fur trade literature that have been largely ignored by twentieth century ethnography taken from living informants (Chance 1973, 1981).

In the first three-quarters of the last century, the upper Kutenai were strongly interested in bison hunting on the Plains as the main cornerstone of their existence. According to one report (Wilson 1866: 305), they crossed the mountains twice a year, once in the spring and once in the autumn. But according to John Linklater (Thiebodo 1940: 330), they crossed about every two months, summer and winter. The fur trade sources suggest a considerable variability in scheduling and even Kutenai residence on the Plains year-round during some periods. This pursuit continued until about 1880 (Johnson 1969:335). As it would be expected, they exhibited many Plains traits, such as living mostly in hide tipis, and they had many horses with which to follow the chase.

But the Kutenai were not at all averse to leaving the horses behind in the winter to cross the mountains on showshoes to get their buffalo meat (Thiebodo 1940). And a frequently unremembered fact of their subsistence was their reliance on Chinook salmon which they caught in the summer and fall near the source of the Columbia, in the northern part of their territory (Coues 1897(2):708; Tyrrell 1916; Hector, 2 October 1859, in Spry 1968:460).

By contrast, the western or lower Kutenai were rather closely attached to the perfectly flat, swampy valley of the Kootenay River from a little above Bonners Ferry down into Kootenay Lake. Like most Plateau tribes they lived primarily in mat lodges, and made extensive use of the famous sturgeon-nosed bark canoe. For food they depended heavily on migrating fish such as trout in the Kootenay River, but not on sea-run salmon. And most unusual for this area, they hunted migrating waterfowl, intensively curing them for winter consumption.

A few of the lower Kutenai did move seasonally to the salmon fisheries on the lower river between the lake and the Columbia, and also to Kettle Falls, at any rate after the Hudson's Bay Company established itself there. But to fish and trade for salmon the lower Kutenai had to be in harmonious relations with the Arrow Lakes and Kettle Falls or Colville Salish, which they not always were.

The upper Kutenai appear to have done more trapping of fur animals, and more hunting of hides, during the last century than the lower Kutenai, but statistics to make a sure distinction are simply unavailable.

It would be too much outside of our interest here to go on with a standard list of the traits of the two Kutenai groups. Rather we shall now continue reviewing a few of the other important features and unusual characteristics that are either relevant to the fur trade or which will at least serve to sharpen our focus.

be normally in conflict. This presupposes a slightly greater degree of conflict among the ethnolinguistic tribes of the Plateau than has been recognized in received ethnography, but it is a picture that can be supported by references to conflict in the fur trade literature that have been largely ignored by twentieth century ethnography taken from living informants (Chance 1973, 1981).

In the first three-quarters of the last century, the upper Kutenai were strongly interested in bison hunting on the Plains as the main cornerstone of their existence. According to one report (Wilson 1866: 305), they crossed the mountains twice a year, once in the spring and once in the autumn. But according to John Linklater (Thiebodo 1940: 330), they crossed about every two months, summer and winter. The fur trade sources suggest a considerable variability in scheduling and even Kutenai residence on the Plains year-round during some periods. This pursuit continued until about 1880 (Johnson 1969:335). As it would be expected, they exhibited many Plains traits, such as living mostly in hide tipis, and they had many horses with which to follow the chase.

But the Kutenai were not at all averse to leaving the horses behind in the winter to cross the mountains on showshoes to get their buffalo meat (Thiebodo 1940). And a frequently unremembered fact of their subsistence was their reliance on Chinook salmon which they caught in the summer and fall near the source of the Columbia, in the northern part of their territory (Coues 1897(2):708; Tyrrell 1916; Hector, 2 October 1859, in Spry 1968:460).

By contrast, the western or lower Kutenai were rather closely attached to the perfectly flat, swampy valley of the Kootenay River from a little above Bonners Ferry down into Kootenay Lake. Like most Plateau tribes they lived primarily in mat lodges, and made extensive use of the famous sturgeon-nosed bark canoe. For food they depended heavily on migrating fish such as trout in the Kootenay River, but not on sea-run salmon. And most unusual for this area, they hunted migrating waterfowl, intensively curing them for winter consumption.

A few of the lower Kutenai did move seasonally to the salmon fisheries on the lower river between the lake and the Columbia, and also to Kettle Falls, at any rate after the Hudson's Bay Company established itself there. But to fish and trade for salmon the lower Kutenai had to be in harmonious relations with the Arrow Lakes and Kettle Falls or Colville Salish, which they not always were.

The upper Kutenai appear to have done more trapping of fur animals, and more hunting of hides, during the last century than the lower Kutenai, but statistics to make a sure distinction are simply unavailable.

It would be too much outside of our interest here to go on with a standard list of the traits of the two Kutenai groups. Rather we shall now continue reviewing a few of the other important features and unusual characteristics that are either relevant to the fur trade or which will at least serve to sharpen our focus.

be normally in conflict. This presupposes a slightly greater degree of conflict among the ethnolinguistic tribes of the Plateau than has been recognized in received ethnography, but it is a picture that can be supported by references to conflict in the fur trade literature that have been largely ignored by twentieth century ethnography taken from living informants (Chance 1973, 1981).

In the first three-quarters of the last century, the upper Kutenai were strongly interested in bison hunting on the Plains as the main cornerstone of their existence. According to one report (Wilson 1866: 305), they crossed the mountains twice a year, once in the spring and once in the autumn. But according to John Linklater (Thiebodo 1940: 330), they crossed about every two months, summer and winter. The fur trade sources suggest a considerable variability in scheduling and even Kutenai residence on the Plains year-round during some periods. This pursuit continued until about 1880 (Johnson 1969:335). As it would be expected, they exhibited many Plains traits, such as living mostly in hide tipis, and they had many horses with which to follow the chase.

But the Kutenai were not at all averse to leaving the horses behind in the winter to cross the mountains on showshoes to get their buffalo meat (Thiebodo 1940). And a frequently unremembered fact of their subsistence was their reliance on Chinook salmon which they caught in the summer and fall near the source of the Columbia, in the northern part of their territory (Coues 1897(2):708; Tyrrell 1916; Hector, 2 October 1859, in Spry 1968:460).

By contrast, the western or lower Kutenai were rather closely attached to the perfectly flat, swampy valley of the Kootenay River from a little above Bonners Ferry down into Kootenay Lake. Like most Plateau tribes they lived primarily in mat lodges, and made extensive use of the famous sturgeon-nosed bark canoe. For food they depended heavily on migrating fish such as trout in the Kootenay River, but not on sea-run salmon. And most unusual for this area, they hunted migrating waterfowl, intensively curing them for winter consumption.

A few of the lower Kutenai did move seasonally to the salmon fisheries on the lower river between the lake and the Columbia, and also to Kettle Falls, at any rate after the Hudson's Bay Company established itself there. But to fish and trade for salmon the lower Kutenai had to be in harmonious relations with the Arrow Lakes and Kettle Falls or Colville Salish, which they not always were.

The upper Kutenai appear to have done more trapping of fur animals, and more hunting of hides, during the last century than the lower Kutenai, but statistics to make a sure distinction are simply unavailable.

It would be too much outside of our interest here to go on with a standard list of the traits of the two Kutenai groups. Rather we shall now continue reviewing a few of the other important features and unusual characteristics that are either relevant to the fur trade or which will at least serve to sharpen our focus.

Many if not all the significant writers on the Kutenai have remarked on the seemingly continual warfare between them and the Plains tribes, particularly the Piegan branch of the Blackfeet. Turney-High (1941) even went so far as to say that the Piegans were the constant enemies of the Kutenai. Certainly, fighting with the Piegans was an extremely rugged fact of life for the Kutenai, and, to handle the problem of this large and aggressive tribe centered just to the east across the Rockies, the Kutenai had to ally themselves a good part of the time with the Flatheads and other Salish, perhaps also with Crows, Crees, and Stoneys, for protection of numbers on the Plains.

Yet there are a number of sightings of the Kutenai where they had some Piegans in tow (e.g. Ross 1825), and the Jesuit missionary Joseph Menetrey was observed at Tobacco Plains in 1859 with an escort of Blackfeet (Thiebodo 1940:328). And further, during the 1830s, the Hudson's Bay Company officers became quite concerned when the Kutenai began following the Piegans on the Plains, to the detriment of the fur trade, taking steps even to break this relationship.

So we must suggest that some Piegans might be friendly while others were at the same time hostile, and that they did not act with unified purpose as we might believe from simplistic notions of Plains tribalism. It would be apparent that if relations had always been uncompromisingly hostile, the Kutenai could not have continued to survive on the Plains since the Piegans probably outnumbered them at least five to one, and the Flathead, even though brave and warlike allies, were after all hunting buffalo principally from one to two hundred miles south of much of the Kutenai activity (Wilson 1866:305; Hamilton 1900; Spry 1968). This is not to say, however, that at times the Kutenai were not sorely pressed by the Piegans, especially in the period 1790-1810, and again in the 1850s.

When toward the end of this study we start to discuss the remarkable turning by the Kutenai to cattle husbandry and grain agriculture in the 1850s, it is important to keep in mind two factors that would have given them a predilection in favor of these settled pursuits. The first is their horse husbandry that predated the arrival of the fur traders, and the second is their aboriginal cultivation of tobacco from seed.

Alone among the areas of the Pacific Northwest, the Kootenay Valley was inhabited by bands of wild horses when the first traders entered it from the east. David Thompson (Tyrrell 1916) discussed them at length after catching and breaking some of them, and his friend Alexander Henry did also (Coues 1897). Whether the horses were Kutenai animals that had gone wild or ones that had entered the valley on their own from the south we do not know. It is probable that they formed a reservoir from which the Kutenai could catch some as they were needed. It is, of course, possible that Thompson was going too far in saying that the horses were actually wild, for perhaps they were simply reserves that the Kutenai did not bother to watch since it was not easy for the horses to leave the valley, surrounded as it is by high mountains, water, or forests -- except for a corridor leading southeast toward Flathead Lake from the Tobacco Plains. This was a corridor that could be very easily monitored since it cut right through the center of the Tobacco Plains band's territory.

Whatever the case, the Kutenai were noted as accomplished horsemen, and more than one writer remarked on the magnificence of their breed (Hector 1861:403; Palliser, in Spry 1968:573n; Wilson 1866:306). Augustus Thiebodo (1940:327) avered that "their horses are very handsome, broad-chested and handsome heads and necks, they have some 5 or 600 here [at Tobacco Plains]." This was said a few weeks after the Kutenai there had traded nearly 150 to immigrants who passed through earlier. Knowing something about horse-breeding, the Kutenai may well have been psychologically adapted to raising cattle. The same thing occurred among the tribes of the Middle Columbia who were both noted horse breeders and well on their way in mid-century to enjoying a cattle herding economy when rudely interrupted by inpouring Americans and the subsequent wars.

The matter of tobacco growing is one of the local ethnographic mysteries of the Pacific Northwest. It is of note because only the Kutenai had the distinction of having a native horticulture, attested by early as well as later sources (Work 1829; Turney-High 1941). It is unfortunate that the plant could no longer be identified by natives in the 1930s (Turney-High 1941) and that the "tobacco gardens" at the mouth of the Tobacco River, if that is where all of them were, have been inundated, making it unlikely that descendants of the plants survive. The fact that smoking the weed was a matter more of ceremonial significance than physiological necessity gives some credence to the alleged cultural primacy of Tobacco Plains (Turney-High 1941). Having their own tobacco did not, however, make the Kutenai feel any less of a craving for the English tobacco of the fur traders, suggesting that what they raised was not produced in great abundance or else was not well-flavored. But growing tobacco would have made the sowing of vegetable or wheat seeds a familiar process; it was just a matter of finding crops that would grow in the Kootenay Valley.

Unlike most of the Plateau peoples, the Kutenai made both sun-dried and fired pottery, though not with a wheel (Taylor 1969:191, after Griffin 1965). Like the tobacco horticulture, the pottery indicates a cultural linkage with the Missouri river cultures in the Dakotas or areas slightly farther north of that, not so surprising now given our knowledge of the Kutenai penetrations in the later eighteenth century all the way to the eastern boundary of modern Alberta.

Kutenai dogs were notoriously numerous and troublesome, frequently destroying all kinds of leather belongings of travelers visiting the Tobacco Plains vicinity. DeSmet (1863:114-116) remarked that each Kutenai family owned from six to seven dogs, each member of a family might possess one or two. They lived on "bones and crumbs," and foraged chiefly at night. DeSmet relates the amusing information that Father Menetrey was unable to sleep at night from the Kutenai dogs fighting inside his tent. Dogs, as everyone knows, are useful for warning of intruders; they are also mobile reservoirs of protein for lean times, extremely effective at keeping camps free of all but their own offal, for human faeces contribute a large part of their diet in primitive societies. And if it is true, as alleged, that human faeces are rich in protein, then dogs form an important side-loop in the food chain.

But the Kutenai were not as ingrown in their habits as the foregoing might suggest. They were producers for a significant aboriginal trade system, and three commodities are worth mentioning here. The chief of these was the hide trade which they had with the Plateau tribes to their southwest, the Kutenai supplying the skins of ungulates to a region that was poor in them. We do not know the antiquity of this trade, but we have information that it continued as late as 1840, when the Hudson's Bay Company was competing with the Plateau Indians for this commodity (A. McDonald 1840a).

One can infer from some sources that the upper Kutenai were the principal suppliers of the hides. This is at least suggested by comments of Alexander Henry, penned in 1811, and based probably on Thompson's observations:

> The Flat Bow, or, as some call them, Lake Indians, dwell on the borders of the large lake, into which McGillivray's river empties in its course to the Columbia. They frequently come up the former river as far as the falls, but seldom attempt to proceed higher. These people are but little known to us. The country they inhabit does not appear to abound in animals of the larger kinds; neither are beavers very plenty, nor other skins of value. Salmon and other fish seem to be their principal food. These people have no horses . . . They generally use canoes made of pine bark, which are very weak, slender vessels [Coues 1897(2):708-709].

Yet from some Colvile District documents of the late 1820s, it would seem that at least then the lower Kutenai were providing most of the hides.

But the lower Kutenai did have at least one commodity that was very important to the daily comfort of Indians and that was a thick reed, perhaps tule, knows as *Klusquis*, which they obtained in their swamps and traded to other tribes (Sullivan, 26 September 1859, in Spry 1968:483). It is here evident that this trade was still flourishing in 1859. But to move these reeds, or mats made from them, southwards would seem a difficult job without horses, which the lower Kutenai certainly had by 1859. However, the easier way to export them would probably have been by water through Kootenay Lake and then down the rest of the river to the Columbia and Kettle Falls, where the market would very likely have been significant because of the large numbers of Indians there and the undersupply of swamps.

The third aboriginal trading commodity we can document from nineteenth-century sources is vermilion or red pigment, used for annointing both the living and the dead. As late as 1858, the physician and geologist James Hector found at "the Vermilion Plain" somewhere north of Columbia Lake the remains of a Kutenai camp and a large fire where they had converted ochre into red oxide which "they take away to trade with the Indians of the low

country, and also to the Blackfeet as a pigment" (Hector, 21 August 1858, in Spry 1968:301). Here we hear one more reason to believe that the Kutenai relationship with the Blackfeet was a complex one and not unmitigated hostility.

While the Kutenai held to a religion typical of Plateau and Plains peoples of the quest for Power through the agency of Guardian Spirits, Sun worship is also attested for the Kutenai (Chamberlain 1892:559), although both David Thompson and Archibald McDonald claimed Sun worship to be typical of the northeastern Plateau generally (Chance 1973:24). The Guardian Spirit theology was one that, at least from our point of view, would lend itself to understanding the Catholic teachings of Canadians, Iroquois, or missionaries because of the similarity between guardian spirits and patron saints.

Moon worship is implied in John Work's amazing reference to a "dying custom" among the Kutenai of sacrificing female children to the Moon. The infant was wrapped in cloth and suspended from a tree "where it is left to perish and cry to death" (Work 1829). This does not square very well with Henry's (Coues 1897(2):708) assertion that these people were fond and indulgent of their children, nor with the reported matrilocality of the Kutenai (Turney-High 1941:144; Ray 1942:211). But Work is almost invariably a sober and conservative reporter.

What we have not yet established is whether Work was ever actually in the Kutenai country himself even though there is no doubt that he had many opportunities to observe the Kutenai at first hand at Flathead House, on the north side of Pend a'Oreille Lake, and at Spokane House. However, away from home, the Kutenai would not very likely be sacrificing infants even if they practised this, so Work's report is probably not first-hand. It is easy to imagine how a single misunderstanding of the common practice of tree burial for infants could be transformed into a notion of sacrifice. With our late twentieth-century ethnological biases we have a tendency to discount reports of customs that seem cruel or bizarre. Hopefully we shall some day find either corroboration or explanation for this almost incredible account, made of a people who from all appearances were in constant danger of extinction and thus in need of all the females they could muster. If it was a fact, however, and if it was dying out, as Work claimed, it is not unlikely that the fur traders such as the religiously inclined Thompson were partly responsible.

After appearing to discolor the reputation of the Kutenai, we shall perhaps make amends by making a detailed accounting of the large number of testimonials to the virtues of these people. With the possible exception of the Flathead, the Kutenai were praised above all other peoples of the Pacific Northwest, including the coast, for traits of character that met the approval of Europeans, though tragically not of the Americans.

There are more comments on Kutenai character in the literature than any other aspect of their lives, certainly something of a corrective to our modern over-emphasis on economics. And if one talks today with Indians of the Pacific Northwest about the old life, the salient subject that seems almost invariably to come to the fore is that of traditional Indian

notions of virtue. To us, particularly those of us interested in cultural history, character seems to be a slippery topic that lies beyond the realm of objective description, to be something we feel uncomfortable with because of the fear of ethnocentricity. But to the fur traders or other small parties of vulnerable visitors character traits were supremely important because they directly affected the ability of interlopers to survive and to predict behavior in a hostile natural environment. Such attributes were also important to traders because they had much to do with how well an ethnic group might adapt itself to European commerce, or how honest a people might be with the property so sacred to Europeans.

David Thompson usually gives us more natural history than cultural observation, and he has little direct comment on the character of the Kutenai though he continually implies cordial relations. At one point he does contrast the cowardly behavior of some lower Kutenai with the manly character of their chief (Tyrrell 1916:391). Yet we can probably see some of Thompson's opinions reflected in Alexander Henry, who wrote in October of 1809 about a chief of the Gens du Bois [Woods] Assiniboines who was a Kutenai by birth, "taken in infancy at war, and by his great bravery acquired influence. He is of small stature and has every characteristic of his own nation" (Coues 1897(2):549-550).

Two years later, Henry extolled the Kutenai as a "brave and warlike nation" (Coues 1897(2):707), going on to add:

> They are always at peace with their neighbors to the south and west. The Flatheads and others frequently mix with them, and join their excursions southward in search of buffalo. These people are mild to their women, and particularly attached to their children.

The depiction of the Kutenai by Ross Cox (1831(2):153-155) is the longest we possess, and it is well worth quoting most of it because of its unusual turns:

> Previous to our arrival among them they entertained the most deadly hatred against white men, to whom they attributed all their misfortunes owing to the assistance which their enemies received in arms and ammunition from the North-west Company's people to the eastward of the mountains.

This statement is seemingly at odds with the attempts the Kutenai made to trade with the North West Company in the late eighteenth century, which we shall note in more detail later on. It is possible that some Kutenai did entertain this hatred, but from Cox's next remarks it is patent that they were able to entertain opinions sufficiently complex that they would not let emotions stand in the way of success. He goes on to say:

> They appeared to be perfectly aware that beaver was the only object that induced us to visit their country; and they accordingly exerted themselves to procure it, not, as some of them candidly declared, for our interest, but for the purpose of obtaining firearms, spears, etc., to enable them to meet their old enemies the Blackfeet on more equal terms.

Cox apparently received much of his information from Nicholas Montour, and there is so far no evidence that Cox himself was ever in the Kutenai country. However, spending as much time as he did at Spokane House, he would doubtless have had much opportunity to interview Kutenai visitors. Continuing his slightly acerbic comments, Cox says:

> The Cootonais are by no means so warm-hearted towards the whites as their neighbors the Flatheads; but Mr. Montour, who spent some years among them, states, that they are strictly honest in all their dealings, and remarkable for their adherence to truth; a virtue by the bye, of which few Indians can boast. Polygamy is unknown among them; and he never knew an instance wherin any of their women admitted overtures of an improper nature. They appear to be jealous of white men, and studiously conceal their females whenever any of the traders approach their lodges.

This cynical and perhaps realistic view of fur traders was paralleled by a low expectation of life:

> A Cootonais seldom smiles. He thinks that sooner or later he is doomed to fall in the field of battle; and this certainty of death, joined to the number of relatives annually killed in their constant warfare, imparts to his features a settled melancholy.

Which should be compared with Thiebodo's remarks of 1859 that follow in due course.

Cox concludes with some notes on their appearance, along with a summary of his views:

> The greatest cleanliness and neatness are observed about their persons and lodges. They are rather handsome, above the middle size, and, compared with other tribes, remarkably fair . . . . In their intercourse with white men, they are rather haughty and reserved; in conversation candid; in trade, honest; brave in battle; and devotedly attached to each other and their country.

Meeting a large band of Kutenai at the Flathead Rendezvous of November, 1824, Alexander Ross (1825) carefully noted the trading characteristics of each tribe, as if taking notes for one of the books he was to write later in Canada:

> Immediately after trading these people went home. In trading they held a middle plan, that is to say they were more particular than the Flatheads, and less troublesome than the Pend'Oreilles. Among this tribe appeared four personages clothed in the character of chiefs, their influence however appeared limited. The Koottannais were but ordinary dressed, and their garments uncommonly black from the smoke of the pitch pine; they appeared lower in stature than the Flatheads or Pend'Oreilles, of rather effeminate countenance.

The "effeminate countenance" might strike us as a very subjective observation, except that Charles Wilson (1866:304) noted that the Kutenai men had "very long black eyelashes, which form one of the most striking peculiarities of their appearance." This is a physical variable that is not apt to receive much scientific comment since lashes are difficult to measure. Appearance, though, had nothing to do with masculine abilities, as most of these writers testify.

John Work (Elliott 1914a:108-109) was a contemporary with Ross in trading with the Kutenai, and took a slightly different view of their trading practice, saying of the Flathead and Kutenai collectively, "They are remarkably fine Indians and easily dealt with."

For reasons beyond our control we shall here jump to the years 1858 and 1859 when the explorers Blakiston, Sullivan, Hector, and Palliser of the British Palliser expedition each made tours through parts of the Kutenai country. Blakiston wrote: "They are perfectly honest and do not beg, qualities which I have never yet met with in any Indians." After staying with them for a week in August and September, 1858, Blakiston lost nothing except to the rapacious dogs. He said that he did not know if the honesty of the Kutenai was to be attributed to the missionaries or if it was "innate." Just the same, even if it was attributable to the Catholics, he went on, the result of that influence was far different from what it had been at missions on the east side of the Rockies (Spry 1968:575-576).

On the other hand, Blakiston's superior, Palliser, wrote while looking over the summer stay-at-homes:

> These are the most wretched-looking fellows I ever met; men, women and children, all living on berries, the men naked and the women nearly so. Yet strange to say they possess a wonderful number of horses, and those very superior to the Indian horses east of the mountains [Spry 1968:573n].

James Hector perhaps balanced Palliser's account by observing in October that:

> These Kootenays are very fine Indians, being remarkably free from all the usual bad qualities of the race. The women are rather comely, and the men, though small, are well built. However, they were in good condition, having plenty of food at present; for Captain Palliser described them as being last summer the most miserable tribe he had seen. They are all very religious, having been converted by the Roman Catholic priests. Frequently, and at stated times, a bell is rung in the camp, and all who are within hearing at once go down on their knees and pray [Spry 1968: 462-462].

William Hamilton (1900), a government scout or spy and, because of his tendency to exaggerate, not to be completely trusted, thought in looking back on his visit of 1858 that the Kutenai were "a noble, pleasant looking Indian and very friendly to the white man, a great contrast to the Blackfeet." He obviously found great pleasure in his travels and fights on the side of the Kutenai against the Blackfeet, but cast aspersions on the martial abilities of the former, as well as on their enemies.

After a difficult crossing of the Rockies in October of the following year, 1859, Augustus Thiebodo was revelling in the comforts of abundant food and warmth next to the Indian village and the H.B.C. trading post at Tobacco Plains when he observed:

> The Indians are a fine handsome looking lot of people, unusually clean . . . . The P. Master [Linklater] says that the Indians observe the Sabbath very rigidly & that they are very honest, that he never locks his doors. It is quite a beautiful sight to be in our tent and watch the little Indian village among the trees under the hills in front of us & to see the strangely painted savages wandering about & staring at us and every now and then laughing at any little thing that happens. I never saw any people so quiet & apparently contented as those we traded with [Thiebodo 1940:372-328].

The famous Jesuit missionary Peter DeSmet was habitually inclined to almost fulsome praise of any Indians who embraced Catholicism, so his remarks on the Kutenai are correspondingly glowing. In 1858 he wrote:

> Their honesty is so great and so well known, that the trader [Linklater] leaves his store-house entirely, the door remaining unlocked often during his absence for weeks. The Indians go in and out, and help themselves to what they need, and settle with the trader on his return. He assured me himself, that in doing business with them in this style he never lost the value of a pin [DeSmet 1863:90].

By now, the question of Kutenai honesty is, if anything, suffering from over-documentation. But DeSmet in 1861 added some traits that are not met with in the other sources when he wrote:

> They were especially distinguished by an admirable simplicity, a great charity, and a rare honesty in all their dealings with their neighbors, and an innocence of manners worthy of the primitive Christians [DeSmet 1863:104].

and:

> It is much to be regretted that no more can be done for these good Indians, for, of all the mountain tribes, they are at once the best disposed and the most necessitous. The beau-ideal of the Indian character, uncontaminated by contact with the whites, is found among them. What is most pleasing to the stranger, is to see their simplicity, united with sweetness and innocence, keep step with the most perfect dignity and modesty of deportment . . . . They are honest to scrupulosity. The Hudson's Bay Company, during the 40 years that it has been trading in furs with them, has never been able to perceive that the smallest object had been stolen from them [DeSmet 1863:107-108].

With DeSmet we may detect some hints of early nineteenth-century Romanticism, as we do also in his Jesuit subordinates Joseph Joset and Nicholas Point; the Kutenai, it would seem, found responsive minds. It might also be remarked that dishonesty in trading is a charge that is hardly ever met with in fur trade discussions of the interior Indians of the Pacific Northwest, even though the traders did lose the occasional horse or poorly guarded cache. To my knowledge, however, nowhere else did the Hudson's Bay Company go off and leave a trading inventory to which Indians could help themselves.

But then again, the Kootenay posts were distinguished by their being devoted almost exclusively to trade with just one tribe; every other post that comes to mind in the Pacific Northwest was visited by several ethnic groups. Thus it is likely that the Kutenai recognized their great vested interest in the posts that were their sole source of arms, ammunition, and other necessaries.

We will add just one more encomium on the Kutenai, this from 1861, by Wilson (1866:304-305), before closing with an American view. Having spent a few weeks in the Kutenai country while acting as secretary and general factotum, and having kept one of our more vivid diaries (Stanley 1970), Wilson summed up some of his observations in an ethnological article by saying:

> The Kootenays were decidedly the finest race of Indians met with during the progress of the [Boundary] Commission; the men were tall, averaging five feet nine inches, with sharp features, acquiline noses, black hair and eyes, and very long black eyelashes . . . . The Kootenays bear the reputation of being brave, honest, and truthful, and pride themselves on the fact that no white man has ever been killed by one of their tribe. Though naturally quiet and inoffensive, when occasion demands, they show themselves inferior to none in all warlike accomplishments, and in spite of the small number of their tribe, manage to hold their own against the Blackfeet in the frequent skirmishes that take place on the common hunting ground.

Noble races of men were frequently alleged to have acquiline noses in the writings of nineteenth-century British writers, as for example in the African novels of H. Rider Haggard. We should also acknowledge by now that the Kutenai have been portrayed as both tall and short, so that there is no way to form a rigid opinion of their stature.

Could the character of the Kutenai have changed suddenly for the worse in the few years leading into 1870? Can we believe the report of General Alfred Sully of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the Kutenai of the Flathead Reservation in 1870 "prefer an idle, drunken life" (Fahey 1974:155)? His remarks are paralleled by several American agents (Davis 1954:104). Or are we just having the benefit of looking at the Kutenai through the eyes of Americans? Perhaps we see the malaise of reservation existence taking hold quickly.

The Population of the Kutenai

In Table 1 some nineteen population estimates from a span of nearly a century are presented. As always with such information, one needs to treat all of the estimates with caution. Five of them are not meant to represent the entire Kutenai population, but are rather estimates or counts of just portions of the total that happened to be present in one place.

The most accurate representations of the entire population are probably those of Thompson's estimate of the "men of families," found in an undated portion of his manuscript journals along with estimates from other tribes, and the figures given by John Work in 1829 and 1830, which are the same data given two different ways. Work's data came from the reports of chiefs during the three years preceding his report of 1830 (Work 1830) and may not include infants. It is difficult to imagine reasons why chiefs might either over-estimate or under-estimate the numbers when reporting to the H.B.C. But it is not unlikely that a chief might count badly or exclude certain bands for various reasons. Therefore, the figures are more likely to be conservative than excessive.

Table 1. Population Estimates and Counts of the Kutenai.

Year	Eastern (upper)	Western (lower or Flatbow)	Total	Source
1805			800 (Tush-opahs)	Lewis & Clark (1854)
c. 1810			140 men of families equals 826-980	Thompson Journal No. 28, p. 87
1811	50 families			Henry, in Coues (1897(2): 707)
1824	212 at the Flathead Rendezvous			Ross (1825)
1827			150 men	Dease (1827)
1829			182 men 215 women 118 boys 115 girls 630 total (Callesauilk)	Work (1829)
1830	91 men 121 women 65 boys 72 girls 349 total (Callesouilk)	91 men 94 women 53 boys 43 girls 281 total (Silaquilaque)	630 (Kootenay)	Work (1830)

Table 1. (continued)

Year	Eastern	Western	Total	Source
1835			1000	Samuel Parker, in Eells (1894)
1845	55 men 70 women 60 boys 50 girls	56 men 76 women 30 boys 50 girls		
	235 total	212 total	447	Warre and Vavasour (1845)
1853			400	Stevens (1854)
1955			350 plus (some gone to buffalo)	Stevens, in Fahey (1974:94)
1857			500	Great Britain (1857:367)
1858	150 lodges & 300 warriors at Tobacco Plains			Hamilton (1900:79)
1859			1000	Linklater, in Thiebodo (1940:329)
1861	400 persons with Chief Michael at Tobacco Plains			DeSmet (1863:113)
1861			1000	DeSmet (1863:104)

Table 1. (continued)

Year	Eastern	Western	Total	Source
1861	450	200	650	Wilson (1866:304)
c. 1890			964	Coues (1897(2):550n)
1905	556 on the Flathead Reservation only, including 210 "full-bloods," 324 "mixed-bloods" and 4 aliens			Fahey (1974:296)

Thompson estimated that each Indian family, not necessarily a Kutenai family, had seven souls (Tyrrell 1916:529) which would convert his 140 men into a population of about 980. But the 212 Kutenai that traded with Alexander Ross in November of 1824 at the Flathead Rendezvous inhabited 36 lodges, yielding an average of only 5.9 persons per lodge (Table 2). If a lodge was equivalent to one of Thompson's families, then we might lower the extrapolated total based on Thompson's men to about 826. Either way, the reduction from ca. 1810 to 1829 when Work gives a total of 630 suggests a substantial decrease in a little less than one generation.

Since nearly all the later estimates are inferior, including those of Warre and Vavasour (Chance 1973:119), it is impossible to decide whether the Kutenai decreased during the course of the last century or remained stable. John Linklater's estimate of a thousand comprised of three bands of 400, 300, and 300 persons each (Thiebodo 1940:329) for 1859 has to be considered authoritative, but the round numbers do not inspire confidence. The Tobacco Plains band had 300 persons, according to Linklater, but the other two bands were not identified; the lower Kutenai must have been one of the others. These numbers would imply that there had been a rebound since the time of John Work.

Work's estimate indicated that the eastern Kutenai were more numerous than the western (lower). Warre and Vavasour's figures, supposedly derived from H.B.C. sources, say the same thing, and this supports the general impression conveyed by travel accounts. But it is probable that the more mobile eastern Kutenai were more difficult to count because they were spread out over such a vast area, and numbers of them were apt to be absent hunting with other tribes, or by themselves in parties as small as a single family (Stanley 1970:154).

The ratios of men to women in the two branches of these people as presented by Work (1830) suggest that there were proportionately far fewer men among the eastern Kutenai; they were exposed more to warfare with the Piegans. Warre and Vavasour's ratios are not to be trusted.

We already noted the number of 5.9 individuals per Kutenai lodge at the Flathead Rendezvous. Statistics were also given by Ross (1825) for the Flathead, Pend d'Oreille, Nez Perce, and Spokan (Table 2). The Flathead and Pend d'Oreille each had 7.3 persons per lodge, the Spokan had 7.5, and the Nez Perce had 5.5. It is not easy to determine how significant these numbers are, if accurate, whether they reflect cultural preference, difficulties of travel, or other logistic problems. One would expect that those who had come the farthest, the Nez Perce, Spokan, and Kutenai, would have had fewer lodges with them and more people per lodge. Conversely, those who came the farthest might have had fewer elders and invalids among them. In fact, it comes as something of a surprise to note that there were so few people per lodge in any of the tribes at the Rendezvous.

Also in Table 2 we can see that the Kutenai had very few children among them, less than one per woman. In that regard they most closely resembled the other tribe most exposed to warfare, the Flathead. They also most closely resembled the Flathead in the ratio of "men and lads" to women. It is, of course, possible that many women and children had been left behind in the Kutenai country since the total of 212 Kutenai

Table 2. Counts from Tribes Trading at the Flathead Rendezvous of November, 1824, at Prairie des Cheveaux, Clark Fork River, Montana.

Tribe	Lodges	Men & Lads	Women	Children	Total	Total / Lodges	Men & Lads / Women	Women / Children
Flathead	42	168	70	68	306	7.3	2.4	1.03
Pend d'Oreille	34	108	68	71	247	7.3	1.6	.96
Kutenai	36	114	50	48	212	5.9	2.3	1.04
Nez Perce	12	28	15	23	66	5.5	1.9	.65
Spokan	4	12	7	11	30	7.5	1.7	.64

SOURCE: Alexander Ross (1825). The tribes are presented in the order in which they traded at the Rendezvous.

is far below Work's near-contemporary total of 349 given for the eastern branch of these people. With the Flathead, however, it is harder to believe that parts of families represented at the Rendezvous were elsewhere. Complicating the issue is Ross' idiosyncratic way of counting heads, so that we are left wondering if many male children were counted among the "men and lads" and if most of the children enumerated were female. Just the same, we would be timid to avoid at least entertaining the possibility that those tribes indulging most in warfare with the Plains tribes were short of both women and children. That they may have been short of women of course directly contradicts what we already remarked concerning Work's statistics of 1830.

The most general conclusion one can draw from the population estimates is that the Kutenai did not suffer any dramatic diminution in numbers in the last century, or if they did, they were able to make up the losses. Except for an influenza epidemic of 1849-50 (Anderson 1850), a famine of 1851-52 (Anderson 1852), and "high mortality" among the Kutenai in 1865 (Finlayson 1865c), we know of no unusual mortality, not even any smallpox epidemics. But this only means that our data are very sketchy.

II. NARRATIVE OF THE KOOTENAY FUR TRADE

1792 - 1811

Probably the first contact the Kutenai Indians had with Europeans was with Peter Fidler, a Hudson's Bay Company explorer, who reached a point in the Rockies near Crowsnest Pass in 1792 (MacGregor 1966, in Dempsey 1973: 11). By 1795 the Kutenai were already coveting the trade goods of the Europeans, for in late February of that year, Duncan McGillivray noted in his journal at Fort George on the North Saskatchewan River that:

> The most general news among the natives is this.-- That the Contonées a tribe from the Southwest are determined to force their way this year to the Fort or perish in the attempt: rumour reports that their Chief has got a parchment Roll written by the Spaniards to the traders of this quarter, the contents of which are unknown. The Gens du Large and all the other nations of this neighborhood wishing to retain an exclusive trade among themselves, have hitherto prevented the Intentions of this Band, of commencing a friendly intercourse with the Fort, in order to exclude them from any share of our commodities, which they are well aware would put their enemies in a condition to defend themselves, from the attacks of those who are already acquainted with the use of arms.
>
> The Coutonées have already made several attempts to visit us, but they have been always obstructed by their enemies and forced to relinquish their design with loss:--This year however it is reported that they intend obtaining a safe passage hither by bribing their enemies with Bands of Horses. Whether this method will succeed we cannot judge, but it is shrewdly suspected that a party will be formed to intercept as usual their progress to this quarter [Morton 1929:55-56].

Dempsey (1973:11) has inferred from this that the Blackfeet tribes were profiting from re-selling European goods to the Kutenai, but it seems just as likely from the quotation and the years following 1795 that the Blackfeet were more worried about the guns, as Thompson said (Tyrrell 1916:375). What is so nearly incredible is the distance these Kutenai were struggling to cross; Fort George was near the eastern boundary of present-day Alberta (Nicks 1970:36). In other words, had the Kutenai reached the fort they would have come some 400 miles from the nearest point of their home territory as we now know it.

Three years later, in 1798, two Kutenai reached Edmonton House, a Hudson's Bay Company post on the North Saskatchewan not as far east as Fort George. They were in the company of some friendly Piegans and brought no furs, though reporting their country to have them in abundance. The next year an H.B.C. trader at Edmonton noted that "Beaver are said to be numerous in the Country of the Cotta na ha's and nothing will prevent the Canadians [North West Company] getting part of them" (Edmonton House Journals, in Dempsey 1973:11). And in that year they made their move to get close to the Rockies so that the Kutenai could visit without the threat of their enemies.

In June, 1799, a canoe of six North West men left Fort Augustus, the opposing number to Edmonton, and paddled upstream to begin Rocky Mountain House. They were turned back by Cree opposed to the idea, but eventually succeeded in the fall. As soon as the Hudson's Bay Company traders knew where the new fort was established, they sent their own party up the North Saskatchewan to found the competing Acton House (Dempsey 1973:11-12).

It is apparent that much of the reason for the two companies having moved eastward across the middle of Alberta, founding a string of posts along the North Saskatchewan, was the Kutenai and their furs. It seems a clear case of these Indians' having brought the fur trade upon themselves by their own desire, so that we need not think that it was foisted upon unwilling victims.

During the construction of the two forts near the Rockies, Rocky Mountain House and Acton House, messages were sent to the Kutenai by some friendly Piegans, but it was nearly a year before it was learned that some were approaching the river. It was later discovered that on their journey the Kutenai had been harrassed by Piegans who stole their horses and threatened to kill them (Dempsey 1973:12), which might explain the delay. On learning of their approach, David Thompson of the North West Company started from Rocky Mountain House on the 5th of October, 1800. With him were Legasse (or Legacé), Beauchamp, Norrin, Boulard, Pierre Daniel, a Cree named He Dog, and Old Bear, the Piegan guide, all on horseback and carrying goods to the value of 300 beaver skins.

Ascending the Red Deer River, Thompson learned that the Kutenai would be on the mountain heights on the morrow. On the 14th, he met the Kutenai chief with 26 men, 7 women and 11 horses at the fort of a high cliff. The next day he followed the Indians to their camp, travelling all day over a bad road, and for the next two days Thompson traded with some while others gambled and stole horses, whose we are not informed. Then, prevailing on some of the Kutenai to follow him back to Rocky Mountain House, Thompson reached it on the 20th, taking only a couple of days to get back. There he traded from them 110½ beaver, 10 bear skins, 2 wolverines, and 5 fishers. Thompson conversed with the Kutenai on the geography of their country, and asked them to come again to guide him into their lands west of the continental divide. He then fitted out Legacé and Leblanc to winter there. The Kutenai and the two French-Canadian traders departed on the 22nd of October (Thompson Journals, Vol. 6, Bk. 13, in Coues 1897(2):703n-704n; Dempsey 1965; 1973:12).

Charles Legacé and Leblanc were thus the first fur traders to enter the Kutenai country, where they stayed during the winter of 1800-01. We do not know how they crossed the mountains nor where they wintered. Since it is more than likely that they returned with the Kutenai via Red Deer River, they would most likely have travelled over Kicking Horse Pass, the route followed now by Canada Highway 1 through Banff National Park. That would have put them down in the Rocky Mountain Trench somewhere north of Lake Windermere. Since the men were wintering it is not likely that they would have travelled around very much. Perhaps some of the details will emerge from a study of Thompson's unpublished journals.

It is important to notice that the two men went alone with the Kutenai, showing from the start a complete trust in these people and a confidence in their ability to provide protection from the Piegans. This sort of relationship was to characterize the fur trade with them ever after. The only other tribe in the Pacific Northwest trusted to this degree was to be the Flathead.

If it is true that Legacé and Leblanc travelled over the Kicking Horse Pass, or less likely the Vermilion Pass a short ways farther south, it is noteworthy that Thompson did not use a pass in that area again, so far as we know. This was most likely because of the everlasting problems raised by the Piegans, who would make even the Howse Pass, used in 1807-1811 much further north, a risky route, eventually leading Thompson to discover the Athabasca Pass as a way to completely obviate the Piegan threat.

In June of 1801, presumably after the return of Legacé and Leblanc, Thompson attempted himself to cross the Rockies, but his guide misled him and he found himself staring at an impassable barrier (Dempsey 1973:12). However, in that same year a party of 26 Kutenai arrived at Rocky Mountain House, and they traded most of their furs to the North West Company rather than yielding to the H.B.C. competitors at Acton House. A Kutenai youth, apparently in another party or alone, was killed that year trying to also make his way to the posts on the North Saskatchewan (Dempsey 1973:12).

The interesting gap in North West Company attempts to trade with the Kutenai between 1801 and 1806 is partly explained by the temporary closure of both Rocky Mountain House and Acton House during these years 1802-1805 (Smyth 1978:1; Dempsey 1973:12). Dempsey notes that the Kutenai failed to arrive at Rocky Mountain House in 1802, and Piegan pressure was probably to blame. Apparently another reason was the troublesome competition from small posts established by the XY Company, a loosely amalgamated split-off from the North West Company, lower down the North Saskatchewan. But in 1804, the traders of the XY Company came back into the fold. Shaeffer (1966) discovered a Kutenai tradition that Legacé and Leblanc may have continued trading with the Kutenai after 1801 and that one of them may have been even killed by the Kutenai.

In 1806, Thompson received orders to resume trade with the Kutenai, Rocky Mountain House having been re-opened the previous year to make that possible (Dempsey 1973:12). There is some likelihood that in giving this order, the partners of the North West Company were responding to the news of the bold Lewis and Clark expedition which they had received in 1805 (Winther 1969:27-28). In any event, it is just to conclude that to some extent the Kutenai trade was being observed and directed by men as far east as Montreal.

Jaco Finlay, one of Thompson's assistants and one of the few fur traders whose bones have been almost positively identified by archaeologists, was set to work cutting a trail through Howse Pass in 1806 (Spry 1968:xciii), and he also went on over to determine the trade potential. He reported back that the prospects were not very good, leading Thompson to decide to remain for the winter at Rocky Mountain House (Dempsey 1973: 12). Finlay seems to have established a small post at the headwaters of the Saskatchewan where he spent the winter of 1806-07. Tyrrell (1916:375) speculated that Finaly may have occupied this post earlier, suggesting that a more continuous contact with the Kutenai may have been maintained after all.

How the Howse Pass was discovered we are uncertain. Irene Spry (1968:xciii) has claimed that this was the one followed by Thompson in his meeting with the Kutenai of 1800, but the geography provided by Coues (1897) makes this seem unlikely.

In 1807 David Thompson finally crossed the mountains. By his own account the "murder" of two Piegans by the Lewis and Clark expedition in July of 1806 on the Missouri had drawn the Piegans south to find revenge, giving him his opportunity to cross unmolested (Tyrrell 1916:375). This, then, seems to be the third reason for the possible gap in the contacts from 1802 through 1805. After crossing, Thompson first erected a warehouse at Canterbury Point at the northwest corner of Lake Windermere, but because of a "lack of water," moved about a mile to the northwest, on the north side of the mouth of Toby Creek, where it flows into the Columbia.

The new post, later referred to as "Old Fort Kootenae," was "strongly stockaded on three sides, the other side resting on the steep bank of the River." The logs of the "House," stockades, and bastions were made of larch and were all "ball proof" as were the logs of the "houses (Tyrrell 1916:376). It will be observed here that Thompson writes the word 'house' in both the singular and plural, making the number of buildings rather uncertain. This is the only Kootenay post which we know for certain was fortified.

Earlier in this section we passed by without commenting on the mysterious Spanish parchment mentioned by McGillivray because we didn't know what to say besides words of skepticism. In the fall of 1807 there was a similarly mysterious feeler from the south, but this time from an American. Thompson received a letter from a Lieutenant Jeremy Pinch, otherwise unknown to history, who threatened to expel the British traders if they failed to obey American regulations and if they did not cease supplying arms to the Indians. Thompson replied none too hurriedly in December from Kootenay House and he disclaimed responsibility for settling the boundary question and then forwarded copies of the correspondence back east; they eventually reached the Foreign Office in London. Pinch's location is unknown; the Kutenai reported to Thompson that 42 Americans were at a location suggestive of modern Lewiston, Idaho, but Pinch's letter was dated at Polito Palton Lake, perhaps Flathead Lake (Elliott 1925; G. Fuller 1966:75-76).

The significance of the Pinch exchange lies in the ease with which the Kutenai could keep informed of movements at a distance from their lands, and secondly that the factor of the threat of American competition in the Kutenai fur trade was present from almost the beginning. Like his successors all the way into the late 1850s, this British trader was not going to let himself be stopped by the bombast that Americans often hurled at foreigners.

Aside from the excitement of unexpected mail, the traders with Thompson nearly starved in the fall of 1807; they were obliged to eat several horses until the Columbia River salmon run appeared. At well over 1000 river miles from the sea, the spot Thompson had picked for his post was still within reach of migratory salmon. The winter of 1807-08 was spent also under the threat of Piegan revenge for the introduction of guns among the Kutenai (Tyrrell 1916).

Thompson was bothered by Piegan spies to whom he showed the defenses of his fort, with good effect. But during the spring a party of 40 besieged him and six of his men for three weeks before giving up. Thompson's foresight in placing the fort on the river bank paid off when he kept himself supplied with water by lowering a kettle over the bank each night (Tyrrell 1916:379-81). This probably explains why the first site chosen, on the banks of Lake Windermere, was rejected--because there would probably have been a beach to cross to get water. Just before going off to their own side of the mountains, the Piegans apparently encountered a party of Kutenai while out hunting and were intimidated. In other words, the latter had been elsewhere during the siege.

On returning home the Piegans were harangued by their civil chief who supposedly directed his men to return "to crush the white men and the natives on the west side of the mountains, before they became well armed," going on to say, "They have always been our slaves (Prisoners) and now they will pretend to equal us . . . ." (Tyrrell 1916:381). How Thompson learned of this and other deliberations among the Piegans is not made clear, but it seems that Thompson did have sources among the Piegans, including the War Chief, Kootenae Appee, whose interesting name is not explained.

A second expedition of about 300 Piegan warriors under Kootenae Appee was mounted, and after crossing the mountains waited twenty miles away while two spies were sent again to survey the defenses of Fort Kootenae. Thompson entertained the Piegans again and gave them presents to take back to the lurking Kootenae Appee, along with the warning that Thompson could not protect them from the wrath of the Kutenai! The strategem of sending gifts worked; having been overcome with a need for the more than 14 feet of rope tobacco Thompson sent, the Piegans went back home. For by their code, they could not accept gifts and then strike the giver (Tyrrell 1916:381-384). The chronology of the Thompson *Narrative* is at this point confused, and it is possible that the second Piegan expedition may have occurred during the winter of 1808-09. This very interesting period can be properly understood only when the manuscript journals are examined.

In the spring of 1808, Thompson left Kootenae House, went upstream to the portage at Canal Flats between Columbia Lake and the Kootenay River, and then voyaged down that river "to look for Indians" (Tyrrell 1916:385). After 24 days of travel he and his party reached Kootenay Lake on the 14th of May, 1808, "after much loitering along the river looking for Indians, whom at length we found near, and at the lake" (Tyrrell 1916:386). It is interesting that the traders saw few or no Indians from Columbia Lake to the area just upstream from Bonners Ferry, Idaho. The season of the year may explain this absence, for at this time of year the Kutenai would have likely abandoned their winter habitations at the low altitudes along the river to go off in search of roots and game.

The day after portaging around Kootenay Falls between present-day Libby and Troy, Montana, Thompson found a village of ten lodges containing both Kutenai and "Lakes" Indians. Here, as elsewhere, we witness the upper and lower Kutenai together, which means that while they could be distinguished with ease by the fur traders, they did not always have exclusive settlements or economies. Although the fur traders were, as often the case, starving, the Indians had just a few dried "carp" of the previous year and some bread of black moss to share. This would accord with the pattern of food shortages at this time of year. Despite the great distance Thompson now was from the Continental Divide, he learned of a Piegan raid made but a few days before in which 35 Kutenai horses had been stolen.

After having encountered a number of small camps of the lower Kutenai, Thompson began his return, a laborious one in which he learned the route of the Moyie River straight through the mountains to Fort Kootenae, using horses he had purchased in the vicinity of present Bonners Ferry (Tyrrell 1916:389-395). During that summer of 1808, the traders crossed over to the North Saskatchewan and canoed down to Rainy River House where they turned in their furs and resupplied themselves for the next year of work across the mountains.

Thompson arrived back at his Fort Kootenae in mid-November, 1808, and took up residence there for the winter, feeling safe, he said, from the Piegans because of the depth of the snow. At this juncture he sent Finan McDonald off with horses and goods to take up residence in the "Lake Indian country" (Tyrrell 1916:398-399).

The place where Finan, James McMillan, and their assistants spent the winter has been a subject of many footnotes, partly because of its intrinsic interest as the earliest building in Montana or Idaho, depending upon where the establishment was really located. A leading Thompson scholar, T.C. Elliott, stated in a speech at Bonners Ferry that the men spent the winter in a leather lodge above Kootenay Falls in Montana, probably at the mouth of Rainy Creek, and there also built a log hut to protect their trading goods and furs (Elliott 1926:284). More recently, Catherine White (1950: 234) claimed that Finan "made his camp on the Kootenai River, almost opposite Libby, Montana, and thus was the first to establish a trading outpost in the present state of Montana." Elsewhere she writes that "McDonald and his companions pitched their two leather tents and built a 'hangard' or log storehouse for their goods" (White 1950:c, citing Tyrrell's [1916] footnotes and two un-named histories of Montana).

In the spring of the year before, 1808, Thompson on the 27th of April had noted that he saw "a fine site for a House, but on the West side of the river" while passing through the Fisher River-Libby area (in Pate 1929). And on the 26th of August, 1809, Thompson recorded:

> A very fine day -- at 7 AM set off [from Fisher River] and went down to the Hangard of last winter -- here we put ashore and I arranged Mr. McDonald and 2 men to go down to the Lake Indians and to trade Horses -- about an Hour's time they returned having found 2 Kootanaes, 1 came with them -- there are 5 Men close to us who soon paid us a visit -- thank God we have now hunters etc but they could kill us nothing here . . . [White 1950:36].

According to White, the term 'hangard' was commonly used by men of the North West Company. Its French etymology includes the term 'hangar' used to indicate a building for carriages.

Although White (1950:36) believes the hangard was opposite Libby, I am inclined not to think so because there were three rapids between the site of the hangard and the falls of the Kootenay, but more especially because of Thompson's journal entry of the 25th of May, 1810, which seems to fix the place even better. Working his way upriver with both horses and canoes, Thompson wrote:

> At 7 AM set off [;] at 8 AM at the end of the House Point -- smart trot -- at 9 AM the Canoes passed and we set off -- went up a very high bank and along do [ditto] -- good -- to avoid rocks and water road, now inundated -- then descended at a brook [White 1950:120].

A close reading reveals that Thompson had camped the previous night at about the mouth of Rainy Creek. Thus the House Point which he transversed in an hour of horseback riding would be the terrace that extends for five or six miles south and southeast of the mouth of Rainy Creek, on the right or north bank of the Kootenay. The term 'point' is sometimes used in fur trade journals of the period to refer to a terrace along a river.

One might well be excused for inferring from Thompson's entry of 1810 that the house point was so named because there was or had been a house on it, even if he made no reference to a structure. This seems, then, to be the best clue to the location of the Finan house of the winter of 1808-09. From reading the several writers who have commented on this question, one suspects that there is relevant material in the unpublished journals, not those covering this stretch of the river, which have all been published by White (1950), but those of the winter of 1808-09, which still have not seen the light.

If the terrace south of the mouth of Rainy Creek was in fact the site of the Finan McDonald House, it would seem a reasonable choice for several reasons. It was presumably within reach of both the lower Kutenai and those of the upper segment who lived above Kootenay Falls. It had good sun exposure, an essential for a winter location; the terrace and the hillsides to the northeast were probably not completely timbered, as they still are not, affording some grazing for horses. One of the Kutenai village sites noted by Thompson in 1810 (White 1950) was, at the mouth of the Fisher River, close enough to provide some protection, if inhabited, yet far enough away to prevent friction. The site was also on the safer side of the river, meaning that Piegan war parties would have to find canoes to cross; and further, the site was not visible to spies around the mouth of the Fisher. This is probably building too much of a case, but one might as well consider every possible factor.

The problem of McDonald's and McMillan's 'hangard' is not disposed of quite as quickly as this, however. In a context of the *Narrative* suggesting that the time is 1807, Thompson writes " . . . half of these goods under the charge of Mr. Finan McDonald I sent to make a trading post at a considerable Lake in McGillivray's River . . ." (Tyrrell 1916:378-379). Tyrrell dismissed this remark, written years after the fact, as an anachronism, having been unable to find corroboration in the unpublished journals. But under the year of 1808 in the *Narrative*, Thompson states that he "Sent off Horses and goods to the Lake Indian Country," which Tyrrell (1916:399) believed to refer to the same event recorded by mistake under 1807, even though the two entries are but 20 pages apart in the published version. One should observe that Thompson refers in the 1807 entry to "a considerable lake in McGillivray's river" as if to imply that this lake had not yet been seen, which it had by the winter of 1808. Nevertheless, it is probable that Tyrrell was correct, for there are other chronological enigmas in the *Narrative*, but we should not dismiss the problem out of hand until the journals themselves have been completely combed. It is pertinent to mention here that the manuscript journals I have seen on microfilm are extremely fragmented, indicating that Thompson carried several books around with him.

While some of his men were down the Kootenay River, Thompson himself spent the winter of 1808-09 at his Kootenay House near the source of the Columbia. To preserve meat he constructed a facility that is of interest, relating in his *Narrative* that:

> As there was now plenty of shore ice of sufficient thickness, we made a Glacier for frozen meat. This is a square of about twelve feet, the bottom and the sides lined with ice; in this we placed one hundred and sixty thighs and shoulders of red deer [elk], and forty-seven thighs of antelopes [probably mule deer]; . . . In these meat glaciers, a layer of meat is laid on the ice, and then a layer of ice, and thus continued: when the warm weather comes on, it is covered with fine branches of the Pine [Tyrrell 1916:400].

Thompson and his men also spent some time, as in the previous winter, at catching and hunting the numerous wild horses in the valley.

Another thing we can see in the quotation just cited is the desire to draw the Kutenai southward into the Flathead country to hunt for the traders. Thompson may have helped to start the Kutenai tendency to gravitate southward, something that happened whenever they lacked an active trading post in their own territory. At the time of this writing, there was quite evidently no functioning post there; the fort at Toby Creek was still standing and still to see some further use, but it was not now occupied.

With the year of 1810 came also the first European competition for the furs of the Kutenai and their neighbors on the west side of the Divide. In the summer, Joseph Howse of the Hudson's Bay Company came across through Howse Pass, and after a temporary setback travelled down the Kootenay River and established a trading house at either Flathead Lake or on Pend d'Oreille Lake. James McMillan and Nicholas Montour of the North West Company were sent along from the North Saskatchewan to watch the motions of Howse and to probably offer competition (Coues 1897(2):611, 656).

In an entry of the 22nd of October, 1910, Alexander Henry wrote that a Cree had just come across the Rockies from the Kutenai country where he had accompanied Howse's party, some freemen who tagged along, and their North West Company shadows. These had, Henry wrote, "been prevented from descending further by the Piegans and Fall Indians [from east of the Piegans], who were watching our people on McGillivray's [Kootenay] River." The party was stalled at the "Old Kootenay House" (Coues 1897(2):656). Olga Johnson (1950) is of the opinion that Howse eventually established himself at the Pend d'Oreille River near Kullyspell House, which would have been according to pattern; other scholars have opted for Flathead Lake, which would have put Howse into more prolonged contact with the Kutenai.

While Howse at least passed through the Kutenai lands going both ways, the impact of this visit was probably not important since there is little to distinguish between the modes of operation of the two companies at this time. And, as we have seen, the Kutenai already had experience of seeing the North West Company and the H.B.C. competing for their trade on the North Saskatchewan River. Howse's results must not have been terribly good, for the H.B.C. left the area alone for more than a decade. When it did swallow up the N.W.C. in the merger of 1821, it seriously considered abandoning the trade of the whole Pacific Northwest as possibly unprofitable.

The justly famous David Thompson manuscript map of western Canada and the Pacific Northwest which he dated "1813 and 1814," and signed, shows a North West Company post at the site of the present town of Bonners Ferry, Idaho (Coues 1897:endpapers to Vol. 3; Tyrrell 1916:endpapers). No other posts are shown in the Kootenay Valley except the one at Toby Creek. Coues (1897(2):675) thought that the Bonners Ferry post was the one used by McDonald and McMillan in 1808-09, but I think that we have disposed of this likelihood from the absence of a reference to such a post in the journals of 1809 and 1810 (White 1950).

Before returning to the Kutenai country in the latter part of 1808, Thompson had been ordered by his partners Donald McTavish and John McDonald of Garth to take in two kegs of alcohol for trading. This was contrary to the wishes of Thompson, who wanted no liquor in the Kutenai trade. To solve the dilemma he loaded the kegs on a vicious horse so that by the end of the first day out the kegs were empty. He then wrote his partners to tell them of this misshap and vowed to do the same with every other keg he was obliged to carry west of the mountains. Here Thompson set a very important precedent that was followed in the Columbia interior until the end of the British fur trade, with only very minor exceptions. The Indians of the interior Pacific Northwest were spared the evils of the liquor trade, though not the pleasures of an occasional "dram" that was customary for chiefs at the beginning of each season's trade.

As it is beyond our immediate needs to continue following Thompson's very involved itinerary through the next four years, and because it lay mainly outside of the Kutenai country, we will simply advert to the individual events or facts that have bearing on the Kutenai fur trade. The essential one here is that in 1809 Thompson fanned out over the country to the south, and after the winter of 1810-11, the Kutenai were no longer to be the central focus of Thompson's interest, nor was the major transportation route to go any longer through their country.

In 1809, David Thompson established Kullyspell House on the eastern shore of Lake Pend d'Oreille, and then Saleesh (Flathead) House up the Clark Fork River near Thompson's Falls. And in the year after that some of his men built Spokane House at the mouth of the Little Spokane River, which within two years became the headquarters for the trade between the Cascades and the Rockies.

In early May of 1810, as Thompson was at Saleesh House preparing for the long journey back over the Rockies to the Saskatchewan, he noted in his journal that he:

> Arranged Michel with a letter for Mr. [Finan] McDonald to trade what provisions he can [in the Flathead country to the east] and send them to the Poil de Castor [Fisher River] by the hands of Michel and Boulard, and also to get what Kootanaes he can to come and hunt for us [Elliott 1920:169].

Evidently Thompson could not depend on finding provisions to feed his brigade that was about to ascend the Kootenay River, not surprising since he had nearly faced starvation along that stream in 1808. In contrast, the Flathead area was to continue to be the primary source of provisions derived from buffalo meat and fat throughout the fur trade. It was apparently too difficult for the Kutenai to bring much of a surplus of buffalo meat and fat across the Rockies directly to their valley, but it is extremely likely that some of the provisions that were purchased through the years to the east of Flathead House were bought of the Kutenai.

In his journey through the Bonners Ferry area in mid-May of 1810 and on up the Kootenay, Thompson makes no mention of a trading post there except for a cryptic reference to having camped on the 17th of May "at the old Hoard" which was one hour by horseback upstream from the crossing over the Kootenay at Bonners Ferry (White 1950:118). Since the 'Hoard' is too far east to be the post marked on the map, and since it is not the McDonald-McMillan 'hangard,' then it must be something else. And it must be also something built later than May of 1810.

The best evidence for the Bonners Ferry post is in a Thompson journal entry of 14 November 1811 in which he states:

> Learning [by courier] from Bercier and Methode that the Lake [Flatbow] Indians do not hunt, but only gamble and keep the men starving, I told them as the season was fast advancing to lay up the furrs they have, about 4 packs, and make the best of their way back to Kinville and return to the Skeetshoo [Spokane] River with all the property etc. as to keep up a post there, with so few goods is expense to no purpose [Elliott 1918:172].

The interpretation we can make, following Elliott's lead, is that Michel Kinville was maintaining a post while Bercier and Methode were camped further north with the Flatbow Kutenai. It would also appear that the post was then abandoned before the winter of 1811-12, but other evidence makes that questionable. This is a notation in a Thompson Journal of 15 March of 1812 that ". . . at 9.42 a.m. stopped 1½H [hour] to try and send some young man to Kinville on McGillivray River, but they were off at Beaver in the Hills" (Elliott 1920:173). This makes it appear that Kinville had either wintered at the post on the Kootenay River or had reoccupied his former station during the spring.

Elliott (1920:165) wrote that he visited a spot at the mouth of Deep Creek about four miles west and north from Bonners Ferry where the Indians told him a trading post had been maintained at one time. The problem with this tradition as an explanation for the N.W.C. post on Thompson's map is that it is clearly marked at the present site of Bonners Ferry and not at the mouth of Deep Creek, which is also shown. Having looked at it from a couple of miles away, I thought that the mouth of Deep Creek was low, swampy ground, so the Indian tradition may be in error. The place is also unlikely because the "Lake Indian Road," the long portage between Lake Pend d'Oreille and the Kootenay River, almost certainly came down to the river right at the town, which was separated from the mouth of the creek by the now drained Paddlers' Lake. A post at Deep Creek would have been therefore separated from the main line of travel by two or three miles of swamp and river.

That the location at Bonners Ferry is marked with a tiny square on Thompson's map while nothing is shown at the location of the 'Hangard' of 1808-09 is suggestive that the former was something larger. But lest we think it was something much larger we should note that Thompson's winter camp at Boat Encampment at the mouth of the Canoe River is marked with the identical square and "N.W.Co." beside it. Thompson was there for just two months, January and February of 1811, just after having come through the

Athabasca Pass for the first time. At that place he probably built no more than a cabin or two. So the post marked at Bonners Ferry could have been just a cabin also, and it was probably unfortified since it was out of the range of the Piegans. Much more of a problem is the one of how long the Kinville post continued to be used.

1812 - 1826

Catherine White (1950:c) has said that three years after the winter of 1808-09, therefore in 1812, a post was put up "nearly opposite" Jennings, Montana. This place is in the very crook of the elbow of the Kootenay River, where it turns abruptly northwest to head toward Kootenay Lake. It is also but a half-dozen or so miles upstream from the inferred McDonald/ McMillan house. However, nowhere in the White edition of selections from the Thompson journals can I find the evidence. This claim is, however, based upon a solid tradition that arises from a number of sources, none of them contemporary to the possible post in this location. These sources include John Campbell, John Pate, Jacob Meyers, a remark by Elliott (1920: 165) and a series of maps, especially those published by the Arrowsmith Company of London. One has to be cautious about traditions like these because they are sometimes dead wrong, such as the frequent claim that a grist mill was established near Kettle Falls in 1816, a story that may have been started by Jacob Meyers. Nevertheless, the fact of a post across the river from Jennings seems compelling just from the weight and diversity of testimony, let alone the many maps, so perhaps we should not be so timorous over the present lack of contemporary evidence. The time when it was in use there is quite another question.

Without any doubt there was a post, frequently called a fort, that before 1825 stood somewhere along the river from Libby on upstream, to the vicinity of the Fisher River. This is plain from the following diary entry of 8 November, 1825, by John Work:

> Mr. Kittson sent off his people [from Spokane House], five men with nine horses and the Kootany outfit on horses to the Forks [mouth of the Spokane] where they are to embark in a canoe or small boat and proceed up the Columbia to the entrance of McGillivrays Kootany River, up which they are to continue to a place called the falls about half a days march below the Old Fort, where they are to build. This road is taken in obedience to orders received from Governor Simpson [Elliott 1914b:177-178].

Placing the 'Old Fort' precisely between Libby and Jennings at the mouth of the Fisher depends on what a half-day's march might be, and whether on horseback or afoot. Libby is about 11 miles above the falls, Rainy Creek is about 15 miles up, and Jennings is at 21 miles. Above Jennings the Kootenay River emerges from a tortuous canyon through which it has run for some 50 miles due south from the Tobacco Plains. Nowhere in that stretch does there seem to be a place suitable for a post or for wintering horses, nor are there any traditions of a post along there. All of the possibilities we cited could be eligible, but the flat across from Jennings seems by far the best choice.

That is because the reason for moving the fort downstream was partly to control the movements of the Kutenai. Work wrote:

> . . . the Fort being situated farther down the river will be the means of keeping the Indians in a part of the country, where beaver are more numerous than where they usually hunt near the Flat Head lands. Another advantage attending this tract [the Kootenay River navigation] is that if necessary they [the fur traders] will be able to put out much earlier in the spring [for the trip back to Colvile] [Elliott 1914b:178].

It is obvious that a move of only eleven miles from Libby to the falls would not have made any significant difference in keeping the Kutenai on their own turf. But the mouth of the Fisher or Beaver Skin River was at the north end of the "Kootenay Road" that led south up that stream and over to the Flathead post on Clark's Fork. Moving the fort away from this road would have been possibly efficacious, though Work may have been over-optimistic. We seem obliged, just the same, to state that the "Old Fort," probably the one put up under Montour for the North West Company, was across from the mouth of the Fisher.

John Campbell, an employee of the H.B.C. late in the Kootenay fur trade history, claimed that the North West Company "built a permanent trader's post, known as Fort Kootenai" at a point nearly opposite Jennings. Further, he said that it "was built by one Montour" (1918b). By Ross Cox (1831) we are informed that Montour was stationed at Kootenay in the winter of 1812-13, and since we have no information about a post being occupied earlier in 1812, it is very possible that Campbell was right.

Before we continue our reliance on John Campbell, it is best to say a few more things about him. He came across to the Oregon Country with the second Sinclair expedition in 1854, passing through the Kootenay Valley (Campbell 1916; Lent 1963; Johnson 1969). He was then a young man. Subsequently he worked for the H.B.C., both at Fort Colvile and in the Kutenai country, to which he returned in 1864 (Campbell 1915a, 1918b), travelling via the big bend at the Fisher mouth, as he had going the other way in 1854. Campbell married Lucille Berland, a daughter of the H.B.C. trader Edward Berland. The latter supervised the Kootenay trade from 1840 until his death in 1853, and had worked for the H.B.C. in the Rocky Mountains from at least 1830 on. Thus Campbell had good links with much of the Kootenay fur trade history.

In fact, however, Campbell (1918a) claimed to have received his information on the earlier posts only from Indians. Whether he included his "half-breed" wife Lucille in this category we do not know. In reciting the traders who ran the Kootenay posts before 1854, Campbell in more than one instance (1918a, 1918c) presented the sequence: Montour, Paget (Payette?), Flett, Berland, which accords well with the facts as we know them from other sources. All of these men served before Campbell's first arrival in the country, which gives him rather good credibility. Campbell, of course, leaves out several names, among which Kittson's is probably the most noticeable.

Campbell is equally direct in stating that the Hudson's Bay Company also had a post "nearly opposite the Fisher River mouth on the west side of the Kootenay River on a long low ____?____ running toward the river." This, he says, was also built by Montour, and nowhere in the transcripts of Campbell's letters does he say whether the H.B.C. actually took over the post built by the North West Company, or had its own. The H.B.C. house was called by the Indian name Ahkleyie, Ahkiyou, or Chkiyee -- our transcripts are perhaps defective (Campbell 1918b, 1918c). One notes that in Campbell's writings there is no recognition of a possible shift of the post downstream by William Kittson in the later 1820s.

In the fall of 1864, Campbell notes (1915a) that he "saw . . . what looked as if there had been an old building a little above the mouth of the [Fisher] river." But this could have been the "remains of a log shanty" on the right bank of the Kootenay at the Indian and H.B.C. trail crossing that Thiebodo (1940:332) noticed in November of 1859, which he supposed had been where a party of immigrants from Minnesota had spent the previous winter. Surely, Campbell ought to have been able to tell the difference between a structure 24 years old and one of 6 years' standing.

He implies having actually seen an H.B.C. structure when he writes that it was "built as the rest were in a long low log building with a peaked roof of poles covered with cedar bark and earth on top with a fireplace built in one corner" (Campbell 1918b). This is hardly the description of even a most rudimentary fort, and we remain unconvinced that Campbell actually saw an H.B.C. one there, partly because the description seems to mirror later structures that Campbell actually lived in at and north of Tobacco Plains. There is the possibility, of course, that Thiebodo's log shanty was an old structure that the Minnesota immigrants of 1858 simply put to emergency use.

To return to our place we left in the chronology, 1812, we will tentatively conclude that the North West Company post of the winter of 1812-13 that was run by Micholas Montour was most likely at the flats opposite the Fisher mouth. Jacob Meyers, an early amateur but serious historian with strong links to the history of Fort Colvile, claimed after reconnaissance on the ground that the "Montour House of 1812-14" was on Lot 2, in the northwest corner of Section 18, Township 30 North, Range 29 West, Montana Meridian, on the "George Hathaway Place" (in Pate 1929). The site had at least one cellar visible at Meyers' visit in 1913. This description is of the flat nearly two miles west of the mouth of the Fisher and immediately west of the mouth of Canoe Gulch.

The supervisor of the North West Company's Spokane District was James McMillan in 1812, and the man "stationed among the Cootonais" was Montour. The Pacific Fur Company also established a headquarters at Spokane under the direction of John Clarke, who sent "Mr. Pillet," almost certainly Francois Payette, to oppose Moutour with six assistants (Cox 1831(1): 188-189). Ross Cox continues with one of the dramatic episodes of the Kootenay trade:

> In the beginning of May, Messrs. Farnham and Pillet returned from their wintering posts. [Farnham had been at the Flatheads.] Their success exceeded our anticipations. Both Flatheads and Cootanais made excellent winter hunts, and returned in the spring loaded with beaver. Mr. Pillet fought a duel with Mr. Montour of the North-west, with pocket pistols, at six paces; both hits; one, in the collar of the coat, and the other in the leg of the trousers. Two of their men acted as seconds, and the tailor speedily healed their wounds [Cox 1831(1):201].

Another version of this stormy competition was published by Alexander Ross (1904:210):

> Mr. Pillet, with some men and a supply of goods, was sent to the Cootanais to oppose Mr. Montour on the part of the North-West. Mr. Pillet travelled a great deal, and turned his time to good account. Both were zealous traders, and they could fight a duel as well as buy a skin, for they carried pistols as well as goods along with them. They therefore fought and traded alternately, but always spared the thread of life, and in the spring parted good friends.

It is evident that Ross could have borrowed the tale from Cox since the book by the former appeared some 18 years after that of the latter. Ross, nevertheless, was well acquainted with the period from participation, first with the Pacific Fur Company, then with the N.W.C., and finally with the H.B.C. As with Cox, there is so far no evidence that Ross ever entered the Kutenai country.

The location for this trading and duelling is, as we have seen, given as Cootanais. Since there was precedent for calling the people below Kootenay Falls the "Lakes," or "Flatbows," one could conclude that the post or posts in question were above the falls, the usual boundary between the two divisions. The account of Ross makes it seem as if Payette just travelled around, without a post, but it would have been difficult to protect trading inventory and furs without a place to house them.

Cox (1831(2):155) is certainly in error when he states that the "trading post established among the Cootonais is situated in about 49° 30' north latitude and 115° west longitude." It is more than likely that this was based upon knowledge of Thompson's first post at Toby Creek. No one between Thompson and Captain Thomas Blakiston in 1858 had the instruments to determine latitude and longitude anyway.

We have mentioned Meyers' location of the Montour post. He also stated unequivocally that the Payette post was in the east half of Section 32, Township 31 North, Range 30 West, Montana Meridian, which describes the mouth of Rainy Creek, the "Ben Thomas Place" (in Pate 1929). Meyers apparently saw a cellar depression here also. Of course, this is about where we situate the 'Hangard' of 1808-09, but it is possible that Payette

used the same place, or even the same structure. We have no way of knowing at present why Meyers reached the conclusions he did, and from Pate's articles it is evident that Meyers was at times ignorant of the sequence of events and companies.

As we have observed, the history of the Kootenay posts begins slipping into obscurity in 1811. There is one reference from 1814 that shows that there was still an active trading post, and that the route past it was still being used even though the way up the Columbia and over Athabasca Pass had come into use (Franchere 1969). The reference is a notation of January 3rd, 1814, made by Alexander Henry, who was now at Astoria, but soon to drown. He wrote that on that day the express for Fort William, consisting of two canoes, 15 persons and 17 packs each, left for the interior. One of the factors, James Keith, after stopping briefly at Spokane House, was to take the express as far as the Kootenay House. From there it was to go on to the posts on the North Saskatchewan, to reach Fort Augustus about the 15th of March (Coues 1897(2):781).

Kootenay appears on a list of North West Company posts of 1802-21 (H.B.C.A., A.64/26/2), and Alexander Ross (1825) implies in a statement of December, 1824, that the Kutenai had been trading in their own lands before that winter. Other than this, however, the nature of the Kootenay trade between 1814 and 1824 is a total blank.

In 1824, Governor George Simpson in his famous shake-up determined to abandon Spokane House in favor of a district headquarters at Kettle Falls, to be named Fort Colvile. Simpson believed that the Flathead and Kootenay posts could be supplied by river from Colvile, the Pend d'Oreille/ Clark's Fork River and the Kootenay River being used, respectively, since they both joined the Columbia above Kettle Falls.

Simpson (1825) instructed John Work as follows:

> The Cautany River we know to be navigable; it is not therefore necessary to examine it, but you will likewise forward the outfit for the post of that name by water--A few long portages must not interfere with this plan as the benefits to be derived from the change will more than counterbalance the additional trouble and personal labour it may give our people. If this plan is found to answer of which I have not the smallest doubt we shall be perfectly independent of the Indians in regard to horses which will be a great saving of property, and thereby we shall also avoid the chance of quarrels with the natives in regard to horse thieving as we shall have few or none to tempt them.

This was easier said than done. William Kittson was sent up the Kootenay River in a boat in the early winter of 1825, but his men could not manage the craft around the portages which were in need of some road-building. So he gave it up and went back around through Spokane to Flathead House. There he and his men spent a crowded winter with John Work and the Flathead party (Elliott 1914a, 1914b; Dease 1826a).

We turn for a moment to the journals of John Work to witness unusually detailed transactions between the Kutenai and the H.B.C. traders at the Flathead post in the winter of 1825-26, the second winter in which the traders failed to man the fort in the country of those deserving people. Work's record is as follows:

> Monday 12 [December, 1825]
>
> The Kootany chief with about a dozen of his men arrived and smoked but brought no furs with them as they said they intended to trade tomorrow. The Chief it seems has been occasionally accustomed to get a dram on his arrival, and on asking for it got a glass of run mixed with water, which, little as it was, with the smoking took him by the head and made him tipsy. A woman who goes in mens clothes & is a leading character among them was also tipsy with 3/4 of a glass of the mixed liquor and became noisy, some others of the leading men who got a little were not affected by it. Gave them some tobacco to smoke when they went off in the evening.
>
> When it was dark 3 Au Plattes, another band of Kootenais, arrived for some Tobacco to smoke, these people are all afoot and were not able to keep up with the main band who have horses. They are all said to have plenty of beaver . . .
>
> Tuesday 13
>
> The Kootenay chief with 60 to 80 of his people arrived in the morning, and after smoking & conversing to about 11 oclock a brisk trade was commenced and continued on to night, when all their furs & leather was traded, the Chief got some tobacco for his people to smoke in the night besides a small present of Ammunition and beads 4 Pluis [bunches]. A present was also given to, Bundosh [Berdache], a woman who assumes a masculine character and is of some note among them, she acted as interpreter for us, she speaks F. Head well. A little ammunition and tobacco was also given to some of the other leading men. The trade was as follows, 481 Large & 205 small beaver, 8 Otters, 1200 Rats, 6 Fishers, 7 Mink, 10 martens, 21 Elk skins, 27 Deer Skins, 9 parfleches & 31 fath[oms] cords, which may be considered an excellent trade as it is seldom or never that things come up to it in the fall. The Chief & indeed the whole of them went off apparently well pleased, though the trade is very cheap, except 12 guns, 3 blankets, and a few Kettles, principally ammunition & Tobacco.--
>
> Wednesday 14
>
> The Kootany Chief with some of his people visited the fort [Flathead] & Traded 15 beaver a few rats & some dressed skins . . . . [Elliott 1914b:190-191].

Friday 16th

> The Kootenasy [sic] Chief paid us another visit and after trading a lodge and some Deer skins, got a small present and in the evening took his final departuse for the winter. He is going with his people to hunt in their own lands not far from the fort on their own river, where they intend to live on deer and endeavour to get a few beaver. On account of the snow they are apprehensive that they will not be able to go sufficiently far off to make a great hunt.
>
> In different conversations with the Kootanies since their arrival they express a particular wish to have a fort in their own country, and represent the communication by water much less difficult than the Indians whom Mr. Kittson saw stated it to be, and say that the part which Mr. Kittson saw is the worst of it. They were told that they might depend on having an Establishment on their lands next season either by land or by water. Every means should be adopted to keep them on their own lands as they make much better hunt there than elsewhere. Their unprecedented trade this fall is to be mainly attributed to their hunting in the summer and fall on the upper waters of their own river and the Columbia. It is out of our power to send people & supplies with them at present for want of horses, the six we have here, some of them from the Snake Country, are so lean that they are totally unfit for the journey [Elliott 1914c:259-260].

On the 21st of December, well after saying he was off to his own lands, the Kutenai Chief reappeared at Flathead House with six of his men to smoke, trade a horse, a few saddles and some appichimons or saddle blankets made of buffalo skins (Elliott 1914c:261). As the winter wore on, small parties of Kutenai appeared occasionally, trading their furs for mainly ammunition, knives and tobacco (Elliott 1914c). Our off-hand impression is that the Kutenai traded quite a large number of furs and skins for a relatively paltry return. But the American competition was not yet felt and the Kutenai were at a disadvantage at such a distance from their river.

William Kittson had also been sent to move the Kootenay fort downstream during the winter of 1825-26, as we have already seen. But so far there is no evidence that he did this during the next or the following years when he was in charge of Kootenay. In a September letter of 1826, John McLoughlin, now the Chief Factor in charge of H.B.C. operations west of the Rockies, wrote in a circular letter that, "We could yet employ during three years a hundred more trappers than we have . . . twenty in the space of country which lies between Kootonais Portage [Sandpoint to Bonners Ferry], Canoe River and Kootonais house . . . ." (McLoughlin 1926b). It is clear from this that Kootenay House was not near the falls but much farther east in order to form a "space of country" triangular in shape.

But could it have been as far east as the mouth of the Fisher? There is troubling evidence in a sketch-map made by Captain Pleasonton, the U. S. Army adjutant at Fort Vancouver, which he made in 1859 from DeSmet's maps and verbal descriptions (Pleasonton 1859). On this map Libby Creek is very clearly identifiable and labeled as the "Old Fort River," and the Fisher is called the "Beaver Hair River," which matches Thompson's "Poil de Castor."

Which post this Old Fort of DeSmet might be is quite open to conjecture at this point. DeSmet's information was most likely based upon his journey up the Kootenay River in 1845. It is possible that this reference, by implication, to a post at Libby might be to the one that Kittson was ordered to establish (McLoughlin 1826c). Kittson spent the winter of 1926-27 at Kootenay, but in a letter of his written there in March of 1827 he makes no mention of having established a new post (Kittson 1927a). He was sent in, however, with only four men in October of 1826, and so had fewer hands than the larger number that had been considered necessary to build a new fort (Dease 1827b). It is also possible that in Kittson's successful navigation with Kutenai guides down the Kootenay River in the summer of 1826, he discovered that a new site for a post was not to be found.

Yet another element in the puzzle was the looming American competition in the Rockies (Dease 1826b). Since American interference in the winter of 1926-27 was significant, at least in the Flathead area (Dease 1827b), perhaps Kittson realized the impropriety of moving the Kootenay fort further downstream to the west. For it was generally the forward policy of the Hudson's Bay Company to keep its posts and traders as close to the competition as possible, even if it meant crossing the Continental Divide.

Moving the Kootenay fort westwards and away from American intrusion would have risked leaving the Kutenai exposed to it. In 1829, Chief Trader John Dease, the man in charge of the Colvile District, was ordered by Governor Simpson to have Kittson watch the Kutenai very closely to prevent the Americans from getting any skins at all (Simpson 1829a). And in 1830, Kittson (1830) complained that he wished "the Crees and Blackfeet were far away from this [Kutenai] tribe as they sometimes amuse them from their usual occupation." All of these factors, plus the manpower shortage at Fort Colvile which was under construction during these years, may have dictated an aggressive stance coupled with a lack of desire to indulge in moving the Kootenay post a few miles downstream.

In 1825, Goerge Simpson instigated a design to educate the sons of Indian chiefs in the Company shcool at Red River, modern Winnipeg. This was an old imperialist method used, for example, by the Romans on the primitive German tribes, a precedent that may have been known to the leadership of the H.B.C. Simpson's program was in some ways laudable given the fact that the Indians of the Pacific Northwest were going to have to deal with white encroachment no matter what. There are arguments against this particular program, one being the exposure these boys would have to disease, a factor that was to be decisive with the only Kutenai candidate chosen for the program.

Kootenay Pelly as he was named after a director of the Company, was chosen in early 1825. Alexander Ross (1825) who performed the task, describes the transaction thus:

> From the Principal Koottanais chief called the Four Bears I got his son in order to be educated[;] this respectable Indian made no hesitation to comply with such a request after its intent being fully explained. I made him the following present and he seemed much pleased viz. 1 New Gun, 1 Pistol, 100 balls and powder, 2 lbs. C[anton] Beads, 1 Looking Glass, 4 yards Gartering, 1 Scalper, 2 flints, 2 awls, 1 fire steel, and a pound of twist tobacco.

But Simpson (1825b) was plainly worried when he wrote the Rev. D. T. Jones at the school to take the utmost care of Pelly and his fellow pupil, Spokane Garry, since "any accident happening to them would be likely to involve us in eternal warfare with their tribes which are very powerful."

Unfortunately for this poor boy sent so far from home, he died at Red River and was buried on the 6th of April, 1831, at about 18 years of age (Register n.d.). Garry, who got back alive, was sent with Kittson in the fall of 1831 to explain matters to the Kutenai (McGillivray and Kittson 1831). The result seems to have been similarly fatal with at least half the boys sent to Red River.

After Kootenay Pelly's departure for Red River, Fort Colvile was established as the new district headquarters, and the post began functioning during the summer of 1826 (Chance 1972). The Lower Kutenai paid a visit and were "highly pleased at having a Fort to which they can resort to trade" (Dease 1826b). This implies, of course, that there had not been recently a post within easy reach of the Lower Kutenai.

However, the Lakes, Kettle Falls, and Okanagan Salish at Kettle Falls, the location of Fort Colvile, were less than pleased; salmon were very scarce that summer, and a quarrel of nine years' standing broke out in somewhat ritualistic violence. The combatants lined up for their battle right in the camp of the fur traders who were just then struggling to erect their buildings. The Kutenai and their enemies were stark naked, painted red, black, white, and yellow, but did wear "war caps" of "calumet eagle feathers." Both bows and muskets were employed to produce some serious casualties (D. Douglas 1914:206). We are not told whether the two Kutenai "females" who had accompanied the 21 Kutenai men to Kettle Falls joined in the struggle.

Kittson (1826), on his successful 1826 exploration down the Kootenay River with an expedition in three canoes, must have met the Kutenai combatants on their return upriver. For on reaching the point where the rapids began just west of Kootenay Lake he found a cave where the Kutenai had made "sacrifices to a spirit residing there" on their way back from "making war on the Kettle Falls Indians." This was the first of two known battles at Kettle Falls occasioned by visitors attracted to the newly established Fort Colvile; after the second one of 1829, the fur traders had had enough and they fortified Colvile with pickets and bastions to keep Indian battles outside of the post.

1827 - 1863

The fight of 1826 did not keep the Kutenai away, and one might suspect that they had not come out of the fray with much damage. By 1830-31, when our information becomes more detailed than usual for a year, we observe that both lower and upper Kutenai visited Fort Colvile in significant numbers, but in just June and July of 1830 (Heron and Kittson 1831). By this they avoided the normally heavy Indian concourse of August--the month they had had the fight. The Kutenai trade at Fort Colvile even in 1827 and 1828 was very substantial (Work 1830). And in mid-April of 1830 some Kutenai attended a council of Indian chiefs at Fort Colvile where a speech by Francis Heron was interpreted by the young and now educated Spokane Garry in the Gentlemen's mess. Five days later, Kittson noted that "The Kootenais chiefs have gone to their lands, they left us well satisfied with their reception" (Heron and Kittson 1831).

Adding to the excitement of the later 1820s were the American ventures into the Rocky Mountain fur trade. For the Kutenai country this pressure began at least as early as 1825 when Johnson Gardner came up to Peter Skene Ogden in the middle of a long confrontation on the Bear River, in present southeastern Idaho, and informed him that he would "see us shortly not only in the Columbia, but at the Flatheads and Cootannees as we are determined you shall no longer remain in our territory." This American knowledge of the trade was held to be a consequence of "that damn'd all cursed day that Mr. Ross consented to bring the 7 Americans [including Jedediah Smith] with him to the Flatheads [in 1824]" (Ogden 1825). Ross had just been sent back to a teaching job at Red River for this and other shortcomings. To be fair to Ross, however, we should note that among the trappers of Ogden who deserted to Gardner on the Bear River was none other than Nicholas Montour, who would have been the best possible authority on the Kootenay fur trade (Morgan 1969:150).

There had been some talk of abandoning the Kootenay post in 1825 and 1826 after Kittson's initial failure to navigate the Kootenay from the mouth upwards. But the American threat made this possibility of abandonment untenable. Dease (1826b) informed Simpson that since the Americans were reported to be coming to the Flatheads, it would be best to keep the Kutenai "out of the way." The Americans did meet up with the Flatheads in the winter of 1826 and traded away all of their furs (Kittson 1827).

During the next winter, an American trading party was expected in the Kutenai territory for the first time (Morgan 1969:294). They came to the Flathead post, but were induced to part with their furs for rum, sugar, coffee and sundries. But they were not so easily disposed of--having sold off their furs, they decided to make up their losses and some decided to winter near Flathead Lake on the fringe of the Kutenai country (Dease 1828a). One of them, Joshua Pilcher, had designs on the Kutenai themselves, so John Dease had Kittson send the Kutenai "out of the way" (Dease 1829a). Kittson was himself bothered by the Americans (Work 1829b). Governor Simpson gave orders that George Barnston (who apparently was not actually used at Kootenay) was to have eight men to meet the American opposition in 1829 (Simpson 1829b).

In the winter of 1828-29 the American David E. Jackson of the Missouri Fur Company had esconced himself in the Kutenai country, and the following spring the indefatigable Jedediah Smith met him there in what Smith called the "Colonais country" (which may be incorrectly transcribed) (Morgan 1969:289-290, 306). But Jackson had done poorly; the H.B.C. was apparently having some success through Kittson who was his usual competent self. Our information on the returns of fiscal year 1828 suggest that the H.B.C. did very well by the Kutenai (Work 1830). The Americans, including Pilcher who had wintered at Flathead Lake, concluded that the Company was too well-entrenched (Johnson 1969:230).

The danger was mostly over by 1830 as far as the Kootenay trade was concerned, though the H.B.C. was not to realize it for some time. While the Company would have liked to do without the cost of keeping up a Kootenai post, it could not dispense with it since the Kutenai would then wander back within range of the Americans (Work 1830). In the summer of 1831, news that Americans were again bent on entering the Kutenai country made Kittson eager to get back there to make the summer trade (McGillivray and Kittson 1831). Kittson undoubtedly drew inspiration from having fought the Americans as a lieutenant in the War of 1812.

Partly because of this struggle, the Kootenay trade had come to be more important in the eyes of the Company. Another reason was probably because it was by now realized that the Kutenai were capable of delivering large numbers of pelts of species other than beaver and muskrat, as well as almost astronomical numbers of deer and elk hides. In 1829, they had delivered no less than 308 elk hides and 1284 deer skins, extremely useful for making watertight bales and for furnishing Fort Colvile with a commodity wanted in trade by the poorly-clad throngs visiting Kettle Falls (Chance 1973). Kutenai leather was by now finding its way into the Great Basin with Ogden as well as to the northern reaches of British Columbia.

So John Work (1830) decided that Kootenay should now have six men instead of the normal four for the winter trade. The buildings at the Kootenay post were, however, described as of a temporary character because it was "just a winter habitation" (Work 1830a). Whether this continued to be the case we do not know, but in the fall of 1830 Nicholas Montour was in fact sent in to the Kootenay post with six men taking with them 30 "pieces" of freight or somewhere between 2400 and 2700 pounds of supplies.

Montour, by now partially forgiven for his desertion from the Company, was to trade as much "good dressed leather" as possible without encouraging the leather trade too much. For the Kutenai had discovered that they could supply themselves with their needs much more easily with leather than furs. Here, by the way, we see how the Company would have deliberately kept the price paid for leather down. Montour was also instructed to put a stop to the Kutenai "intercourse" with the Cree and Blackfeet which had kept them from trapping at an acceptable rate. Cree and Piegan Blackfeet had been even coming to trade at the Kootenay post in recent years (Heron and Kittson 1831; Work 1830a).

The Americans were still feared, and if they "cast up" at Kootenay, they were to be undersold at any price, but not with trade goods! Instead they were to be paid in notes on Montreal at the rate of $4.00 Halifax Currency for each large beaver or its equivalent. This was possibly clever, for in this way the Americans would have no way to obtain H.B.C. trading goods. With notes all they could do was head for home before their own supplies ran out. Montour was also instructed by Kittson that "The Indians should be made to understand the impolicy of allowing American trappers to hunt on their lands." He was not to leave Kootenay in the spring before getting every skin (Heron and Kittson 1831).

Montour's orders to send six packs of leather to Flathead for forwarding to Fort Colvile as soon as he reached his post in the fall allows the inference that his station was probably near the Fisher River. The implication is that the "Kootenay Road" from the Fisher mouth to the Flathead post was to be used. Had the post been farther down the Kootenay River it would have made no sense to send leather to Colvile via the Flathead post since backtracking would have been involved.

Not only was the policy toward the Americans firm, the free trappers--the freemen--were to be expelled from the Kutenai country (McLaughlin 1830a). The Kutenai were therefore to be totally isolated from competing trappers: Americans, Iroquois, and French Canadians. This would keep prices paid by the Company for Kutenai furs down since freemen were not above buying furs from the Indians for resale to the Company. On the other hand, the Kutenai, if all went as planned, would not have to compete with interlopers. It is not easy to decide here whether these policies were more help or harm to Kutenai interests, but it is clear that the Company would gain.

Yet the Kutenai were no pushovers. We have already noted complaints about their intercourse with Cree and Blackfeet; in the summer of 1830, Chief Trader Francis Heron at Fort Colvile complained of "the present unstable habits" of the Kutenai (Heron and Kittson 1831). Heron himself had an unstable habit--excessive drinking, which was to eventually bring him to grief with the Company. The Kutenai around 1833 themselves switched alliances from the Blackfeet back to the Flathead and Nez Perce because of Blackfeet perfidy (Irving 1883). But the situation seems to have been complex.

By early 1833, John McLoughlin (1833a) was starting to think about closing the Kootenay post, probably because of Kutenai preoccupations with war and peace on the Plains. That summer Archibald McDonald (1834a), now head of the Colvile District, made a hurried visit to the Kutenai country to discover whether the Indians planned to abandon their post (McLoughlin 1834b). And Duncan Finlayson (1834) had gone up on the spring express to Colvile with a reminder written in the back of his diary, apparently information to be relayed to the Colvile management, to say that: "The Coutanais might also have an interested person with them till such time as they become more settled in their usual hunting grounds and located in their own country."

In other words, the Kutenai were probably in danger of becoming full-blown equestrian nomads of the Plains instead of following their usual split economy. The only way to stop this was to put an "interested person" on their trail, not just summer and winter traders. William Kittson was again the man for the job, and he went after the Kutenai to prevent their following the Piegans south into American territory during the summer of 1834 (Simpson 1834a). Kittson confirmed once again his membership in that elite corps of clerks that included Finan McDonald, Alexander Ross, John Work, Francis Ermatinger, and Angus McDonald who as individuals traded more furs than any other Company servants. They also blunted the American advance for three decades and faced the Piegan peril, but they seldom were adequately rewarded and instead, in some cases, earned the contempt of their superiors, perhaps for looking like dupes.

It was undoubtedly known to the H.B.C. that the Americans had just opened a trading post for the Piegans on the Missouri headwaters where they were supplied by river. If the Kutenai fell into this orbit the trade prospects for the H.B.C. would not be good. By the fall of 1834, McLoughlin wavered no further and became determined to carry on business with the Kutenai no matter what (McLoughlin 1834c). We do not know what caused the change of heart, perhaps Kittson had met with some success, perhaps the betrayals of the Piegans had become too much for the Kutenai, as mentioned by Captain Bonneville (Irving 1883). The encroachment by Nathaniel Wyeth into the Snake River Plain may have also made McLoughlin decide to allow no more crumbling of the Company's domain. Yet even in early 1835 the Kutenai were still accused of "wandering about" and doing little; but the blame was placed on Francois Payette (Simpson 1835a). However, we know that Simpson was very quick to look for weaknesses in his subordinates, so we should hesitate before thinking that Payette was incompetent.

Where was this post of the 1830s that both the Company and the Kutenai tired of? Besides the hints and assertions we have already discussed, we might turn briefly to the evidence of maps. The M. H. Stansbury (1838) map published in 1838 by the U. S. Army shows the Kootenay post directly opposite the mouth of the Fisher. However, we have a tendency to distrust maps for precise dating because they so frequently depict information many years old. Some of Stansbury's information is as late as 1834, but that is no guarantee that the location is that up-to-date. Since the move of 1826 from Spokane House to Colvile is reflected, it would seem reasonable, though not fully compelling, to believe that the data are younger than the middle 1820s.

A map that was published with the 1849 English first edition of Alexander Ross' *First Settlers* (Thwaites 1904) depicts "Kootanie Fort" a few miles downstream from the Fisher mouth: about one-third the distance from the Fisher to Rainy Creek, and also on the right bank. Here again, there is information elsewhere on the map to show that it was made after 1834, and therefore does not actually hark back to Ross' last year in Oregon, 1825.

The Kootenay post was moved from some point between the Fisher River and Bonners Ferry to the Tobacco Plains in the fall of 1839. This insufficiently exact statement introduces one of the more convoluted problems of the Kootenay trade history, and we must attempt to unravel its attendant inconsistencies with as little equivocation as possible. At the same time, it would be false to present a simplistic summary or bald conclusion without recognizing the many questions a person must ask.

The statement we made above is based upon the following portion of a letter of Archibald McDonald (1841b):

> Here itself [Fort Colvile] I am in hopes we will not fall much short of the ordinary amount of Returns and by the last accounts from Thomas Flett the Kootenais too will do something. Last fall, in order to relieve the upper Indians from unnecessary trouble and loss of time in coming down to trade at the present House, it was made with them at the Tobacco Plain 6 days march higher up on the River, which extention of distance required a start from hence of 10 days earlier than usual.

The letter is dated 10 January, 1841, in a Fort Colvile letterbook, one of only two that survive, but I think that the true date should be 10 January, 1840, for several reasons. First, this letter, and one that follows it dated 11 January, 1841, are both preceded by one dated 23 September, 1839--and a series of 1839, in order, preceding that one. The two January letters of "1841" are followed by a series of letters accurately dated 1840, beginning with one of 25 April, 1840. After the year 1840 is exhausted we enter a complete sequence for 1841, including letters for January, but which this time relate to events of 1841, for example the proposed visit by Governor Simpson to the Pacific Northwest, who it was expected might try to cross over the mountains through the Kutenai country. The year of 1841 is written more boldly in the two letters in question, as if added at a later date, and the configuration of the numbers in the dates is slightly different than in the letters that are correctly dated 1841. In other words, a later hand may have written in the years.

Another reason to reject the date is the testimony of Thomas Flett (1865) that he last saw the Kootenay post (or posts) in 1840. Were we to accept the date of the letter in question as 1841, we would be forced to say Flett was wrong, for it would mean that he had been there in 1841, during the early months of the year at least. Even though we shall question some of Flett's testimony later on, we feel less uneasy about his dates of service. Letterbooks, of course, can have their entries out of sequence, but usually they are not meant to since they are a filing system. In this run of letters from early 1838 well into 1842, there are no spaces between letters of more than a few lines at most. All letters in the run appear to be correctly dated in sequence except for the two odd ones we have noted. One might add also that there are some letters that are not completely dated, where the year, for example, is missing.

What are we to make of the move "6 days march higher up on the river?" The travel time from the mouth of the Fisher could not have been 6 days by horse. In 1859, Thiebodo (1940:330-331) traveled by horse from the mouth of the Tobacco River south to the Fisher River in one and a half days: from 10 a.m. on the 30th of October to the evening of the 31st. But in 1840 - 41, canoes were still being used by the wintering parties, hence most likely by Flett also in 1839. Thus the 45 or 50 miles involved might conceivably have required 6 days of working upstream through swift water with heavily loaded craft and few men to work them. The term "march" need not bother us much since it was frequently used to designate boat travel. Just the same, we are in a quandry over the location of "the present House" from which Flett transferred the operation, despite the clear implication by John Campbell that it was from the mouth of the Fisher that the move was made.

All specific references to the trading location after the fall of 1839 are of Tobacco Plains or points to the north and east, including those of 1840, with the exception of Berland's late summer rendezvous of 1841 at Lac la Traite [Trading Lake] at Bonners Ferry where he was met by Simpson. But that was possibly because of Berland's bad leg which had apparently caused him to withdraw from his advanced position of early summer at "Thompson's House," almost certainly the one at Toby Creek (Archibald McDonald 1841d). In any case, points of summer rendezvous were by this time frequently not the same as the wintering stations.

As to the reasons for the move, we have already witnessed McDonald's statement that it was done for the added convenience to the Indians. Since the Company had as a general policy often thought of trading convenience, could something else have changed? By a tradition wholly separate from that of the fur trade records we learn that:

> In about 1840 a group of Akiyeniks from the Fisher River country, after their young chief Tamar or Red Sky had been killed by the Blackfeet, had migrated to Tobacco Plains, joining an Upper Kootenai band there under Not Grizzly Bear, predecessor of Michelle [Johnson 1969:295].

It is not all that conceivable that the Fisher River Kutenai would have uprooted themselves over just the death of a chief--there must have been additional reasons. Without speculating on what those could be, we should rest content in the fact that we have some oral tradition that seems to mesh unusually well with fur trade sources. This would be expected of a people who, it has been said by their most recent ethnographer, had a remarkably accurate historical sense (Schaeffer 1966:6).

When Archibald McDonald (1841b) wrote of Flett's move to Tobacco Plains, and said that, "the Kootanais too will do something," there is the implication that in the year or years leading up to it the Kutenai had not been behaving themselves very well as fur trappers. There are related hints, such as this from the fall of 1838, just a year before McDonald's decision to move:

> The Kootannis Outfit with Pierre Duqette we got off on the 18th [October] consigned to the charge of Big Charlo; the trade, however, if he is alive and back to the place, must I suppose be conducted by Berland. Altogether, nothing could be more pitiful than the make shifts we are compelled to make instead of exercising that mighty control and influence over our Indians the American Congress gives us the credit of possessing [Archibald McDonald 1838a].

The problems only alluded to here were, if we may read between the lines and advert back to the earlier necessity of pursuing the Kutenai onto the Plains, that the Kutenai were still not behaving as they ought and had probably been pursued to the Plains by Berland. Hence the suggestion that he had risked his life.

Both the move to Tobacco Plains and the problems with the Kutenai are suggested by the following report from Fort Colvile:

> Edward Berland, whom I fitted out here for the Kootannis the morning I embarked for below [Fort Vancouver], is also back with something rather better than the ordinary summer Returns from that quarter; owing in some measure from the attempt we have made to meet the natives at the nick of time up at the Tobacco Plain, but even this faint attempt at managing them and our business there cannot I fear succeed long ___?___ the individual exertions of an obscure coureur de bois, however willing and industrious [Archibald McDonald 1840a].

On his way back to Colvile in August, Berland has passed the "old trading place" to find a band of Kutenai there trading away their leather to Indians from the south for guns and dentalia. In other words, while attempting to bring things under control by a timely appearance at the Tobacco Plains by, it would seem, catching the Kutenai there before they left, others came in behind and traded their leather to other Indians at the very place the Company had just abandoned (McDonald 1840a).

As if that were not enough, Berland received a threatening note from one Moncrouvier, a trader on the east side of the Rockies, who claimed that he was soon going to cross to compete for the Kutenai trade. Berland was therefore to be sent right back from Colvile to the Tobacco Plains "to watch what is going on there" (Archibald McDonald 1840a). All this running around over immense distances was expected of a man who was put down as a mere *coureur de bois*, a "woods runner" or common itinerant trader. McDonald was fond of drawing a distinction between "gentlemen" and mere "common men," terms he employed. This was actually to be McDonald's opening play to get a young "gentleman," Patrick McKenzie, to take over the Kutenai trade (Archibald McDonald 1841c). But here McDonald was blinded by class distinctions, for Berland proved to be very valuable, and he was much lamented in official letters of the Company at his death more than a decade later.

It is probably no coincidence that we have no glowing reports of Kutenai virtue from the 1830s or early 1940s. Of course, we should not expect anything of the sort from someone as prejudiced as Archibald McDonald. Much of the fault for Kutenai unsteadiness may have lain with the great turnover of traders during the 1830s and ineptitude on the part of Flett. Certainly Berland seems to have settled them down, but only a part of them, the nucleus he gathered around himself at Tobacco Plains. Nevertheless, one suspects that there were important economic reasons for the shiftless Kutenai behavior (from the Company point of view), and among them would almost certainly be a depletion of fur and hide-bearing animals in the southern half of the Kutenai country.

Without speculating further on the location of the Kootenay post abandoned in 1839 under the duress of a change in economy and tribal alliances, we shall pass on to considering the nature of the establishment that was abandoned. This is perhaps introduced best by transcribing excerpts here from the testimony of Thomas Flett made at Victoria on the 26th of September, 1865, part of the lengthy inquest over a period of years made into the value of H.B.C. holdings in the United States. The quotation will also show the character of these proceedings.

> Thomas Flett, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:
>
> Interrogatory 1.--What is your name, age, residence, present and former occupations, and of what country are you a citizen?
>
> Answer.--My name is Thomas Flett; age 51 years; my residence is in Colvile Valley, and I am by occupation a farmer. I am now a citizen of the United States, and was born in Scotland.
>
> Int. 2.-- How long were you employed by the Hudson's Bay Company?
>
> Ans.--I was eighteen years in their service. I first entered their service in 1833, and left it for the last time in 1851; at times between these dates I was out of their employ.
>
> Int. 3.--When did you first see the Company's post at Kootanais; how long did you remain there, and in what capacity?
>
> Ans.--I first saw the Company's post at Kootanais in 1836, and last saw it in 1840; I was in charge of the post during the winters of 1837, 1838 and 1839, going to Colvile for supplies in summer, leaving another person in charge. When I last saw it in 1840, it was in charge of Edward Berland, now deceased.
>
> Int. 4.--Describe the post at Kootanais, its situation and distance from Colvile, and the number and kind of buildings.
>
> Ans.--The post at Kootenais consisted of three dwelling houses, and a store, all of hewn square timber--it was situated on the south side of the Kootanais River, near

the middle of the Tobacco Plain, and about 300 yards from the river, and was in excellent order. It is about four hundred miles from Colvile. The boundary line, as run by the Commissioners, is north of the post.

Int. 5.--What amount of stock, if any, was kept by the Company at Kootanais, and what land was used and occupied for their pasture ground?

Ans.--The stock was horses; I would say about 150 horses, including Berland's, who was in charge when I last saw the post. The whole of the Tobacco Plain was used for their pasturage, and they were often removed for other pasture, that of the plain not being always sufficient.

Int. 6.--What sort of land was this plain, as regards character and soil; how did it compare with other lands around, and what is its value per acre? What quantity of it is good farming land, and about how much per acre would it produce?

Ans.--Some of the land was good and some of it not good; the poor parts of it were sandy and gravelly, the best part of it black loam, mixed with some clay; it is the best wintering ground in the whole country. I do not know its real value; the greater part of it was dry and sandy, the least part of it, say one fourth, was good land. The whole Tobacco Plain was about four miles long, and about two broad; from one quarter to one third of it would yield fifteen bushels of wheat per acre. I have seen Indian corn growing there; where corn grows, wheat ought to.

Int. 7.--Of what did the trade of the post consist?

Ans.--The trade of the post was in furs, buffalo skins and deer skins, and was valuable.

Int. 8.--What was the value of the buildings at Kootanais in 1846?

Ans.--When I last saw them they should be worth at least six thousand dollars [very roughly $60,000 1981 dollars]; what they were worth in 1846 I do not know; when I saw them there were no men to build them in the country except the Company's.

* * * * * *

Cross-examination. [by the United States' representative]

Int. 1.--How long would it take ten men, such as the Company had in their employ, to erect the buildings at Kootanais?

Ans.--I suppose that ten good axemen would make them and finish them in about five months.

Int. 2.--How much did the Company pay its servants who were employed in such labour in 1838 and 1839?

Ans.--The wages of common hands was about twenty pounds sterling per annum, some at twenty-five, and some thirty pounds per annum.

Int. 3.--How much land was actually enclosed at Kootanais when you left there in 1840?

Ans.--None but a horse corral of about half an acre.

Int. 4.--How do you know the boundary line runs near Kootanais?

Ans.--I only know from hearsay.

Int. 5.--Do you not know from the same hearsay that the Company has abandoned the old post of Kootanais, and built a new one north of the boundary line?

Ans.--I have heard that they were on the other side of the line.

Int. 6.--How long have you resided near Colvile?

Ans.--Was at Colvile from 1840 to 1851 . . . .

* * * * * *

THOMAS FLETT

Victoria, Vancouver Island, 26th September, 1865.

Note first of all that Flett says that the post consisted of three dwelling houses and a store of hewn square timber. That inventory is identical in the character and number of buildings to the one taken by the H.B.C. in 1847 (Ogden and Douglas 1847b). Yet we have already observed that Flett moved to a new location on what was almost certainly his last trip to Kootenay. Could he have then been the builder of the post inventoried in 1847? I doubt that he had the manpower to put up all four buildings of squared logs in a single winter, especially since by his own testimony he says it would have required "ten good axemen" to make and finish them "in five months." That is probably an overestimate, which is will be possible to accurately compare with building schedules we have from other posts. In any event, we can see that Flett's testimony does not dovetail at all well with the contemporary letters we were just examining.

Observers of the buildings at Tobacco Plains in 1860 and 61 either flatly denied they were of squared logs or could not remember. So could Flett have been describing the post he abandoned in 1839? That is quite possible, especially regarding the squared logs. As to the three dwelling houses and the store, Flett could easily have been shown the 1847 list, since he was sent to Victoria as a witness for the H.B.C., and also because he had evidently been coached to state that the post of 1845 was south of the boundary. It is noticeable that the cross-examiner for the United States picked up on this gratuitous bit of information on the whereabouts of the line.

Yet, three dwelling houses and a store does depict a minimal H.B.C. post that would of necessity include a dwelling for the man in charge, a house for lower-ranking employees, and an Indian hall where Indian visitors and traders could be sheltered from the winter weather while they traded. The fourth, and most important, element would be the store for warehousing and trading. This seems to have been the nature of the Flathead post of 1825 which had at least the number and type of buildings just enumerated (Elliott 1914b, 1914c).

A post of four such structures would have been most likely arranged in a square to conform to the plan which we have elsewhere (Chance and Chance 1979) called the "standard H.B.C. plan." In this common arrangement, if one looked at the post from the shore of the river or lake beside which it stood, the gentleman's house would be toward the rear, facing the water, the store would be perpendicular to that house and on the observer's left, the men's quarters across the square to the right, and in the foreground and more or less opposite to the trader's house would be the Indian house or hall. As far as the Kootenay post of the late 1830s or the one of the mid-1840s this plan is entirely conjectural--it is just the best hypothesis we can employ at the present moment.

There are other problems with Flett's testimony, and Archibald McDonald in at least two letters questions his reliability and criticizes his intemperate and sneaky drinking habits.

> I do not altogether admit that poor Thomas Flett is a useless man to me. On the contrary I have always found him most active and interested: but he is a common man and cannot be expected to command that respect and authority which his situation demands, and may possibly have no aversion to a glass. Within the last fourteen months I certainly did discover him guilty of this indiscretion three times, and remonstrated with him each time [Archibald McDonald 1842a].

This drinking seems unexceptional by our standards. But perhaps we can at least infer that Flett's performance in the Kootenay trade had not been terribly good.

Another problem we have with Flett is with the number of horses belonging to the Company and Berland at Tobacco Plains, "about 150," which seems greatly excessive by a factor of our or five, given all the problems encountered by the Company in buying, feeding, and keeping track of horses in the Colvile District. They were expensive and usually in short supply, and a full-time paid horse herder would have been required to watch 150 head.

In a part of the testimony that was omitted from quotation, Flett was forced under cross-examination to change his valuation of the farm land around Fort Colvile from $1.25 an acre to $10 (Flett 1865:170). That is quite a change of story. We note that he stated he was in charge of Kootenay in 1838, yet we have already quoted a letter of Archibald McDonald who mentions three names associated with the wintering of 1838: Pierre Duquette, Big Charlo, and Edward Berland, but no Flett. So we are full of hesitation about Flett's testimony on the Kootenay post or posts that he saw and served in.

In the fall of 1840, Pierre Duquette reported to Archibald McDonald--on returning to Fort Colvile from Berland at Kootenay--that "their stock of provisions would not admit of their passing the winter at the House (Archibald McDonald 1841f). The location of this "House" was probably the newly established one at Tobacco Plains; the lack of provisions implies a certain diminution of game from a decade before when the wintering parties had customarily lived off the country, eating mostly deer and elk (Work 1830). The next spring an Indian courier sent out from Fort Colvile found Berland at "Riviere la Biche [Elk River] between the Tobacco Plain and Thompson's Lake, where he was obliged to move out with his people for the means of living" (Archibald McDonald 1841g).

That summer of 1841 both the immigrants from the Red River Colony, destined to help reinforce the British claim to the Oregon Country (Lent 1963), and Governor George Simpson himself, passed through the Kutenai country (Simpson 1841, 1847). During the planning for Simpson's tour, part of an around-the-world junket, Archibald McDonald (1841f) suggested that he "had better come by the Tobacco Plain, which is somewhere situated near the Kootanais Ho. you [McLoughlin] see marked on the map . . . ." Since McDonald had been to the post of 1834, and his ignorance of the exact location of the 1841 Kootenay House is here apparent, it is logical to conclude that he does speak here of the new House at Tobacco Plains.

Edward Berland could not be of much help to either party since he had injured his leg at Columbia Lake in the early part of the summer, his second injury in two years. He withdrew to the vicinity of modern Bonners Ferry where he was met by the Simpson party at Lac la Traite--Paddlers Lake--where he was found making his summer trade.

Simpson must have approved of Archibald McDonald's plan to put the Kootenay trade under a young gentleman. This was Patrick McKenzie who arrived too late from the East to take the fall canoe to Kootenay, so was instead sent by way of the Flathead post which was under John McPherson (Archibald McDonald 1841h). McDonald's instructions to the young clerk are of interest:

> You already know my views with respect to your occupations for the Winter, which however I shall briefly recapitulate here to refresh your memory. Had you been with us earlier in the season your station would have been the Kootanais, and even now, you proceed to Berland at the Tobacco Plain, via the Flatheads. There you will remain a couple of weeks, and make yourself as intimately acquainted as possible with the affairs of that place, as it is more than probable, there will be your future field of action. The language, above all things you ought to direct your attention to,--to acquire an intimate acquaintance with the Indians--the number of men in the different bands--the best disposed and the best hunters etc. etc. etc. You will take an account of every thing at the Tobacco Plain for our information here, and then return to the Flatheads where you will pass the winter. Old Pierre will keep charge there till your return [McPhereson would be gone to the Plains], and some time in December we shall expect to hear a full account from you of all that is going on above. That is all I shall commit to paper. I need not say that, to enhance your own value and to be useful to the concern, it must be by paying assiduous attention to every thing that comes across you, and to turn your hand to any thing that must unavoidably be done [Archibald McDonald 1841c].

One senses in these prolix orders that McDonald may not have been kept sufficiently informed by Berland. Unfortunately, we do not have McKenzie's report. The young gentleman proved to be handy with Indians, though not in the Kutenai country, and he served as one of the interpreters for Isaac Stevens' great Walla Walla Council of 1855 (Manring 1912:42).

The 1840s were years of great transition for the Oregon Country. We have noted the first wave of immigrants from Canada, a pitiful attempt to match the American flood of covered wagons. In 1842, the first missionary contacts with the Kutenai were made by Father DeSmet when he visited a Kutenai village of 30 lodges two days' journey north of Prairie des Cheveaux (Horse Plains), perhaps near Little Bitterroot Lake (DeSmet 1844:265). This was followed up in 1845 by DeSmet's travel up the whole Kootenay valley from Bonners Ferry to the Continental Divide and over the other side to Fort Edmonton. On this trip DeSmet established two missions for the Kutenai, one, the Assumption, across the river from Bonners Ferry and the other, the Sacred Heart of Mary, at Tobacco Plains (DeSmet 1848).

Jesuit attempts to settle the Flatheads around St. Mary's Mission in the Bitterroot Valley dealt a great blow to the Hudson's Bay Company's purchases of buffalo products, especially the buffalo grease needed to feed the Company's servants (Archibald McDonald 1842d). So Berland was sent across the Rockies from the Kutenai country with a two-gallon keg of rum to induce the Piegans to part with some of their grease (Archibald McDonald 1842c). It is worth observing that the Kutenai could not be relied upon to take up this slack, indeed they could never produce a volume of buffalo products--grease, meat, robes, etc., to match that of the Flatheads.

Berland is credited by John Campbell (1918a) with having built the first post at Tobacco Plains, on the east side of the river, presumably at the mouth of the Tobacco River. This is evidently the same location shown on DeSmet's (1848) published map and on the Pleasonton (1859) sketch map, both of which were based upon DeSmet's travel up the Kootenay River. In 1852, because of problems with the Blackfeet, another post was constructed just across the Kootenay River, probably near the mouth of Dodge Creek (Campbell 1918a, 1918c; Johnson 1969). These Blackfeet troubles are authenticated by a letter of April, 1852, in which Chief Trader Alexander C. Anderson (1852) wrote from Colvile that the reports from Kootenay were not good: Berland had done his best, but the Kutenai were suffering from famine from having been excluded from the buffalo grounds by the Blackfeet. Raids by these terrors had also severely disrupted the Flathead trade as well as the Jesuit missions in the Rocky Mountains (Anderson 1851).

The post at Dodge Creek must have been Berland's residence when he died in 1853. When he failed to return from hunting waterfowl, his wife went looking for him and found him face down in the mud on the banks of a lake, having bled at the mouth and nose. The family withdrew to the farmstead they had started in the Colville Valley (Ogden and Mactavish 1853b). John Linklater, a Scot of small stature but courageous disposition, replaced Berland. John Campbell says Linklater was a lowland Scot, but then also tells us he retired to the Orkneys.

When the second Sinclair party of Red River immigrants stopped at Tobacco Plains on the east bank of the Kootenay, Linklater, at his post on the west bank, heard (but did not see) their arrival, and rode his horse across the river to meet them:

> He was very happy to see some white people there. At that time he was all alone in that country; there was not another white person nearer than three or four hundred miles to his station. He came across to our camp from the other side of the river by fording it. We had not all got done unpacking our animals when he came over. He was so glad to hear that there were some white people on the other side of the river that he did not take time to saddle his horse, but jumped on it and rode over bareback to see us. While he was in our camp and all were eager to see him there was very near an accident. Mr. Sinclair's mount took fright at something and started to run around among the other animals; the saddle got loose and under his body. There was a Colt's revolver in the holster, tied on the saddle, that somehow started to shoot, and it was fortunate that none was hit. . . . There were a lot of Kootenay Indians standing around also and wondering what kind of a gun that was that could shoot so often, they having never seen one of these six shooters before that time. It was a sight to see them standing around open mouthed when they saw the pistol and Mr. Linklater showed them how it was handled [Campbell 1916:192].

Olga Johnson, who has written two books on the Kutenai country, claims that the post was moved a couple of miles north to Young Creek during the 1850s (Johnson 1850:14; 1969:332-333). Her evidence cannot be traced though we suspect it may come from something by John Campbell. There is no Hudson's Bay Company source to corroborate this shift, which would have been made by Linklater if it is based on reality.

Linklater certainly established a new post just north of the international boundary probably in 1858 (Campbell 1918a, 1918c). This was still in the Tobacco Plains. Oddly enough, in Hamilton's (1900) account of their meeting at this place in the fall of 1858, Linklater supposedly did not know where the line actually ran. But Captain Thomas Blakiston of the Palliser expedition during that summer had found where the line was and had further discovered that the post at the mouth of the Tobacco River was at 48°55'5" North latitude and 115°31' West longitude (Blakiston 1858). We have not yet determined whether Blakiston's results were communicated to Chief Trader George Blenkinsop at Fort Colvile in time to affect a decision to set up a new post north of the line.

What we do know is that the war against the Spokan, Coeur d'Alene, and Palus was raging on the Plateau and the Hudson's Bay Company, suspected of supplying ammunition to the hostiles, had been forbidden by the Army from selling any more guns or ammunition to the Indians. Such a ruling would, of course, have spelled disaster for the Company's trade in the Colvile District. There was, naturally, no such restriction in British Columbia. From a letter of February, 1859, we learn that Blenkinsop planned to open a new trail from the just completed post of Fort Shepherd, also just over the line, to Kootenay. In his opinion, if the Kootenay post had plenty of goods and ammunition the Company could draw a good part of the Flathead and other trade "from south of the line" if Fort Colvile had to be abandoned (Blenkinsop 1859a). This shows that a move had either been made or was about to be made. Later that same year Blenkinsop (1859b) reported that Kootenay was well stocked with amunition brought in from Fort Hope on the Fraser.

Blakiston's discovery of the coordinates of the post and mission at the mouth of the Tobacco River may have come as a surprise since up until then it was generally believed that the Tobacco Plains were wholly north of the 49th parallel. Blakiston did not mention seeing a post just north of the line, nor did he say anything about one at the mouth of Dodge Creek. What he did see was:

> Following the track still S.S.W. the following morning in a thick fog, we came on the river, and within a few hundred yards found three diminutive log houses. Two of them, not over ten feet square, and to enter which it was necessary to crawl through a hole as an apology for a door, had evidently been used for dwellings; the other, somewhat larger, without a chimney, we were informed was the Kootanie chapel which had been erected the previous spring when a priest was there.

> The Kootanies afterwards informed me that while people always come in the fall, remaining the winter trading with them, and returning to Colvile, eight or ten days' journey, in the spring. These are the Hudson's Bay Company's people, and this post is what figures on maps in large letters as "Fort Kootanie." I remained here till noon, and obtained observations . . . . [Blakiston 1858].

Blakiston's visit was followed by those of the other members of the Palliser expedition, Sullivan, Hector, and Palliser (Great Britain 1860, 1863; Spry 1968). In the Kutenai country the expedition was seemingly disorganized with different parties pursuing various routes and objectives, all apparently looking for new passes through the mountain ranges and exploring country that had for the most part been traversed by the fur traders for decades. If there were military purposes behind the expedition they have been well concealed. The records consist largely of diaries and summary reports which are often of mainly geographic interest; each place on the several itineraries would receive just the barest description.

But the expedition members did discover that the Indian trail west from the Cranbrook area to Kootenay Lake, the north end of another that led past Moyie Lake to Bonners Ferry, and yet a third that went west from Tobacco Plains to the same place, were now all overgrown or impassable from downed timber. Here is food for some thought. Either these men were lied to, which is doubtful, or else a certain deterioration in native communications had set in by the late 1850s.

Without tracing the itineraries and discoveries, and further significance, of the Palliser expedition, we shall pass on to a brief consideration of possibly the most colorful and least truthful account of the whole Kootenay trade history. A certain William Hamilton, about whom we thus far know little besides that is contained in his account (Hamilton 1900) and a few skeptical remarks in the masterpiece history of the Plateau Indian wars by Robert Ignatius Burns (1966:329), went on a fact-finding mission for the Army from Fort Walla Walla to the Plains in the fall of 1858. This was supposedly to discover whether the Rocky Mountain and Plains Indians intended to make common cause with the recently defeated Indians of the Columbia Plateau.

Hamilton, and his assistant, a "half-breed" of blood-thirsty inclinations named Alexander McKay, also traded for buffalo robes and furs on this trip, which probably means that they were not serious full-time emissaries of the Army. This is just one of the many difficulties with this account. Once on the Plains these men fell in with the Blackfeet with whom they both traded and fought, before fleeing to a Kutenai village on the Plains where they took refuge and than accompanied back to Tobacco Plains. During this retreat the Kutenai with their new intrepid allies found and defeated the Blackfeet twice with some 300 warriors hotly engaged on each side! Not only that, but they crossed the Rocky Mountains from the Plains of Montana (or Alberta?) to Tobacco Plains in less than three days' travel, warriors, women, children, and wounded all, and beleaguered by hundreds of Blackfeet.

Once at Tobacco Plains they moved to the Catholic Mission, which Hamilton mentions but does not describe, where they awaited the vengeance of the Blackfeet massing from as far away as the Saskatchewan River. They waited for four days as the signs, including smoke signals, grew more ominous daily. In the meantime, "Scotty Linklighter" established at his post about "one-fourth mile north of the boundary line afterwards established" had been contacted and acquainted with the impending attack.

On the 5th of November the battle began only a half mile from the Mission. About 400 Kutenai warriors attacked an equal number of Blackfeet, but the strategems of Hamilton and the fierce charges led by himself, McKay, and Linklater prevailed; the Blackfeet were burned out of their cover in the trees. The battle resembles a combination of Finan McDonald's incineration of sixty-eight Blackfeet in 1822, known through the publication of Alexander Ross' *Fur Hunters of the Far West* in 1855 (Morgan 1969:396; Ross 1956), and the battle of Four Lakes near Spokane, which Hamilton may have witnessed. Three Kutenai were killed; the number of Blackfeet dead is not given though one may infer at least a dozen. Linklater received an arrow right through his thigh, which was skillfully pulled out by Hamilton.

It is an engaging account, and had we more space it would be interesting to repeat much more of the detail, as well as perform a sort of autopsy. For there are, as we said, many problems with the story, of which we can mention just a few. Most important is the absence so far in our researches of any mention of this event in H.B.C. sources. The wounding of an H.B.C. postmaster in battle would not have gone unnoticed in Company correspondence. Further, Linklater seems to have said nothing of this to James Hector or Augustus Thiebodo the next year, and at least the latter was obviously, from his own account, a willing listener of anything Linklater had to say. The Palliser expedition explorers were crisscrossing the mountains during this period, before and after, without showing any awareness of such a dangerous state of affairs.

We also may wonder why Linklater abandoned his tiny post to the care of an assistant while taking part not only in the battle but in its preliminaries and aftermath, while there were hundreds of Blackfeet lurking about, advertising their presence with signals from the mountaintops. Finally, there is the question of where 400 Kutenai warriors could have materialized from, given the fact that the entire Kutenai nation, both branches of it, could not possibly have fielded 400 warriors.

So we have a tantalizing historical problem. The whole business cannot be thrown out as fiction because Hamilton shows some knowledge of Tobacco Plains, the locations of the new H.B.C. post and the Mission at the unmentioned older post, and I think that Hamilton also displays some knowledge of the Kutenai. These are some of the dilemmas of a single historical source; from which we turn to the entanglements of a multiplicity of sources, no two of which are in complete agreement. This is natural enough except that one hopes for better congruence than we have when it comes to the simple matter of counting a handful of buildings, and by men largely associated with the profession of surveying!

Beginning in 1865, the United States and the Hudson's Bay Company finally got down to the business, after many delays, of determining the nature and value of the Company's holdings in the United States since the Company insisted on being compensated for the loss of its forts, outposts, farms, and trade in the part of the Oregon Country that fell below the 1846 treaty line of the 49th parallel. The proceedings were all recorded, leaving fourteen volumes of immensely valuable testimony including both deliberate exaggerations and calculated understatements by Company servants and American observers.

Some ten individuals testified on Kootenay; many witnesses had been there not too long before with the Boundary Survey Commission in 1860-61. Thomas Flett was the only witness who had actually served at Kootenay as a trader, and we have already looked at his deposition; why Linklater was not called is a question we cannot answer. Most witnesses discussed the post, abandoned in 1860-61, that they had seen at the south end of Tobacco Plains, at the mouth of the Tobacco River, though several also referred to the new one just north of the international boundary (G. C. Gardner 1867; Francis Hudson 1867; George Gibbs 1867).

The older post, No. 14 on our summary list of Kootenay posts, stood next to the Mission of the Sacred Heart of Mary, the church of which had been erected, by Blakiston's account, in the spring of 1858, and by Johnson's (1969) version, in 1857. The church and a small cabin next to it were photographed in 1860 or 61 by Royal Engineers personnel attached to the British segment of the survey. This photograph, copies of which still survive in England, was used in the hearings to elicit comment from the witnesses, most of whom recognized it. What did not clearly emerge from the testimony was the degree to which the Mission and the H.B.C. post were separate entities, whether the post was of the same vintage as the church, and whether the former was completely or just temporarily abandoned. For we know from Thiebodo's marvelously detailed account from October of 1859 that it had been then in use, even though Linklater himself lived in a tipi.

Rather than going on with a tortuous struggle through all the testimony of imperfect memories and their nearly uniformly derogatory comments about the shabbiness of the buildings, we should instead look at Table 3 where some of the main points are abstracted.

One receives the impression from all this that these people saw a group of buildings somewhat at variance to the H.B.C. inventory of 1847 (presented in the summary of posts under No. 10) in which a store of 20 x 20 feet had figured as the largest building. Of course much could have changed in fourteen years. But we are still uncertain whether the 1847 inventory was of the old post opposite the Fisher mouth or if it was of the new "House" of Berland's at Tobacco Plain.

Not a single witness admitted to having entered any of the H.B.C. structures, but John Alden, an astronomer and artist with the American party, was more perceptive than most of the others, and he described Linklater's house:

Table 3. Observations on the Number of Buildings at the H.B.C. Post and the Catholic Mission at the Mouth of the Tobacco River, 1858-61.

Observer	Date	Comments	No. of Buildings	Linklater Present?	Source
T. Blakiston	1858 (summer)	Two diminutive log houses of 10 feet square each plus a chapel	3	No	Blakiston (1858)
W. Hamilton	1858 (Oct. & Nov.)	Mentions the "Mission" and nothing else	?	No*	Hamilton (1900)
J. Hector	1859 (October)	"merely a little log cabin"	1	Yes	Spry (1968:464)
J. Palliser **	1859 (August)	Mentions no buildings	0	No	Spry (1968:475)
A. Thiebodo	1859 (October)	Three log "shanties"	3	Yes	Thiebodo (1940)
G. C. Gardner	1860 (fall)	Remains of four diplapidated log buildings	4	No	G. C. Gardner (1867:192)
J. Alden	1860 (summer & fall)	Four or five log huts including the church	4 or 5	No	Alden (1867:553)
G. Gibbs	1860 (fall)	Two small worthless log cabins plus the church	3	No	Gibbs (1867:407)

Table 3. (continued)

Observer	Date	Comments	No. of Buildings	Linklater Present?	Source
F. Hudson	1860	A church, a dwelling for the trader, and three or four smaller buildings	5 or 6	No	Hudson (1867:340)
C. T. Gardner	1860	A dilapidated log house and shed	2	No	C. T. Gardner (1867:322-323)
C. Wilson***	1861 (summer)	An uninhabited mission house	1	No	Wilson (1988:306)

* Hamilton did see Linklater at his new post just north of the 49th paralle.

** Palliser seems to have been inclined to make the countryside appear more wild than it was in order to accentuate the value of his explorations.

*** Wilson makes no mention of any buildings in his diary (Stanley 1970).

> It was less than half the size of the church, I should say; to the best of my recollection the roof was like the roof of the church, constructed like the roofs of that country, of bark and mud, and the timber round logs; I think if they had been squared I should have noticed it; they were very inferior log buildings, from their appearance outside; I don't know what they were inside, as I did not enter them [Alden 1867:561].

Alden went on to say that Linklater's house was "not nearly so high" as the Catholic Mission, itself not even six feet at the eaves. The doors on all the buildings except the church were shut so that he did not enter them. Speaking of the post buildings as a whole, Alden said they were not half the length of the church though one of them was larger than the others; "They seemed to me lower than we should ordinarily build log houses." One is tempted to think here of the tiny hovels with small doors that are known archaeologically from the Orkney Islands. It is no wonder, however, that Linklater was more often than not seen living in a tipi or canvas tent at Tobacco Plains.

Alden is also the best witness on the church:

> The largest one [of the four or five huts] I entered and found to be a church; it was entirely empty, except some religious engravings; there was a picture of Piux IX and of saints. I recognized it as a church by its form, and it was so spoken of. It was not chinked so as to be suitable for a store or dwelling-house, and the light was received within through the chinks. It was constructed of logs. You could see daylight through the roof, which was apparently of bark covered with mud. It was of one story. It was a long narrow building, at least 30 feet long, but the length much greater than the breadth [Alden 1867:553].

DeSmet (1863:111) informs us that the Kutenai themselves constructed this church:

> . . . the Kootenays have built a little church of round logs on the great Tobacco Prairie. They carried the logs,--which averaged from 20 to 25 feet in length,--in their arms a distance of more than a quarter of a mile, and raised the walls of the new church, as it were, by main force. The exterior is covered with straw and sods. In this humble house of the Lord they meet morning and evening, to offer to the Great Spirit, their fervent prayers,--the first fruits of the day.

The small cabin visible in the photograph of the church, that stands behind it and to one side, was perhaps the "parsonage" which was also mentioned by DeSmet as being a structure of two rooms, intended as the final solution to the problems Father Menetrey had with dogs eating his belongings in the night (DeSmet 1863:116).

Alden made a number of watercolors of the scenery in the northern Rockies, and he says that he even considered painting the mission and trading post, but after walking around discovered that he could not find the proper angle.

1864 - 1871

From 1860 into the summer of 1866 the active Kootenay post seem to have been the one just north of the international boundary, but we have little to go on. What seems surprising is the slow response of the Hudson's Bay Company to the gold strike made on Wildhorse Creek some 50 miles to the north in 1863 (Bancroft 1877:522; Johnson 1969:316). Gold had been "worked from the bed" of the Kootenay River at Tobacco Plains several years earlier, apparently by H.B.C. personnel, perhaps Linklater (Hector 5 October 1859, in Spry 1968:465). One reason for the slow response of the Company may have been its new difficulties experienced in supplying Kootenay. The high customs tariffs of the Civil War forced the Company to use its new road explored by Chief Trader Joseph McKay and built by Angus McDonald in 1864 (Tolmie 1864b). Despite Blenkinsop's sanguine expectations in 1859, it took five years to get the road built.

Just as the Company was beginning to take the gold mining market seriously, John Linklater, and another clerk, one McLaren, quit the Company's service in the Colvile District suddenly on the 30th of May, 1865. Why they did so is not known; perhaps it had something to do with gold fever. Michael Phillips was appointed to take Linklater's place that fall. But then Linklater turned right around and rejoined the service and took the Kootenay outfit in via Kootenay Lake--evidently by the new road (Finlayson 1865b). He threatened to resign again the following spring (Finlayson 1866a), but instead accompanied Phillips in to the Kootenay country that fall and left the service there in November of 1866 (Finlayson 1867a). This all sounds like he had an interest in the mining. At some point after that Linklater went back to Scotland, settled in the Orkneys, and married; he had not allowed himself an Indian family in the Kutenai country (Campbell 1918c; Johnson 1969). He was also unusual in returning to Europe, for few European-born fur traders in the Pacific Northwest even went back. Linklater had, of course, endured an extremely solitary existence while running the Kootenay trade for a dozen years, even for a fur trader.

The Kootenay post was in 1866 taken out of the Colvile District and put under Fort Shepherd located on the Columbia River opposite the mouth of the Pend d'Oreille River some 40 miles north of Colvile. And in that year Michael Phillips took out a claim of 160 acres in his own name, but on behalf of the Company, apparently at Wildhorse Creek. This was to take better advantage of the mining market. John Campbell (1918c) stated that the move to Wildhorse Creek was made in 1865, but the following passage from a February, 1867, letter of Chief Factor Roderick Finlayson to Chief trader John Hardisty at Fort Shepherd makes it seem as if the move was not made until 1866:

> It is satisfactory to learn that the additional supplies you had forwarded to Kootenais had reached Mr. Phillips there safely.
>
> Respecting the 160 acres of land taken by Mr. Phillips near the Kootenay river for the purpose of establishing a Post there as being a better locality for trade than our present Station we are not prepared at present to Sanction the purchase of this land, but see no reason why it should not be pre-empted by Mr. Phillips, in his own Name at present, on behalf of the Company to secure its possession. And should it eventually be found advisable for the Company's interests there to purchase it, we may do so, and if not, it may be abandoned. A small Station for trade, as you suggest, may be placed there, to secure part of the Cash trade of Wild Horse Creek, and that of the Shawsap Indians on the Kootenay [Columbia] Lake . . . . [Finlayson 1867a].

After this, the posts at Kootenay burgeoned to at least four in number, including ones at Wildhorse, Perry (Poirier) Creek, Fisherville, and a post at the south end of Kootenay Lake. The latter probably served in part as a way-station on the supply route from Fort Shepherd to the rest of the Kootenay posts since it lay astride the general line of travel as we infer it. By now, so far as we can tell, all the activity lay within British Columbia, except that Kutenai of the United States were probably still trapping for the Company despite the undefined demographic catastrophe they suffered in about 1865.

Michael Phillips took it upon himself to purchase large amounts of trading stock from cannier competitors just at the moment the Kootenay mines were failing. Some of this may have been done with the sanction of his immediate supervisor, Chief Trader Hardisty. Phillips bought a pack string of flour from Walla Walla, and the entire Kootenay stock of the Oppenheimer Company of Colville. The Board of Management of the Western Department in Victoria was completely downcast by this ineptness and had to apologize to London repeatedly for the poor supervision of Kootenay, which ironically had been even elevated to being its own district in the midst of all this in the summer of 1869. By 1870 the collapse was inevitable and two posts were closed, followed by the other two in the spring of 1871.

The loss sustained by the Company in the last year amounted to $23,461 which would come to something over $200,000 in present money. Roderick Finlayson tried to absorb much of the blame for himself, mentioning the fact that Kootenay was cut off from the world for much of the year. But he informed London very indignantly that the officers involved in the Kootenay fiasco, as well as those in the now shrunken Colvile District, had no incentive with such small dividends as they were now receiving. Stung by harsh criticism from London, Finlayson tendered his own resignation, to take effect in the spring of 1871 (Finlayson 1870b).

Many things contributed to the last gasp. The move into a partial cash economy with slippery miners put men like Phillips, who had been a good Indian trader, out of their element. The Lakes Salish in the Fort Shepherd area became sullen and unwilling to pay their debts, nor would they help move the final Kootenay fur returns by water out to the west. Morale in the Company was bad, and the money supply and gold dust fell to a trickle, and the miners departed. We do know, however, that the Kootenay District produced at least 10 packs of furs in its last year, meaning that the Kutenai had come through, probably to the best of their ability. But those furs had to be shipped by an American, Charles Kendall of Spokane Bridge, to Victoria via Walla Walla and Portland (McKay 1871).

A full analysis of the collapse will eventually have to be made, but let us close by just noting that the withdrawal was not planned to occur in 1871, it merely happened to coincide with the final settlement between the United States and the Hudson's Bay Company over the claims of the latter.

III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TRADE

The Logistics and Operations

Before 1812, the Kootenay trade was supplied from posts on the North Saskatchewan River in modern Alberta, the goods having come from Montreal via Fort William on Lake Superior. The Howse Pass was used for the most part before the winter of 1810-11. With Thompson's break through the Athabasca Pass in January of 1811, a new and more northerly route free of Piegan harassment was obtained for expresses. This new route put the Kootenay Valley into the sidelines since the route most easily taken from the Athabasca Pass southwards was down the Columbia River to Kettle Falls, or farther to the mouth of the Spokane River and thence to Spokane House. As a result of the War of 1812 and the ensuing Treaty of Ghent in 1815, the North West Company was able to bring its heavy freight in through the mouth of the Columbia and to take its furs out the same way for shipment directly to China for at least part of its sales.

The use of more or less stationary Kootenay winter posts seems to have begun in the winter of 1812-13 when the North West Company established one, and the Pacific Fur Company set up a short-lived competitor close by. The need for a more regular Kootenay post was probably a partial consequence of the shift of supply and express routes since there would no longer be parties traveling along the Kootenay with whom the Indians might trade.

There is much reason, however, to think that traders assigned to the winter posts in the early years were not above leaving them to go find the Kutenai camps should the Indians be reluctant or unable to find their way to the trading posts. This factor, similar to the method used in the sister establishments in the Flatheads, make for our difficulty in deciding where precisely the traders were actually to be found in a given year.

There is no clear evidence for a summer trade pattern with the Kutenai before the mid-1820s, but it is reasonable to suppose that the Kutenai traded with parties moving between Spokane House and the Flatheads when the latter stopped on the north shore of Lake Pend d'Oreille (Work 1826: 35). It is also evident that Kutenai sometimes participated in the summer and fall trades at Flathead House on Clark's Fork.

By the late 1820s, a routine was developed in accordance with the new systematization initiated by George Simpson in 1824 (Merk 1931) and carried out by such methodical men as John Work and William Kittson. This routine involved a separate summer and winter trade.

John Work (1830) reported that at the end of July or the beginning of August parties left Fort Colvile for both the Kootenay and Flathead areas to make a rendezvous with each of the tribes. This trade was "soon done," the journey inwards taking about 20 days in each case. At the end of October, the wintering party left for Kootenay to await the spring return of the Indians in buildings that were of a "temporary character." There was also a fall trade, and if the returns were large, a special trip back to Fort Colvile would have to be made before winter set in so that there would not be a manpower shortage for the spring return to headquarters.

After the spring trade, the men returned to Fort Colvile at the end of March or the beginning of April, in time to square the financial accounts at the end of the fiscal year in mid-April. The accounts, consolidated at Fort Colvile for the whole Columbia Department, were then sent by spring express up the Columbia to Boat Encampment, then over Athabasca Pass, and on to York Factory on Hudson's Bay, where they went aboard ship for the summer voyage to London. Part of the express, with copies of the accounts, branched off in mid-Canada to go to Lachine, a suburb of Montreal, via the Red River Colony and the Great Lakes. The duplicates would be dispatched to London from Montreal.

The furs themselves were sorted, counted, cleaned, and pressed into new bales at Fort Colvile where they were then loaded on the early summer fleet of boats to Fort Vancouver. There they were re-packed and loaded aboard ship in a special water-tight compartment on the main deck for the trip around the Horn to London. The Hudson's Bay Company did not normally ship furs directly to China, as the North West Company had.

The returning fleet or brigade of boats from Fort Vancouver brought new trading inventory and other supplies back up to Fort Colvile in mid-summer. If the men and goods of the brigade arrived late at that post, sometimes from having had to await the delayed arrival of a ship at Vancouver, then the summer trade to Kootenay might be jeopardized (Work 1828a), since there were not always enough men left in the Colvile District during the absence of the brigade to carry on operations in the Kootenay area.

Manpower was always a critical factor, and the amount needed was closely calculated. For instance, in 1825 William Kittson was given just one extra hand for the Kootenay trade so that he could build a new fort (Elliott 1914b). Often Indians were hired to help man boats and horse trains to Kootenay in order to fill out the ranks since these employees could be dispensed with in between the times of high demand.

The trip to Kootenay in summer was made overland with horses from Fort Colvile; the trip in the fall was by water, the voyage taking about 20 days (Work 1830). On the 20th of August, 1830, Kittson returned to Colvile from making the summer Kootenay trade with four men, including two Indians, and 20 horses (Heron and Kittson 1831). The data on the boats or canoes indicate that more than one was often used for the river transportation up and down McGillivray's or the Kootenay River (Archibald McDonald 1841c, 1842a).

David Thompson and his men had, of course, navigated the Kootenay River many times between Canal Flats just south of Columbia Lake and Bonners Ferry. But it was William Kittson who opened the lower river between Kootenay Lake and the Columbia River in 1826 to fur trade traffic, even though the route had certainly been used by Lakes Salish and Flatbow Kutenai before that (Kittson 1826). The problem with this lower stretch was that it had at least six portages around major falls and rapids. If one looks down into this stretch of river today, it is simply difficult to believe that it could have been navigated at all since the water is so fast and the canyon often narrow.

The type of boat used was most likely the same as the "canoe" described by John Work that was employed between Flathead House and Dalkena on the Pend d'Oreille River. Though called a canoe, it was a lap-straked cedar craft with flat keel, two sharp ends that were probably upturned rather sharply for passage through rapids. Like the larger boats used on the Columbia, these canoes were lineal descendants of Viking craft, the tradition having been transmitted through Viking descendants on the islands off Scotland. It is not unlikely that an occasional craft of this sort was constructed during the winters at the Kootenay posts between 1827 and the 1840s, for we have an order to Montour to build a new one at Kootenay during the winter of 1830-31 (Heron and Kittson 1831). More than likely most of the canoes used in the Kootenay trade were built at Fort Colvile which had a regular boatwright on its staff.

At one point we read of Edward Berland navigating the Kootenay River in a skin canoe, built when he thought the regular canoe was not going to arrive at Tobacco Plains. But Berland had a serious accident in this craft, which may have given little encouragement for later use of such a flimsy thing. By 1848, and probably before, Berland was using pack trains to move spring returns from Kootenay to Colvile (Lowe 1848).

It was during or after Berland's tenure, which ended in the winter of 1853, that the pattern of a two-season trade stopped. Thereafter the trader just wintered with the Kutenai and made a long trip to Colvile in the summer, returning to his field in September or October. This lasted until some point in the mid-1860s when the mining market on the upper Kootenay River required year-round attention, especially since there were competing traders to be bested. The old system of boat brigades on the Columbia River between Colvile and Vancouver was given up in 1848 when the Cayuse War forced the H.B.C. to supply the Colvile District from the lower Fraser by horse train through the Similkameen Valley. There were at least two later uses of the Columbia for supplying the Colvile District, but these were occasioned by problems with customs duties and other factors.

By the 1850s, the Company, short-handed as it was, and desirous of making sure the Kutenai never would have to turn to American traders in western Montana for their supplies, adopted a policy of leaving a trading inventory to which the Kutenai could help themselves in the trader's absence. DeSmet (1863:108) describes the system as it stood in the late 1850s:

> The agent of the Company takes his furs down to Colvile every Spring, and does not return before Autumn. During his absence, the store is confided to the care of an Indian, who trades in the name of the Company, and on the return of the agent, renders him a most exact account of his trust . . . . The store often remains without any one to watch it, the door unlocked and unbolted, and the goods are never stolen. The Indians go in and out, help themselves to what they want, and always scrupulously leave in place of whatever article they take its exact value.

What was described was a type of "silent barter," but one between people who knew and trusted each other.

By the 1850s, if not before, the river transportation was abandoned, and the Kootenay trade was supplied entirely by pack trains. The route from Colvile went southeast to Chewelah, across the mountains to the Pend d'Oreille River which it followed as far as Sinyakwateen about where a crossing was made. The right bank of the river was then followed to Sandpoint, thence across to Bonners Ferry where the Kootenay River was crossed at the "Kootenay Traverse." The Kootenay was followed along the right bank until just above the mouth of the Fisher River where it was crossed. From there the H.B.C. trail followed the left bank of the Kootenay all the way up to the Tobacco Plains (Alden 1867:557; Thiebodo 1940). There is no reason to think that this was other than the summer trade route that had been in use since 1826.

In 1864, the H.B.C. completed a road from the upper Columbia River at Fort Shepherd, British Columbia, to the Kootenay mines so that it could move its pack strings directly across from Fort Hope on the Fraser River to Kootenay and avoid paying U. S. Customs duties by staying north of the border. The road had been planned since the early 1850s, but it was only after much waiting on the part of the H.B.C. to see whether the British government would finance or build the trail that it finally went ahead in order to cash in on the Wildhorse Creek gold rush (Ballenden 1852a; Finlayson 1864a). Kutenai Indians were apparently employed by Angus McDonald, Chief Trader in charge of the Colvile District, in constructing the trail (Tolmie 1964a). The cost expended by Angus was $4006.78, of which the government of British Columbia agreed to reimburse only $720, pronouncing "McDonald's Road or Pass" useless (Finlayson 1865a). Nevertheless, it seems that the Company used the trail until 1871, and the investment would have been well worth it if the Company's ventures at the Kootenay mines had paid off.

The Nature and Quantities of the Trade

We have somewhat complete statistics covering furs traded from the Kutenai for just the fiscal years 1823 through 1830. Twelve species of fur-bearing animals are listed, of which muskrat was most frequently traded; but each one was but about a tenth the value of a beaver skin. The next species in quantity was beaver, averaging 945 pelts a year. This was slightly less than one-third of the entire Colvile District

average of some 3200 beaver a year for the same period (Work 1830; Heron and Kittson 1831; Chance 1973). The proportion of Kutenai muskrat was also a little under a third of the Colvile District annual average of about 5000 for the same years. Besides muskrat and beaver, all other fur species were insignificant in numbers at this time, marten being the largest of the remaining species with an annual average of only 34 pelts a year.

The Kutenai were the chief supplies of deer and elk hides, deer reaching 1455 hides and elk, 376, in 1830. In that same year, however, the Kutenai trapped far fewer fur species than usual because they had discovered that it was easier for them to obtain what they needed with hides. This was changed by lowering of the prices paid for hides. There are price lists, which of course vary from year to year and from one post to another, but which nevertheless give us a rough idea of what these items were worth to the Indians. For example, the price of a gun ranged from 12 to 20 beaver skins, which immediately lays to rest the absurd tales of Indians having to stack beaver pelts to the height of a gun to buy the item.

The Kutenai in the years 1823 through 1830 also sold the H.B.C. significant numbers of pack cords, parfleches (saddle trunks of buffalo hide), appichimons (buffalo hide saddle blankets), lodges, leather shirts, and leather "leggins." The largest number of leather lodges (tipis without poles) was 17 in 1828. Unfortunately, we do not know the prices paid for lodges, but they must or at least should have been substantial. All the horse trappings, some of the hides, and the lodges were used to equip Company pack trains, especially those of the great inland brigades to the Snake Country as well as the long trains by which the New Caledonia trade was maintained.

We possess returns for 1827, 1828, and 1830 which show the Kutenai trade at Fort Colvile. Almost a tenth of the Kutenai trade of 1827 was performed at that post, but there was a severe drop in 1828, and by 1830 the amount of negligible. This may betray the effects of an increasing business with the re-established Kootenay post at the expense of its headquarters. It could also indicate a Kutenai flirtation with American traders, even if most of their pelts were eventually secured by the H.B.C.

From 1827 and 1828, the Fort Colvile trade of the Kutenai is broken down between the upper and lower Kutenai. Quite predictably, the lower Kutenai were trading more than twice as many furs in most categories as were the upper. That is because the lower Kutenai lived much closer to Fort Colvile. That their trade also dropped off sharply by 1830 says something vague about the location of the Kootenay post. The proportion of deer skins traded at Fort Colvile also was much more impressive with the lower Kutenai.

On the other side of the ledger, we are fortunate in having David Thompson's requisitions for the "Columbia Department" for the years 1807 and 1808 (Dempsey 1973:37-41). Since in those years the Columbia Department consisted mainly of the Kutenai country, we have a good idea of what Thompson hoped to present to that tribe during those two years. The 108 categories of goods of 1807, both for Indian trade and fur trader consumption,

were increased to 151 categories the next year, and the quantities themselves were increased in most cases, often doubled in the second year. There was almost nothing in the way of trinkets, even fewer types and smaller quantities than the H.B.C. was accustomed to import into the district. Thompson, for example, asked for only 6 pounds of beads in 1808, though he did request 6 gross of hawk bells. But there was little else in the way of gewgaws.

Of the standard higher-value trade items, 36 blankets, 78 capots, 20 guns, 5 kegs of gunpower (about 333 pounds), probably between 5 and 600 pounds of tobacco, a bale (about 84 pounds) of copper kettles, and 14 dozen scalping knives were wanted for 1808. Several requisitions and invoices are extant for the Colvile District from 1826 into the 1860s, which would provide interesting comparisons. One inevitable conclusion is that the types of trade goods did not vary much until the late 1850s when the mining market began to force changes. Other observations possible from the lists would concern building hardware, food items for the traders, medicines, tools, and the quantities of alcoholic beverages.

Drawing detailed and quantified inferences from these lists requires much time. But one can readily say from an even brief perusal of the requisitions and invoices that the trading stock of both the N.W.C. and the H.B.C. was largely plain utilitarian stuff; the quality is more difficult to decide upon. But it is well known that the American fur traders tried hard to secure or emulate British trading stock because it was better made and for partly that reason preferred by the Indians.

Synopsis of the Traders Assigned to Kootenay

Like other outlying posts such as Flathead House or Fort Hall, the Kootenay posts were sometimes used by the H.B.C. for breaking in new European clerks under conditions that would quickly show their mettle. Such was the case with William G. Rae and Patrick McKenzie. But more often, the Kootenay trade was in the hands of highly experienced Canadian men of the interpreter or postmaster rank. These latter were the highest grades of contracted labor and just below that of the generally quite literate clerks such as William Kittson and John Work who were "Gentlemen" being groomed to be shareholding chief traders or chief factors.

Some of the men in charge of Kootenay had a past as freemen, unengaged traders who were simply grubstaked by the Company in return for furs they traded, or trapped themselves. Francois Payette and Nicholas Montour moved back and forth between being freemen and engaged servants, as did Francois Annance; all three may have been clerks at some point in their careers.

Edward Berland was a freeman during much of his early career. Freemen were generally looked upon as a nuisance in the Colvile District, but they were quite useful to the H.B.C. as nuisances also to the American fur companies operating on the Missouri headwaters. Freemen and French-Canadians generally faded away during the 1850s, so that there was no longer such a reservoir of men skilled with Indians to draw upon, and green men straight from Europe had to be used instead, to the eventual financial distress of the Hudson's Bay Company.

From the beginning of the western gold fever in 1849, the H.B.C. had much trouble keeping itself staffed; many of the old French Canadians headed for California. The result was a much lower frequency after that of French Canadians and half-breeds in H.B.C. service, employees of all ranks being now much more frequently drawn from Scotland and its isles. A result in the Kootenay trade was the reduction in staff to the point that after 1850 it was often handled by a single man, sometimes with an assistant, bolstered by part-time Indian employees and casuals like John Campbell who needed employment between bouts of prospecting or attempts at ranching.

Aside from David Thompson, who was a North West Company partner while in the Kootenay country, the highest-ranking fur trader employed in the Kootenay trade was Clerk William Kittson in the late 1820s and the early 1830s. This, not surprisingly, coincides with the period of the greatest aggressiveness on the part of the H.B.C. in its Colvile District trade and with the time of the greatest threat from American fur traders. The reasons for the slowdown in the 1840s are complex and not fully understood, but the American immigration into the Oregon Country that started in the early 1840s had much to do with it, and certainly the boundary settlement of 1846 was of overwhelming influence.

The list that follows presents all of the information we now have on the supervisory men in the Kootenai trade. It is confusing partly because appointments made at the annual council at Red River, or Norway House, in Rupert's Land (modern central Canada) could be countermanded by Chief Factor John McLoughlin in Vancouver or by the Chief Factor or Chief Trader in charge of Fort Colvile. Secondly, we often know more of appointments than we do details of actual service.

Most of the men in the Kootenay trade had colorful careers and some have been the subjects of biographical essays. Unfortunately, we cannot expand these matters in the short space of this study.

List of traders who were assigned to or who served at the Kootenay posts. Winters are designated by the years in which they began.

1800 Legacé and Leblanc wintered among the Kutenai (Coues 1897).

1807 David Thompson wintered at Toby Creek (Tyrrell 1916).

1808 David Thompson summered along the Kootenay River and wintered at Toby Creek; Finan McDonald and James McMillan wintered near Rainy Creek (Tyrrell 1916).

1809 No evidence of an active post, but several N.W.C. parties passed through the Kutenai country (Tyrrell 1916; White 1950).

1810 No evidence of an active post, but Joseph Howse of the H.B.C. and James McMillan of the N.W.C. were at Toby Creek in the fall (Coues 1897). Thompson passed along the Kootenay River (White 1950).

1811 Michel Kinville apparently wintered at Bonners Ferry; he may have summered there also (Elliott 1918). John McDonald of Garth of the N.W.C. was at Toby Creek in November (Coues 1897(1):278).

1812 Nicholas Montour of the N.W.C. and subordinates wintered at a post probably at the mouth of the Fisher; Francois Payette of the Pacific Fur Co. wintered at another post close by (Cox 1831).

1813 The following were either present or assigned to the Kootenay Post of the N.W.C. for the fiscal year 1813-14: Nicholas Montour, Clerk; Francois Methode, *Guide;* Jacques Ostiserico, *Devant*; J. B. Delormé, *Milieu*; Alexis Le Compte, *Milieu*; J. B. Pillon, *Milieu* (H.B.C.A. F.4/61/6-7d, in Payette 1962:188-193). The first three men were continuing with the N.W.C.; the last three were former employers of the Pacific Fur Company. The French terms are voyageur ranks: *Guide* - lead man in a boat brigage, at the front in the first boat; *Devant* - front man in a boat; *Milieu* - middleman in a boat, the lowest rank above Indian employees.

1814-1823 No evidence of assignments although it is reasonably certain that a post was in operation during all of these years. It is very likely that Montour served for much of this time (Cox 1831(2):154).

1824 Thomas Dears, Clerk, was appointed by Minutes of Council, 2 July, 1824 (H.B.C.A. D.4/87). But there was apparently no one actually there; the Kutenai traded at the Flathead post (Ross 1825; McLoughlin 1826a).

1825 Kittson made a brief summer trade (Elliott 1914a); but the Kutenai that winter traded at the Flathead post (McLoughlin 1826a; Elliott 1914b).

1826 William Kittson made the summer trade and then wintered there (Kittson 1827a). Thomas Dears was appointed by Minutes of Council (H.B.C.A. D.4/88/135d-136), but perhaps did not serve.

1827 No firm data. It is possible that Thomas Dears served.

1828 The summer trade was lost because of the late arrival of the trader, due in turn to the late appearance of the summer brigade at Colvile (Work 1828a). Kittson served in the winter (Dease 1828a; 1829a).

1829 The summer trade was conducted by Kittson (Dease 1829b); Kittson may have wintered (McLoughlin 1829a).

1830 Francois Payette was appointed by Minutes of Council (H.B.C.A. D.4/124/17a). He was locally expected to go there (Ermatinger 1830), but Kittson made the summer trade (Heron and Kittson 1831). Montour was sent with six men in the fall for wintering (Heron and Kittson 1831), and one source (McLoughlin 1830a) suggests that Montour was also there in the summer; in early October he had trapped briefly near Bonners Ferry (Heron and Kittson 1831).

1831 Francois Annance was designated for the summer (McLoughlin 28 June, 1831, in Varker 1948:199). Kittson was to winter there (S. McGillivray and Kittson 1831).

1832 Francois Payette was considered, perhaps employed; Montour was also considered (McLoughlin 14 March, 1832, in Barker 1948:264). Alexander C. Anderson was appointed by Minutes of Council, 8 June, 1832 (in Pate 1830). Montour wintered there, probably his last year (McLoughlin 1833a).

1833 A wintering party was present (Ferris 1940:249). Archibald McDonald made a summer trip there (A. McDonald 1834a).

1834 Francois Payette was appointed (McLoughlin 1834a). Kittson was designated to follow the Kutenai on to the Plains and draw them away from the Piegans (Simpson 1834a). Kittson was designated by Minutes of Council, 1 July, 1834 (H.B.C.A. D.4/100/44). Payette wintered there, probably for the last time (Simpson 1835a).

1835 Payette was designated for the winter (McLoughlin 1835a). W. G. Rae was ordered to make the summer trade (McLoughlin 1835b). I. Finlay was ordered to take charge for the winter as an interpreter and postmaster, and Payette was instead ordered to Walla Walla (McLoughlin 1835c).

1836 Rae was appointed by Minutes of Council (in Pate 1930); Flett may have summered there (Flett 1865). The post that winter was in the charge of Big Charles and Antoine Felix (A. McDonald 1837a).

1837-39 Thomas Flett served in the winters; a subordinate took charge during the summers (Flett 1865).

1840 Flett apparently served during the summer, and Edward Berland began his long tenure that winter (Flett 1865).

1841 Patrick McKenzie, an apprentice clerk, was ordered to Kootenay in October to understudy Berland during the winter; no evidence that he was used thereafter (A. McDonald 1841c).

1840-1853 Edward Berland apparently served continuously, both summer and winter, until his death. His rank is usually given as Interpreter, though just before he died he was called a Postmaster. The two appear to have been virtually interchangeable.

Detailed documentation for his tenure is:

1840 (Flett 1865)
1841 (A. McDonald 1841a)
1846 (Simpson 1846a; Douglas and Ogden 1846)
1847 (Ogden and Douglas 1847)
1848 (Ogden and Douglas 1848)

1850 (Ogden 1850)
1851 (Ogden 1851)
1852 With Michael Ogden as Postmaster and apparent subordinate (Douglas 1852a)
1853 Berland, Postmaster, died from pneumonia (Ogden and Mactavish 1853)

1853-1865 John Linklater, Interpreter and Postmaster, apparently served continuously until he quit the H.B.C. for the first time in 1865. Detailed documentation for his tenure is:

1853-1859 (Thiebodo 1940:329)
1854 (Campbell 1916:192)
1858 (Hamilton 1900:102-113)
1859 (Great Britain 1863)
1859 An Indian also employed by the H.B.C. at Bonners Ferry as a trader (Spry 1968:468)
1860 (Gibbs 1867:407)
1862 Linklater appointed (Mactavish 1862a)

1865 Linklater suddenly quit on 30 May 1865 (Finlayson 1865a). Michael Phillips was appointed (Tolmie 1865a). Linklater rejoined the service in the fall of 1865 (Finlayson 1865b).

1866 Linklater intended to quit in the summer (Finlayson 1866a). Michael Phillips was appointed; Linklater accompanied Phillips to Kootenay in the summer (Finlayson 1866b). Phillips was in charge during the winter of 1866, and Linklater retired from the service on 20 November, 1866 (Finlayson 1867a).

1867 Phillips was appointed (Tolmie 1867). Phillips' salary was L 40 per year (Finlayson 1867b).

1868 Mr. Jane replaced Phillips (Tolmie 1868a). Chief Trader Joseph Hardisty was ordered to replace Jane (Tolmie 1868b). Phillips and Allard were to continue at Kootenay (Tolmie 1868c) but Hardisty continued to be present as supervisor (Tolmie 1868d).

1869 Hardisty and Phillips, Clerk, were appointed (Tolmie 1869a).

1870 Chief Trader Joseph W. McKay was ordered to the Kootenay District to close it (Finlayson 1870) because Chief Trader Hardisty was in disgrace over large financial losses.

IV. THE IMPACT OF THE FUR TRADE ON THE KUTENAI

In discussing the impact of the fur trade and fur traders on the Kutenai, one is necessarily faced with running through a catalogue of the different parts of Kutenai life that were changed. This is because the influences of the fur trade were so far-reaching and comprehensive; the fur traders represented a European culture that had almost pathologically overflowed its bounds, which had been engulfing the world by virtue of its more wide-ranging knowledge, task specialization, and powerful technology. The fur traders, of course, brought only fragments of this colossus into the Kutenai country, but some of those fragments were nevertheless quite potent, partly because they were extensions of London, one of the principal centers of the expansion.

In an earlier study (Chance 1973) I reviewed the influences of just the Hudson's Bay Company on all the native cultures of the Colvile District, but slighted several tribes including the Kutenai. Most of the categories of fur trader influence we will discuss or omit here parallel information on other parts of the Colvile District, especially those inhabited by the three ethnolinguistic tribes of the western part of the district, the Colville, Lakes, and Spokan.

Rather than permitting the tribes to simply take it or leave it, it was a deliberate Hudson's Bay Company policy, more conscious than with its predecessor, the North West Company, to attach the Indians to the traders by "supplying them with their principal wants" (Dease 1827a). This was because in such districts as the Colvile, Indians were relied upon to do the trapping, so they had to be integrated into a system as well as possible if profits were to be realized. This was a policy of dependency, which somehow seems a little questionable when a strong culture does it to a weaker one, but it is no different from the goal of any aggressive commercial enterprise.

There were controls on the degree of dependency allowed, however. We have already mentioned the strict control of liquor traffic. Indebtedness was also as a rule not countenanced. According to Chief Trader John Dease (1827a) credit was not given in the Colvile District. We know, however, that exceptions were made, especially with chiefs (Chance 1973), and an interesting anecdote from the hand of DeSmet suggests the same sort of exception was made with some Kutenai. An old chief, poor and blind, owed an old debt of two beaver skins to the Company. He went to the priest, perhaps Father Menetrey, for he had persuaded his friends to give him a buffalo robe to repay the debt.

> The missionary, accompanied by the old man, went to the clerk of the Company to learn the particulars of the debt. The clerk examined the books, but said that no such debt existed. The chief still insisted on paying, but the clerk refused to take the robe. "Have pity on me," at last exclaimed the worthy old man, "this debt

> has rendered me wretched long enough; for years it has weighed on my conscience. I wish to belong to the blameless and pure prayer (religion), and to make myself worthy of the name of a child of God. This buffalo robe covers my debt." and he spread it on the ground at the feet of the clerk [DeSmet 1963:108].

There is also the interesting information from James Hector (in Spry 1968:464), who got it from Linklater, that goods were distributed to the Kutenai in the fall, evidently on credit. They would then pay for them with their furs the following spring. This is perhaps an oversimplification since Linklater wintered among the Kutenai. But to the extent it was a fact, this method of "grubstaking" may well have been more typical of the later years of the trade when the Company seems to have singled out the better or more professional trappers among the Indians for special attention.

The policy of attachment worked to the extent it did because of the trading goods. We have already remarked on the character of the items traded by the fur companies. We need to know their effects; but unfortunately we have to launch into guesswork here, with or without inspiration. Such things as copper and brass kettles, knives, steel awls, axes, perhaps thimbles, probably saved some labor and time for the Indian women. But the gains may have been lost to the increased fur and hide processing the women almost certainly had to do. We have never yet seen reference by a fur trader to this relationship between labor-saving tools and the potential for increased productivity in peltries.

Guns and ammunition we know were prized, but the actual quantity purchased in the average year is not known to us. Apparently the Kutenai did not come up to the Flatheads in the numbers of guns at the Flathead Rendezvous of 1824 (Table 4). Much later, Charles Wilson made the curious observation in the summer of 1861 that some Kutenai a few miles north of the mouth of the Tobacco River were greatly in need of tobacco, powder, and ball because of "having had little or no communication with the whites" (Stanley 1970: 161). Of course, this was the summertime, when the traders no longer visited the Kutenai; and Wilson did not say they lacked guns--the categories mentioned were all those that were rapidly expended. Yet DeSmet (1863:107) did claim that the Kutenai were "Deprived . . . of agricultural instruments and firearms, they are always in want, and they may be said to keep a perpetual Lent." Surely DeSmet is not at his most accurate here; he had visited with Kutenai at St. Ignatius Mission south of Flathead Lake in 1859, but had not been in their country since 1845.

One can speculate at length on what the actual consequence of the Kutenai having guns was. They were doubtless better able to defend themselves against the Piegans, but then they probably would have stayed off the Plains much more without firearms. Guns clearly made it easier to hunt fur and hide-bearing animals, but we do not know very much about the extent to which bullet holes were acceptable in deer hides or in bear skins. Since many of the latter probably became military headgear, bullet holes may have been permissable. We know that the Company always traded significant quantities of "beaver shot," and since beaver skins were largely made into felt

Table 4. Counts of Guns and Horses Among the Five Tribes Trading at the Flathead Rendezvous of November, 1824, at Prairie des Cheveaux, Clark Fork River, Montana.

Tribe	Population	Guns	Horses	Guns / Population	Horses / Population
Flathead	306	108	1140	.59	3.72
Pend d'Oreille	247	40	330	.16	1.34
Kutenai	212	62	180	.29	.85
Nez Perce	66	20	170	.30	2.57
Spokan	30	6	38	.20	1.27

SOURCE: Alexander Ross (1825). The tribes are presented in the order in which they traded at the Rendezvous.

for hats, holes may have been acceptable even though steel traps seem to have been used extensively in the Colvile District. We really have a sort of circular problem here, for without guns the Kutenai would not have depleted their elk, deer, sheep, and bear resources to the extent they did, making it less necessary for them to journey onto the Plains for protein.

Woolen blankets and capots (hooded coats of blanketing), and other woolens were immediately perceived as better clothing than buckskin in wet weather (Tyrrell 1916). In 1861, Wilson saw that the " . . . dress of the Kootenays consists of a blanket, or buffalo skin, wrapper, breech-clout of blanket or leather, with leggings and moccasins" (Wilson 1866:305). It is interesting that the Kutenai were still wearing as much traditional clothing as Wilson seems to imply; by this time Western clothing was very common among the tribes of the western part of the district.

The beads the Kutenai obtained were put to some uses linked with religion, as in Wilson (1866:305) again:

> . . . most of them have a Roman Catholic token suspended from a small bead necklace. A broad belt of yellow metal round the neck is a very favourite ornament, and many of the men are accustomed to carry a long string of beads by which they are enabled to tell the exact day of the month, coloured beads on the string serving to mark the termination of each month, a mode or reckoning time which has probably been introduced by the priests.

Not only had Company servants helped Indians keep track of the Sabbath, even before the arrival of priests in the country, but they also made appointments with Indians in such a way to suggest that the Indians of the Colvile District had been introduced to European calendrical reckoning just for business purposes (Chance 1973:83).

Religious acculturation as always is a very complicated issue, made worse by the partisanship of so many of the historians and anthropologists who take an interest in the subject. We shall confine ourselves to noting that the "Master of Life" concept was known and used by Thompson in the Pacific Northwest (Elliott 1920:171), a fact not previously known to me when I discussed this probable derivative from eighteenth-century Deism (Chance 1973:76). This sort of simple theology seems to have been characteristic more of the gentleman class of traders, while the lower orders, when religious, expressed themselves more along the lines of orthodox Catholicism. Much has been written of the early influences of Catholic Iroquois on the natives of the Rockies, but all we can say here is that this influence was probably felt by the Kutenai, since they were well exposed to these independently-minded intruders, but the extent of the proselytization or example is not precisely known.

DeSmet credited Edward Berland with sowing the effective seeds of Christianity among the Kutenai, which makes this intrepid trader even more of a paternal figure to "his Indians," as it was sometimes expressed. The

work of the missionaries themselves, begun with DeSmet's extensive baptisms in 1842 and 1845, is a subject that we should explore but cannot. Certainly by 1859 the Kutenai were noticed by Hector and Thiebodo to be very observant of daily religious practice. Though we cannot put the finger on any precise evidence, we suspect that the lower Kutenai were more conservative about giving up the old religion.

Perhaps the most dramatic change with the Kutenai was their adoption of cattle husbandry and a horticulture verging on agriculture. Unfortunately, all of our notices derive from the years 1859 through 1861. When it started is not easy to say; since both major branches of domestication require a certain amount of sedentism, and since there is often an ecological relationship between the two, with straw feeding cattle and manure fertilizing fields, it is possible that the two came in together. Usually however, in the Pacific Northwest potato cultivation was adopted by Indians often decades in advance of other horticulture and of animal husbandry, but we presently lack references to early Kutenai potato horticulture.

From Thompson's diaries we know that even though he had no post at the Tobacco River, he nevertheless sowed an experimental garden there in 1809 that included peas, turnips, and barley. But he left it unattended, and the results were not spectacular (White 1950:35). His choice of this location was probably inspired by the Indian tobacco gardens there (Gibbs 1869:381). Thomas Flett (1865) saw "Indian corn" growing there in the late 1830s, but whose planting it was we are not told--it could have been Berland's. However, Berland's continual comings and goings would not have made it easy for him to grow corn anywhere. One observer of the H.B.C. post at the Tobacco River in 1860 stated that it looked as if about forty acres had once been under cultivation there (C. T. Gardner, in Joint Commission 1865-69(13):56).

That the fur traders inspired the horticulture there seems to be little doubt, though the missionaries gave it encouragement. DeSmet even ordered ploughs from St. Louis for the Kutenai (and presumably other tribes), but the steamer bearing the implements burned on the way up the Missouri sometime before late 1861. The missionaries had also provided spades and ploughs to the Kutenai (DeSmet 1863:107; here contradicting himself), and Thiebodo (1940:329) saw two ploughs in the hands of these people in 1859.

Returning to the antiquity of the horticulture, we can only say that such innovations do not as a rule happen overnight since they require so many compensatory adjustments in a people's way of life. We are aware that at least by the late 1840s it was Hudson's Bay Company policy to encourage Indian agriculture around Fort Colvile. DeSmet implied some respectable age to the culture of food plants when he wrote in a December, 1861, letter that:

> The Indians have devoted themselves to agriculture [at Tobacco Plains] for some years past. They cultivate little fields of maize, barley, oats, and potatoes, all of which ripen. It is rare that the frost injures the crops before the season of harvest. Their small fields cannot be extended, owing to the want of instruments of agriculture [DeSmet 1863:106].

He added that the cultivation was done with wooden digging sticks. This seems almost a re-enactment of the small Neolithic efforts of the Fertile Crescent. I do not think it would be extravagant to suppose that in 1861 the Kutenai had at least decades of experimentation behind them. When we look at the better-known histories of the Colville, Spokan, and Nez Perce, such a statement seems well within reason.

John Linklater informed Thiebodo (1940:327) in 1859 that the Indians of Tobacco Plains grew "excellent wheat," which the diarist saw and agreed to the verdict. The year before Thomas Blakiston had recorded that "They grow some wheat and a few peas; a patch of the former, about 40 yards square, which I saw near their camp, although rather small-headed, looked well . . . ." (Blakiston 1868; Spry 1969:575). George Gibbs, also speaking generally of Tobacco Plains from his visits there in 1860, wrote:

> The Indians of the neighborhood raise some wheat, turnips, potatoes, and parsnips, generally selecting recesses in the foothills, and other favorable spots [Gibbs 1869:382].

At Joseph's Prairie, somewhere around Fort Steele, B.C., Gibbs (1869:381) saw "some patches of wheat, which looked well for Indian cultivation." This same Native establishment impressed Charles Wilson in 1861 to write:

> After the middle of our journey we passed over a fine large plain [Joseph's Prairie] where there were a few Indians living and taking charge of the Kootenay chief's property (the chief himself being absent); he has a large establishment here, two or three log houses, a band of 70 horses and about 30 head of cattle, besides which he had some wheat in the ground and a few vegetables [Wilson, 12 August 1861, in Stanley 1970:162-163].

That could lead one to think that the Kutenai chieftains were using horticulture and husbandry to enhance their position, a pattern common enough in developing countries where the leadership often spearheads innovation.

As to the cattle, the same sources note them in small herds, the largest being some 50 head at the Tobacco River (Thiebodo 1940:329). On ascending the mountains to the southeast of the Tobacco Plains in the summer of 1861, Charles Wilson, as usual one of our more expansive sources, observed:

> . . . at our feet lay the Tobacco Plains dotted over with clumps of trees and hemmed in at about 30 miles' distance by the abrupt spurs of the Galton Mountains, whilst to give a little air of civilization to the scene, numerous herds of cattle and horses (the property of the Indians) were roaming about at will [Wilson 22 July 1861, in Stanley 1970:154].

Somewhat surprising are the references to the Kutenai milking their cattle (Hector, in Spry 1968:462; Gibbs 1869:381; Stanley 1970:161). Palliser, passing the north end of Tobacco Plains in 1859 said that the Kutenai "had milk in abundance" (Spry 1968:475). In a photograph of a Kutenai village taken in 1861, four cows are plainly visible standing among the tipis, looking at the photographer.

The source of the cattle seems to have been the immigrant party of 1854 which was forced to leave some of its cattle behind (Lent 1963). We need, however, to try to discover if the same thing occurred in 1841, since the increase could not have been enough between 1854 and 1860 to account for the total herd then of probably well over 100 head. The Hudson's Bay Company did deliberately introduce cattle among Indians of the southern Plateau (Chance 1973) but the Kutenai country would seem too distant for that to have taken place there.

While there are many other areas of fur trade influence we could discuss, we are hampered by scanty or single-source data which force too much speculation at this stage, so we shall take up just one or two additional matters, including the question of mammal depletion. In 1830, John Work reported that deer and elk were already becoming scarce in the vicinity of the Kootenay post. He also said that the average chivreau (deer) traded to the post weighed just 51½ pounds, presumably dressed (Work 1830). This does seem like small deer, but not proof of depletion by itself.

There are notices of 1839 and 1842 that the supply of deer had failed, which would apply chiefly to the Kutenai country (Archibald McDonald 1839a, 1842e). Yet this cannot have been a condition that lasted long, for in 1853 Fort Colvile had on hand some 688 deer skins, plus 58 elk hides, and 15 reindeer (caribou) hides (Fort Vancouver n.d.). Most of these skins and hides must have been of Kutenai origin. The number of elk hides is, nevertheless, rather low compared to earlier times.

The most telling testimony to big game depletion comes from the pens of the Palliser expedition. Thomas Blakiston (1858), claimed that the Kutenai had to cross the Rockies for their meat "for there is little or no large game on the west side." And James Hector in the next year just north of Lake Windermere was moved to reason:

> Elk or wapiti must at one time have been very numerous in this district, as we saw a great many antlers lying on the ground, and sometimes the Indians had piled them in heaps of 50 or 60 together; but the open nature of the woods, and the limited range, excepting up and down the valley, must have made them an easy prey to the Indians as soon as they acquired firearms. We have not seen a single track of an elk yet in the valley, and but only a few of the smaller deer [Spry 1968:459].

This sad commentary suggests that whole herds were killed together; one should be reminded that only adult males had antlers.

As to other species, the beaver catch declined, but marten and bear rose dramatically in later years. We cannot be sure of beaver depletion because the price for them declined sharply in the 1840s as beaver hats were pushed aside by those of silk. Coincident with this change was indication of demographic crisis among beaver in the Colvile District, betrayed by the increasing proportions of small or immature beaver in the catch (Johnson and Chance 1974).

John Linklater told Augustus Thiebodo that the catch of the winter 1858-59 had included 220 bear skins, 800 martin, 500 beaver, 2000 rats [muskrat], a large amount of dressed moose [!], elk, and buffalo skin (Thiebodo 1940:328). To Hector (in Great Britain 1863:155) in the same year Linklater said the production of his post was about 200 bear, 600 marten, and only 300 beaver, as well as other species. Linklater may thus have been quoting statistics to suit the audience. One could wonder if the bear and marten populations could have withstood very many years of such abuse. Evidently the fisher population in northern Idaho was all but wiped out (Donald Johnson:personal communication).

All this trapping would have been hampered if the Indians had wasted their time in raids and feuds. The Hudson's Bay Company, and the North West Company before it, had policies of settling differences among the tribes, indeed of lecturing them against making war. Conferences of chiefs were held at Spokane House and Fort Colvile in which the traders especially forbade warfare among the tribes west of the Continental Divide. These injunctions may not have extended to the proper way to treat Piegans, but even here we cannot be sure, for the Hudson's Bay Company had a well-developed trade with them also.

In 1822 a party of Kutenai visited Spokane House where they were taken inside the fort to protect them from their enemies, the Coeur d'Alene, who were camped nearby. The traders even took the precaution of arming themselves in case there were trouble. Finan McDonald (McDonald and Birnie 1823) observed that since "we consider them [the Kutenai] strangers, who have always conducted themselves well toward the whites, we indulged them with permission of sleeping in the Fort." The curtailment of violence in the Colvile District should have been beneficial to most of the Indians, but perhaps we judge too freely.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Economic and Historical Significance of the Kootenay Fur Trade

The history of the Kootenay fur trade is like one of those damaged mosaics that are sometimes found on the floors of Roman villas and basilicas. Although large patches may be missing, when most of the floor is cleared the patterns begin to be sufficiently discernible that the mind's eye can fill in some of the absent details with reasonable confidence. Here we have presented not above half of the surviving pieces, so the detail and the patterns can be made sharper in time.

With the Kootenay trade we see no picture of one or two static fur trading posts with corpulent traders smoking behind the counter waiting for Indians to drop by to be cheated. It was rather a story of constant movement of men, horses, canoes, and trading posts, and with traders as often as not travelling about trying to collect the last fur of the season. There is so much motion and the records are so scanty that we cannot satisfactorily pinpoint the locations of the traders for even half of the summering and wintering trading parties.

The toughness of traders who could move about and live under such harsh conditions is difficult for us to comprehend. And while the Kootenay trade was part of a vast network centered in London, then the commercial capital of the world, we have perhaps noticed that important decisions were made all the way down the well-stratified chain of command to the clerks and postmasters who conducted the Kootenay trade. That capable and vigorous men could be found to run the business of Kootenay for between three and five thousand dollars a year in our money says something about the expectations of the nineteenth century, both the low expectation of comfort and remuneration and the desire to perform well for considerations other than money.

The profit to the Hudson's Bay Company of the Kootenay trade may be roughly calculated. If we average the net profit of the Colvile District for 23 out of the 34 years from 1822 through 1855, we arrive at a figure of £ 2717, which takes no account of possible inflation or deflation in the British pound during those years. This was equal to $13,042 in 1853 dollars, using an H.B.C. rate of exchange for the year, or about $130,416 U.S. dollars of today using a factor of 10. If we assume that the Kootenay portion of the Colvile District yielded about a third of the profits, which seems justified, then we find an average net annual profit of about $43,472 for the Kootenay trade for that period. Of that sum, about 66% would be taken by capitalist investors, mostly in London, and about 33% would go to pay Company officers in North America.

For the whole period of 1822 through 1855, the sum total profits realized by the Company from the Kutenai would have been only about $1,478,048 if our average is close to being representative. That is, of course, only very approximate since I do not know all the factors that entered into the calculation of the net profit, for example whether the "depot advances" for goods passing through Fort Vancouver were used, and if they were, to what extent they were realistic for figuring profit. Just the same, the general impression is that there was no immense profit made out of the Kutenai Indians for all the human investment on the part of the H.B.C. servants, let alone the incalculable labor expended by the Indians themselves. I think that our figures are sufficiently accurate to rest safe in that conclusion.

We presently have no way of approximating the North West Company profits from before 1822 though it would seem very likely from the general tenor of correspondence (Merk 1931) that the average for the years 1807 through 1821 was quite a bit less than the one we present above. And after 1855, the profits for the H.B.C. dropped dramatically; several years of the 1860s showed losses for the Colvile District, the greatest of which was $24,372 in 1864 (1864 dollars), at which time Kootenay was still a part of the District. We have already witnessed the huge loss incurred during the final year of the Kootenay trade.

If the wealth gained from the Kutenai was not very great by our standards, the impact of getting it was more significant. The changes wrought in the lives of the thousand or so Kutenai were revolutionary in that, as we have seen, they were given the means of repelling their enemies the Piegans, of hunting more efficiently, and perhaps of finding a slightly greater comfort in their harsh existence through the use of blankets, cooking pots, knives, firesteels, axes, files, and other tools. On the other hand, the Kutenai were tempted, indeed cajoled, into destroying their animal resources, especially deer and elk, perhaps also their beaver, bear, martens, fishers, and other species. They were introduced to cattle husbandry, milk, and some agricultural crops, opportunities that they seized but could not use quickly enough to build themselves into a strong power before the Americans seized their country.

I think that the fur traders softened the Kutenai barriers to Christianity and to the white man in general. Whether this was good or bad depends on one's perspective. It would seem that some of those North American Indians who resisted the Americans have become strong in recent times--one thinks of the Sioux and Navajo. On the other hand, some that resisted desperately like the Northern Paiute were crushed and remain so. So far, the Kutenai have not done well in the white world: I think of the small group of survivors near Bonners Ferry, Idaho, who inhabit a tiny islet of ground surrounded by white farms. Of course, without the fur traders they might well have succumbed much more to the revages of the Piegans. There was no way for the Kutenai to withstand the power of Euroamericans armed with the formidable technology; the traders probably eased them into the orbit of the European world so that they were not overwhelmed by a sudden onslaught of conquest and disease.

As with much of the United States, the fur traders explored the country and made it easier for the immigrants to follow. This is obvious to anyone. But in the case of the Colvile District, the traders actually were perceived by American immigrants and miners as forestalling settlement and exploitation by their "old fogey" policies (Lex 1863). This was partly true though greatly exaggerated by contemporary commentators. This fact, so far as it was true, may have given the Indians a more prolonged period of adjustment.

The details of the lives of most of the fur traders of the Kootenay posts are largely lost because most of the men were of insufficient rank and education to leave much behind. So the drama and excitement of the Kootenay trade are glimpsed through just single sentences and paragraphs in surviving letters. We have to imagine the rest, which is not that bad if a framework can be provided on which to drape that effort.

The Colvile District was the most abundant producer of furs of all the districts of the Oregon Country exceptiong New Caledonia--northern interior British Columbia. But it exceeded New Caledonia in its production for the area of land. The Kutenai contributed a very significant amount to that status and were one of the three tribes mainly responsible; the other two being the Flathead and the Lakes or Sinaikst. The Kutenai participated fully in the fur trade before the Lakes by more than two decades, and they outlasted the Flathead also by a decade or two. No other tribe in the Pacific Northwest involved itself for a longer period in the organized fur trade than did the Kutenai, and no other excelled than in the intensity of effort over the long run, ignoring for a moment their waywardness in the middle 1803s.

I think that the Kutenai contributed in an important way to the image of the Rocky Mountain Indian as an energetic, colorful, brave and reliable human being, the longed-for realization of the dream of the noble savage that had been so often disappointed on both sides of the Rockies. Why the Rocky Mountain Indians, the Kutenai, Flathead, Pend d'Oreille, some Nez Perce, the mountain Shoshoni, and the Crow, stood out in this fashion is another problem, but probably their great value as trappers in a difficult terrain had something to do with it.

Summary of the Kootenay Posts, and Their Structures

1. Camp or house of Legacé and Leblanc of 1800-01.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: Unknown; presumably in the upper Kootenay Valley, or on the headwaters of the Columbia.
   Dates in Use: 1800-1801, ?
   Structures: Unknown
   Sources: Coues (1897:footnotes); Dempsey (1965); original source solely in the unpublished Thompson journals; Schaeffer (1966).

2. Abortive or preliminary Fort Kootenay of 1807.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: Northwest shore of Lake Windermere, B.C.
   Dates in Use: 1807.
   Structures: One Warehouse.
   Source: Tyrrell (1916); Thompson journals.

3. Fort Kootenay, called Kootenay House by Thompson, later called Old Fort Kootenay, Thompson's Old House. Built in 1807 just after No. 2; perhaps used as late as 1841.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: On the left bank of Toby Creek, near its mouth at the Columbia River, just north of Lake Windermere, B.C.
   Dates in Use: 1807-10, and ?.
   Structures: A house, palisades, and bastions mentioned; probably at least a store in addition. This is the only post that was certainly fortified.
   Source: Tyrrell (1916) and the Thompson journals; latest primary source is Archibald McDonald (1841d).

4. The Finan McDonald/James McMillan house of the winter of 1808-09; apparently occupied for just that season.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: At or a little south of the mouth of Rainy Creek, right bank of the Kootenay River between Libby and Jennings, Montana.
   Dates in Use: 1808-09.
   Structures: A "hangard" or storehouse and two leather tents.
   Sources: Thompson journals (White [1950] and unpublished journals).

5. The Michel Kinville or "Lake Indian" House of the fall of 1811 and perhaps of the spring of 1812.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: Probably at the present town of Bonners Ferry, Idaho.
   Dates in Use: 1811-12.
   Structures: Unknown, but probably just a single structure.
   Sources: Elliott (1914b:112n, 1918, 1920); and possibly unpublished journals of David Thompson.

6. Montour House of the winter of 1812-13. Probably used up until at least 1823.
   Affiliation: North West Company.
   Location: Probably at the flats across from the Fisher mouth; right bank of the Kootenay River.
   Dates in Use: 1812-23 (?).
   Structures: Unknown, probably at least one building; possibly fortified.
   Sources: Cox (1831), Ross (1904), Campbell (1918a, 1918c).

7. Payette House of the Pacific Fur Company for the winter of 1812-13.
   Affiliation: Pacific Fur Company.
   Location: Unknown; alleged by Jacob Meyers to have been at the mouth of Rainy Creek.
   Dates in Use: 1812-?.
   Structures: Unknown; possibly one building.
   Sources: Cox (1831); Jacob Meyers (in Pate 1929).

8. William Kittson House of the Hudson's Bay Company. If this was a distinct house in a new location, it was probably built in the winter of 1826 or shortly thereafter.
   Affiliation: H.B.C.
   Location: Unknown; probably either at the same place as No. 6 or at Libby, Montana.
   Dates in Use: Unknown, at least late 1820s.
   Structures: Unknown, but said by John Work to have been of a temporary character. There is some possibility that this post had minimal fortification, because like its immediate predecessor, No. 6(?), it was sometimes referred to as a "fort." If this post was on the same site as No. 6, the probability is very good that it was entirely reconstructed under Kittson because of the short longevity of the types of buildings used.
   Sources: Work (1830); Elliott (1914b).

9. Hudson's Bay House of the 1830s; the "Kootanie Fort" of the maps. There is a better than even chance that this post was the same as No. 8, but we cannot be sure, partly because our references of the late 1830s are to a house and not to a fort.
   Affiliation: H.B.C.
   Location: Probably across from the mouth of the Fisher.
   Dates in Use: 1830s.
   Structures: Unknown, but Flett's (1865) testimony listing three houses and a store of hewn logs may well describe this post; if so, there were no fortifications, at least in later years. There is some indication (Campbell 1918c) that this location may have been used by Berland after the initial transfer to Tobacco Plains.
   Sources: Archibald McDonald (1840a, 1841b); Campbell (1918a, 1918b, 1918c); Flett (1865) if he is not telling the truth; Stansbury (1838) map; Wilkes (1841) map; Arrowsmith (1957) map; Devine (1857) map; Arrowsmith (1859) map; Ross map of 1849 (Thwaites 1904). All maps listed refer to H.B.C. posts rather than N.W.C. posts, except for the Ross map which is ambiguous.

10. Edward Berland's East Tobacco Plains post, c. 1839-52.
    Affiliation: H.B.C.
    Location: Tobacco Plains, at the mouth of the Tobacco River on the right bank; well back from the left bank of the Kootenay. The location as a site of buildings is not reasonably certain until 1845.
    Dates in Use: c. 1839-52.

Structures: Three houses and a store, of hewn logs according to Flett (1865). According to the H.B.C. inventory of 1847 the buildings were as follows:

1 dwelling house	18 x 15 feet	valued at £ 120
1 dwelling house	15 x 13 feet	valued at £ 80
1 dwelling house	12 x 10 feet	valued at £ 60
1 store	20 x 20 feet	valued at £ 150

Sources: Archibald McDonald (1841b, 1841f); Ogden and Douglas (1847b); Hudson's Bay Company (1865); Campbell (1918a); DeSmet (1848) map; Pleasonton (1859) map.

11. Berland's and Linklater's West Tobacco Plains post, c. 1852-58. Probably constructed by Berland.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: On the right bank of the Kootenay River, most likely at the mouth of Dodge Creek.
Dates in Use: c. 1852-58; well-authenticated for just 1854.
Structures: Unknown, probably just one or two buildings.
Sources: Campbell (1916, 1918c); Johnson (1969:332-333).

12. Post at the mouth of Young Creek; supposedly a successor to No. 11; if a real post, most likely abandoned on or before 1858.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Mouth of Young Creek, right bank of Kootenay, just south of the 49th parallel.
Dates in Use: Late 1850s.
Structures: Unknown.
Sources: Johnson (1950:14, 1969:332-333). Johnson is the sole source for this information, which may derive from writings of Campbell we have not seen. This post seems doubtful.

13. Linklater's North Tobacco Plains post, c. 1858-66.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Variously from one-quarter to one mile north of the 49th parallel, and probably one the left bank of the Kootenay.
Dates in Use: c. 1858-66.
Structures: At least one building.
Sources: Angus McDonald (1865:164); Hudson (1867); G. C. Gardner (1867); Hamilton (1900); Campbell (1918c).

14. Linklater's post, c. 1857-60, next to the mission station of the Sacred Heart of Mary.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: At the pond known as Lake Livermore on the right bank of the mouth of the Tobacco River, back from the left bank of the Kootenay. Probably the same site as No. 10, and probably the same buildings as No. 10.
Dates in Use: c. 1857-60.
Structures: Variously two to four crude log cabins, not counting the adjacent Church of the Sacred Heart of Mary and its associated cabin for the visiting missionary. The mission station,

built in about 1858, may not be the same as that founded in 1845 by DeSmet since the DeSmet (1848) map and the Pleasonton (1859) map show the mission to the south of the Tobacco River, near Rexford, Montana.

Sources: Alden (1867); Gibbs (1867); Hudson (1867); Thiebodo (1940); Spry (1968); Johnson (1969); Kootenay River Trail map (c. 1860); Hawkins (1861) map.

15. Phillips' post at Wildhorse Creek, c. 1866-71.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Fort Steele, B.C., on a claim of 160 acres taken out by Phillips.
Dates in Use: c. 1866-71.
Structures: At least one log cabin.
Sources: Finlayson (1867a); Tolmie (1868a); Campbell (1918c); Johnson (1950, 1969).

16. The "Flatbow" Post, 1868 or 1869-71; under David McLoughlin.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Probably at Creston, B.C., at the south end of Kootenay Lake.
Dates in Use: c. 1868-71.
Structures: Probably just one building.
Sources: Tolmie (1869b); Johnson (1969:317).

17. Post at "Fisherville," 1868 or 69-1870 or 71.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Unknown, presumably near Cranbrook, B.C.
Dates in Use: c. 1868-71.
Structures: Probably one building.
Source: Tolmie (1869c).

18. Post of Perry Creek, 1868-70.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Probably at the mouth of Perry Creek, just south of Porteous, B.C.
Dates in Use: c. 1868-70.
Structures: Probably just one building.
Source: Finlayson (1870)

19. Post called "Trading Post," 1868 or 1869-70.
Not the same as No. 18, but possibly the same as No. 17.
Affiliation: H.B.C.
Location: Unknown.
Dates in Use: c. 1868-70.
Structures: Probably just one building.
Source: Finlayson (1870).

Archaeological Recommendations

If the archaeological contexts of any of the Kootenay posts are intact in whole or in part, the following problems may be addressed. It is important to attempt to precisely locate the posts so that they can be situated in the chronology--to get around the ambiguities that exist in the historical documentation. The historical record will then take on added meaning and significance. If, for example, we know where William Kittson had his winter headquarters then we can speak more intelligently about the logistics of the fur trade at that time and about the competition between the Hudson's Bay Company and the fur companies of the Americans that were reaching in from the upper Missouri. If we know whether fortifications were erected opposite the mouth of the Fisher we can speculate more sharply about security, about Piegans, and about the intended permanence of the post.

One may expect to recover some of the artifact patterns that will help to classify and sort the fur traders from an anthropological standpoint. The patterns would be of two types: horizontal distribtions both inside and outside of dwellings, and statistical patterns that show relative proportions of artifact classes that can be recovered from even disturbed contexts. The horizontal patterns tell us where various sorts of activities took place and in what intensity. Statistical patterns, the second type, help to identify the kinds of activities particular structures were devoted to, they can reveal unsuspected changes through time, such as with a series of Kootenay fur posts, or they can be used to establish signatures. Statistical patterns become useful when comparison is made with other assemblages from other sites, in this case Fort Colvile, Kanaka Village, Fort Vancouver, Spokane House, Bellevue Farm, or the many posts sampled in Canada. Anomalies occur which then require historical explanations, which in turn enrich history itself.

The sites of the Kootenay posts will almost certainly prove not to be spectacular archaeological deposits from a layman's point of view, even though they may well increase our knowledge of the fur trade history of the Kootenay Valley. The posts need to be located especially so we can sort out the muddy "middle period" chronology, and so that we can recover controlled samples of their assemblages to discover details of their trading inventory and the characteristics of their domestic economies. Features in the shape of hearth bases, cellars, and possibly fortifications in the case of the post or posts opposite the Fisher mouth may be found. Foundations of buildings will be hard to find since the structures probably rarely rested on posts that entered the ground. But post molds from various platforms like beds may be present, depending in part on the amount of sand in the soil.

An archaeologist with experience in fur trade sites should be sent to the Kootenay reservoirs to perform a reconnaissance on the ground, and to photograph suspected sites, notably at Rainy Creek, the flat opposite the Fisher mouth, the site complex just north of the mouth of the Tobacco River, and above the flood plain around the mouths of Dodge and Young creeks, also in the Tobacco Plains. Other suspected sites outside of the two reservoirs might be photographed for the purpose of enhancing the historical background study to show the different types of geographical settings. Inquiries should be made around the town of Libby to determine if fur trade period artifacts have

surfaced. If they have, the items should be examined by a qualified individual so that a chronological assessment can be made.

Where warranted by reconnaissance, suspected sites may be then tested in a limited and inexpensive way. Since the sites and their assemblages cannot be very large, it is important that reconnaissance, testing, and possible excavation be kept in perspective, and that funds be employed at a rate that can be continually justified by returns in information. A good criterion to keep in mind is whether historical information is being augmented by the work; if it is not, then the enterprise in the case of the Kootenay posts becomes questionable. This is because anthropological data in historic sites will not be of any value if the historical framework remains unknown. It also means that hunting for artifacts is a waste of money; we already have an excellent idea of what the artifacts of the fur trade from ca. 1800-1871 look like--what we need is information about the people and their history.

On suspected sites, the best procedure of exploration is by using controlled patterns of shallow, hand-auger excavations with close attention to the precise number and class of artifacts recovered per known volume of augered earth. Auger patterning should be flexible, with the archaeologist beginning with just a measured line of two or three holes, which can be expanded or intensified with smaller intervals as the returns indicate. Random patterns are not recommended because they are far more expensive than an effort begun on a small scale with two to four people under the direction of someone who knows what he is looking for. The essential factor is having a testing director who is experienced enough to aim at the most likely parts of the terrain.

Cellars can be found by augering with close patterns if artifact returns suggest that such are warranted. Most of the Kootenay posts should have cellars, of at least the shallow variety found under servants' houses at Colvile and Kanaka Village. But deep cellars are also to be expected. These structures were used to store desiccated furs, to secure valuables, for making caches left when traders were absent, and for the storage of meat and roots.

If a site is discovered by these means, a decision on whether to proceed with regular excavations can be made by comparing artifact densities with those that are precisely known from augering and excavating such sites as Fort Colvile, Kanaka Village, or Spalding Mission. Decisions can be also based on whether features have been encountered during the augering.

Artifacts most likely to show up in augering tests of the Kootenay posts, in order of decreasing density, are glass beads, lead shot and ball, clay pipe fragments, gunflints, slate tablet fragments and slate pencils, and trinkets like jews harps and brass rings. Copper sheet scrap and wire, and iron gun parts would also be expected, though rare. Ceramics should be very scarce or nonexistent since tinware was mainly used at outlying posts. Bottle glass, especially of the dark olive-green variety, may be present, but again in low frequency. Nails and window glass should be very hard to find, -if seen at all, and iron of any kind will be scarce. Tools will be extremely low in frequency except for files, and horseshoes and their nails may not be found at all on the Kootenay sites.

Time-sensitive artifacts with which the posts can be situated in the chronology will be chiefly beads and clay pipe fragments. Ceramics and window glass will be very useful if found, but they, as we said, are not really expected. Dated Catholic medals often show on fur trade sites and can help in dating. Coins are not expected from the Kootenay sites since specie was not used in trade at all until the 1860s and then very rarely.

Animal bone refuse ought to be abundant, but will by itself not be diagnostic since butchering patterns on sites of the lower-ranking traders will most likely be indistinguishable from Indian refuse of that type. Non-European features that are nevertheless associated with the posts should be expected, such as out-door cooking pits and earth ovens.

A stratigraphic feature that is expected on unplowed locations is deposits of clay or silty clay, often burned, from roofing and from chimneys and hearths. Stone was very sparingly used in construction by these traders, in fact the meagre use of stone is one of the small mysteries of the fur trade, possibly explained by the fact that most of the traders had experience in far colder parts of the continent where stone is cold and subject to frost damage. Privies should be rare or absent; the evidence to date suggests that fur traders below officer ranks, and sometimes officers, did not have much use for them. If fortifications are present they will probably not encircle buildings but will more likely just connect them. Buildings themselves are most likely to be defined by clay or silt strata and little else besides patches of denser artifacts.

In conclusion, the Kootenay posts need to be approached cautiously from the archaeological standpoint but they must be approached to satisfy the law and the public need. General archaeological reconnaissance often fails--I found most of the important archaeological sites in Lake Roosevelt only after arming myself with questions. There may be some good deposits that can be rewarding in information, chiefly at the flats across from the Fisher and near the little lake just north of the mouth of the Tobacco River. The latter site has been inundated for many years, which will not have done much damage unless there has been erosion. The site or sites across from the Fisher, on the other hand, were disturbed to an unknown degree in about 1950 by a road-building crew that turned up a stone inscribed:

> "Forts, 1810-1812. H.B.C. 1810 - N.W.C. PFC 1812. J. Meyers, locator"

which would indicate that the disturbance was at or near where Meyers had thought several of the early posts, including that of Howse, had been located. This marker was:

> a little distance downriver from a spot where a rancher earlier plowed up a large hearth stone with chimney rubble, an ancient bootjack in the form of a nude woman, and several jugs of alcoholic beverage reported to have been still palatable and potent. The fields of this ranch can be seen in the Kootenai River view on page 182 [which is of the flat across from the Fisher][Johnson 1969:182, 218].

Such a report is not encouraging, and it could be that only cellar bottoms, if such there are, will be found intact.

Historical Recommendations

Not all of the data we had collected for this study could be used in this version of the report. That is because we seriously underestimated the amount we had in notes or at our fingertips when we designed the writing contract. Not all of the literature in libraries close at hand was used either, because of the volume. And there are a number of archives that could be consulted; these are listed at the end of the references.

This study can be expanded and enriched in many ways, especially with the incorporation of more human interest material and more analysis of the ethnohistory of the Kutenai. There is a considerable amount of biographical information available on some of the men who figure in the Kootenay fur trade, some of which could be employed to the greater enjoyment of the reading public.

Other subject areas where enhancement can be guaranteed are the correlation of American fur trade events of the upper Missouri with those of the Kootenay, and the relations between the Kutenai and the Blackfeet. We can make more extensive use of the George Simpson and Peter DeSmet sources and of our notes from Hudson's Bay Company correspondence. Many historic maps, a few photographs, and several sketches, engravings, and watercolors are available for illustrating a more finished product. It would also be desirable to include various maps and drawings of our own composition to help the reader to visualize the topics under discussion. Then, of course, one would want to publish some of the panoramic photographs made in the course of the ground reconnaissance of the trading post sites. Very useful in this kind of study is the oblique aerial photograph that will show completely and vividly the valleys, mountain passes, and other features.

One could argue that it would be worthwhile to complete the historical research so that it would allow the production of the definitive study, which this is not because of the many loose ends and unconsidered sources. There is not much chance that such a definitive study of the Kootenay fur trade will be done independently of government sponsorship, for several reasons. In the first place, Olga Johnson (1950, 1969) has "skimmed the cream" as far as popular commercial books are concerned. Also, no private researcher such as a graduate student writing a thesis can hope to finance the archival work that should still be done. There is also the problem of academic fashion; fur trade history is not looked upon with much favor these days in the better schools because of the belief that everything "significant" about it is already known. Even though we could show this belief to rest on doubtful foundations, we nevertheless have to live with the facts of fashion. Most writers of general or popular history will not be inclined to treat the whole Kootenay fur trade as a unity; rather we should expect more exploitation of such segments as the David Thompson material or the cultural position of the Kutenai, but not the two together, nor amalgamated with such themes as the economics of the fur trade.

It seems that the most abundant information on the Kootenay fur trade and on the Kutenai in the historic period will come from historic as opposed to archaeological sources. If that is true, then much of the compensation for the loss of archaeological deposits to roads, farming, and especially dam construction lies in historical research. A review of the National Historic

Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 suggests that historical documentation falls squarely within the intent of the Act, at least for properties eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. All of the Kootenay fur trading posts would be most likely eligible, if located. Documentation is, of course, presumed to be necessary for the location of sites in this and other Acts of Congress.

We cannot hold out unrealistic hopes of resolving our historical problems by additional research in archives. Archival research is an unpredictable enterprise, and I have already spent some time in the best repository, the Hudson's Bay Company Archives, without, however, having had the Kootenay story as the objective. Virtually all of the archival research will produce relatively low-volume returns for the amount of money invested--that is from the standpoint of historical research. But when we compare the ratio of return over investment to the costs of producing archaeological information, the results should be very respectable. In other words, the cost-benefit ratio for archival research is much better than for archaeological work.

REFERENCES CITED

Abbreviations: H.B.C.A.: Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg.
B.C.P.A.: British Columbia Provincial Archives, Victoria.

Alden, John
1867 Testimony. In Joint Commission (1865-69(9)).

Anderson, Alexander C.
1850 Letter to George Simpson, Fort Colvile, 17 April 1850. H.B.C.A. D.5/28/104-105.

1851 Letter to Governor and Council, Fort Colvile, 22 April 1851. H.B.C.A. D.5/30/639.

1852 Letter to Governor and Council, Fort Colvile, 22 April 1852. H.B.C.A. D.5/33/448.

Arrowsmith Company
1857 Map. Published in Great Britain, House of Commons (1857).

1859 Map. Published in folder to accompany Volume 11 of Joint Commission (1865-69).

Ayers, Gary, Bob Betts, Erich Obermayr, Dennis Roubicek
1979 *Cultural resource survey of the Kalispel Trail.* Cultural Resource Consultants, Inc., Sandpoint.

Ballenden, John
1852a Letter to Eden Colvile, Fort Vancouver, 22 March 1852. H.B.C.A. A.11/71/66.

Bancroft, Hubert H.
1877 *History of British Columbia, 1792-1877.* San Francisco: H. H. Brancroft.

Barker, Burt Brown
1948 *Letters of Dr. John McLoughlin.* Portland: Binfords and Mort

Blakiston, Capt. Thomas, Royal Artillery
1858 Report on the exploration of the Kootanie and Boundary passes of the Rocky Mountains in 1858. In Great Britain (1860:Appendix II).

Blenkinsop, George
1859a Letter to George Simpson, Fort Colvile, 25 February 1859. H.B.C.A. D.5/48/288.

1859b Letter to James Graham, Vancouver, 14 December 1859. H.B.C.A. A.11/71/1047.

Burns, Robert I., S.J.
1966 *The Jesuits and the Indian wars of the Northwest.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Campbell, John V.
1915a Letter to the *Kootenai Times* of 27 January 1915. Quoted in Pate (1930.

1915b Letter to the *Kootenai Times* of 3 March 1915. Quoted in Pate (1930).

1916 The Sinclair Party . . . 1854. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 7(3):187-201.

1918a Letter to Charles Kessler, Lillooet, 2_ April 1918. Transcript of original in the William A. Clark Memorial Library, Los Angeles.

[1918]b Letter to Charles Kessler, [Lillooet], written between April and October. Source the same as 1918a.

1918c Letter to Charles Kessler, [Lilloet], 6 October [19]18. Source the same as 1918a.

Chamberlain, A. F.
1892 Report on the Kootenay Indians of south-eastern British Columbia. *Reports of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* 62:549-614.

Chance, David H.
1972 Fort Colvile: the structure of a Hudson's Bay Company post, 1825 to 1871 and after. Report to the National Park Service.

1973 Influences of the Hudson's Bay Company on the Native cultures of the Colvile District. *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes,* Memoir No. 2.

1981 The Spokan; The Colville. Mss: ethnographic summaries submitted to Cultural Resource Consultants, Inc., Sandpoint.

Chance, David H. and Jennifer V. Chance
1979 Kettle Falls: 1977: salvage archaeology in and beside Lake Roosevelt. *University of Idaho Anthropological Research Manuscript Series*, No. 53.

Coues, Elliott, editor
1897 *The journals of Alexander Henry and David Thompson, 1799-1814.* New York: Francis P. Harper.

Cox, Ross
1831 *Adventures on the Columbia River . . . .* London: H. Colburn and R. Bentley.

David, William L., S.J.
1954 *A history of St. Ignatius Mission: an outpost of Catholic culture on the Montana frontier.* Spokane: Hill Printing Company.

Dease, John Warren

1826a Letter to Governor, etc., Spokan, 7 April 1826. H.B.C.A. D.4/119/92-93.

1826b Letter to Governor, etc., Athabasca Portage, 15 October 1826. H.B.C.P.A. A/B/40/422K.

1827a Colvile District report and answers to queries put by John McLoughlin, 16 April 1827. H.B.C.A. B.45/e/1.

1827b Letter to Governor, etc., Fort Colvile, 16 April 1827. H.B.C.A. D.4/120/62a-63.

1828a Letter to Governor, etc., Flat Heads, 7 December 1828. H.B.C.A. D.4/122/13-14.

1829a Letter to George Simpson, Flatheads, 17 January 1829. H.B.C.A. D.4/122/34-35.

1829b Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 15 August 1829. H.B.C.A. D.4/123/22a.

Dempsey, Hugh A.

1965 Thompson's journey to the Red Deer River. *Alberta Historical Review*, winter issue:1-8.

1973 History of Rocky Mountain House. *Canada Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History*, No. 6. Ottawa.

DeSmet, Peter, S.J.

1844 *Voyages aux montagnes rocheuses, et une année de séjour chez les tribus Indiennes du vaste territoire de l'Orégon . . .* Malines: P. J. Hanicq.

1848 *Missions de l'Oregon et voyages aux montagnes rocheuses, aux sources de la Colombie, de l'Athabasca et du Sascatshawin, en 1845-46 . . .* Gand: Van der Schelden.

1859 *Western missions and missionaries: a series of letters.* New York: P. J. Kennedy.

1863 *New Indian sketches.* New York: D. and J. Sadlier and Company.

Devine, Thomas, delineator

1857 Map drawn for the Commissioner of Crown lands in Canada. In Great Britain, House of Commons (1857).

Douglas, David

1914 *Journal kept by David Douglas during his travels in North America, 1823-1827 . . .* London: W. Wesley and Son.

Douglas, James
1852a Letter to Eden Colvile, Victoria, 16 March 1852. H.B.C.A. D.7/1/259.

Douglas, James and Peter Skene Ogden
1846 Letter to George Simpson, Fort Vancouver, 19 March 1846. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/34/26-26d.

Eells, Myron
1894 *Father Eells; or, the results of fifty-five years of missionary labors in Washington and Oregon, a biography of Reverend Cushing Eells, D.D.* Boston: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society.

Elliott, T.C., editor

1914a Journal of John Work, June-September, 1825. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 5(2):83-115.

1914b Journal of John Work . . . . *Washington Historical Quarterly* 5(3):163-191.

1914c Journal of John Work, December 15th, 1825, to June 12th, 1826. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 5(4):258-287.

1915 Journal of John Work. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 6(1):26-49.

1918 David Thompson's journeys in the Spokane Country. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 9(3):169-73.

1920 David Thompson's journeys in Idaho. *Washington Historical Quarterly* 11(3):163-173.

1925 Discovery of the source of the Columbia River. *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 26.

1926 In the land of the Kootenai. *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 27: 279-291.

Ermatinger, Francis
1830 Letter to Edward Ermatinger, Thompson's River, 4 March 1830. Huntington Library, HM 16761, San Marino.

Fahey, John
1974 *The Flathead Indians.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Ferris, Warren Angus
1940 *Life in the Rocky Mountains, a diary of wanderings on the sources of the rivers Missouri, Columbia, and Colorado from February, 1830, to November, 1835.* Paul C. Phillips, editor. Denver: The Old West Publishing Company.

Finlayson, Duncan
1834 Journal. H.B.C.A. E.12/3.

Finlayson, Roderick
1864a Letter to Thomas Fraser, Victoria, 21 August 1864. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/27/143.

1865a Letter to Angus McDonald, Victoria, 21 June 1865. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/26/131d.

1865b Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 25 November 1865. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/29/32-32d.

1865c Letter to Angus McDonald, Victoria, 6 June 1865. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/26/118a-119.

1865d Letter to Angus McDonald, Victoria, 18 April 1865. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/26/94.

1866a Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 25 April 1866. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/29/125.

1866b Letter to William, G. Smith, Victoria, 20 October 1866. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/34/42.

1867a Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 11 February 1867. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/35/215d-214.

1867b Letter to Board of Management, Western Department, Victoria, 2 October 1867. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/35/544-545d.

1870a Letter to William G. Smith, Victoria, 1 July 1870. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/43/37-42.

1870b Letter to William G. Smith, Victoria, 5 March 1870. H.B.C.A. A.11/85/113-116.

1871a Letter to William Armitage, Victoria, 4 October 1871. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/43/97.

Flett, Thomas
1865 Deposition and cross-examination, September, 1865, at Victoria. In Joint Commission (1865-69(2)).

Fort Vancouver
n.d. Account summaries. H.B.C.A. B.223/d.

Franchère, Gabriel
1969 *Journal of a voyage on the north west coast of North America during the years 1811, 1812, 1813 and 1814*, edited by W. Kaye Lamb. Toronto: Champlain Society.

Fuller, E. O.
1974 The confederated Salish and Kootenai tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana. (Submitted to the Indian Claims Commission in 1952.) In David A. Horr, editor, *Interior Salish and eastern Washington Indians* (3):25-168. New York: Garland Publishing Company.

Fuller, George W.
1966 *A history of the Pacific Northwest with special emphasis on the Inland Empire.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gardner, Charles T.
1867 Deposition of C. T. Gardner, Washington D.C., 30 January 1867. In Joint Commission 1865069(9):322-323.

Gardner, G. Clinton
1867 Depositions of 10 August 1866 and 23 April 1867 at Washington D.C. In Joint Commission (1865-69(9)).

Gibbs, George
1867 Depositions of May and June, 1867. In Joint Commission (1865-69(9)).

1869 Physical geography of the northwestern boundary of the United States. *American Geographical Society Journal* 4 & 5.

Glover, Richard, editor
1962 *David Thompson's narrative, 1784-1812.* Toronto: Champlain Society.

Graham, Clara
1945 *Fur and gold in the Kootenays.* Vancouver: Wrigley Printing Company.

1963 *This was the Kootenay.* Vancouver: Evergreen Press.

Graham, James A.
1859 Letter to George Simpson, Fort Vancouver, 4 July 1859. H.B.C.A. A.11/71/971 & B.223/b/42/135d.

Great Britain, House of Commons
1857 *Report from the select committee on the Hudson's Bay Company; together with the proceedings of the Committee, minutes of evidence, appendix and index.*

1860 *Further papers relative to the exploration by the expedition under Captain Palliser . . . presented to both houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, 1860.*

1863 *The journals, detailed reports, and observations relative to the exploration, by Captain Palliser . . . during the years 1857, 1859, and 1860.*

Griffin, James B.
1965 Prehistoric pottery from southeastern Alberta. Appendix to Wormington and Forbis (1965).

Hamilton, William
1900 A trading expedition among the Indians in 1858 from Fort Walla Walla to the Blackfeet country and return. *Montana Historical Society Contributions* 3:33-123.

Hawkins, Col. John S.
1861 Manuscript map, enclosure to Hawkins to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Colville, 12 April 1861 (No. 15). Public Record Office, FO 5/811/189, London.

Hector, James
1861 On the geology of the country between Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean . . . . *The Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London* 17:388-445.

Hector, James and W. S. W. Vaux
1861 Notice of the Indians seen by the exploring expedition under the command of Capt. Palliser. *Transactions, Ethnological Society of London*, n.s. 1.

Heron, Francis and William Kittson
1831 Chief Trader Heron's journal of occurrences at Fort Colvile, 12 April 1830 - 13 April 1831. H.B.C.A. B.45/2/1.

Hudson, Francis
1867 Deposition of 13 February 1867 at Washington D.C. In Joint Commission (1865-69(9).

Hudson's Bay Company
1865 Document "A." part of the brief of the H.B.C. In Joint Commission (1865-69(2)).

Irving, Washington
1883 *The adventures of Captain Bonneville.* New York.

Johnson, Donald R. and David H. Chance
1974 Pre-settlement over-harvest of upper Columbia River beaver populations. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 52:1519-1521.

Johnson, Olga W.
1950 *Story of the Tobacco Plains country.* Caldwell: Caxton Printers, for the Pioneers of Tobacco Plains.

1969 *Flathead and Kootenay; the rivers, the tribes, and the region's traders.* Glendale: Arthur H. Clarke.

Joint Commission
1865-69 *Papers of the British and American Joint Commission for the settlement of the claims of the Hudson's Bay and Puget Sound Agricultural companies.* 14 volumes. Montreal and Washington.

Kittson, William
1826 Letter to John Dease, Colvile, 5 September 1826. B.45/c/1/1-2a.

1827a Letter to John McLeod, Kootenais House, 8 March 1827. B.C.P.A. A/b/40/M22K.

1830 Letter to John Rowand, Kootanais, 12 August 1830. H.B.C.A. D.4/b/125.

Kootenay River Trail Map
c. 1860 A sketch copy of a map in the U. S. National Archives, R.G. 76, Series 69, Map 21. In Ayers et al 1979:33.

Lent, D. Geneva
1963 *West of the mountains--James Sinclair and the Hudson's Bay Company.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lewis, William and Meriwether Clark
1854 Document in 33rd Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Executive Documents No. 1, Report 86, p. 460, Serial 746. In E. O. Fuller (1974).

Lex (a pen name)
1863 Lex to Editors, Colville Valley, 11 August 1863. In *The Washington Statesman* (Walla Walla), 22 August 1863, p. 2, column 3.

Lowe, Thomas
1848 Journal. B.C.P.A. A/B/20.4/295jA.

McDonald, Angus
1865 Testimony at Victoria, 25 September 1865. In Joint Commission (1865-69(2):150-167).

McDonald, Archibald
1834a Narrative of the fur trade in the Rocky Mountains. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.

1837a Letter to John McLeod, Colvile, 25 January 1837. B.C.P.A. A/B/40/M22K.

1838a Letter to Samuel Black, Fort Colvile, 3 November 1838, B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1839a Letter to Samuel Black, Colvile, 22 August 1893. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1840a Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 24 August 1840. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1841a Letter to George Simpson, Fort Colvile, 1 August 1841. H.B.C.A. D.5/6/185.

1941b Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 10 January 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1941c Letter to Patrick McKenzie, Fort Colvile, 31 October 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1941d Letter to John McLoughlin, Okanagan, 19 July 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1941e Letter to James Sinclair, Colvile, 27 December 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

McDonald, Archibald
1841f Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 5 January 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1841g Letter to Governor and Council of the Northern Department, [Fort Colvile], April 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1841h Letter to John McPherson, Fort Colvile, 31 October 1841. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1842a Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 8 June 1842. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1842b Letter to Edward Ermatinger, Fort Colvile, 30 March 1842. B.C.P.A. A/B/40/M142A.

1842c Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Colvile, 8 August 1842. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

1842d Letter to George Simpson, Fort Colvile, 26 May 1842. H.B.C.A. D.5/7/79-80.

1842e Letter to James Douglas, Fort Colvile, 19 April 1842. B.C.P.A. A/B/20/C72M.1.

McDonald, Finan and James Birnie
1823 Spokane House Journal. H.B.C.A. B.208/a/1.

McGillivray, Simon and William Kittson
1831 Journal of Fort Nes Perces, 26 March 1831 - 30 November 1831. H.B.C.A. B.146/a/1.

MacGregor, James G.
1966 *Peter Fidler, Canada's forgotten surveyor.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

McKay, Joseph W.
1871 Letter to Roderick Finlayson, Victoria, 1 August 1871. H.B.C.A. A.11/86/297-298.

McLeod, John
n.d. Journal and correspondence. Dominion Archives of Canada, Ottawa.

McLoughlin, John
1826a Letter to Governor, etc., Fort Vancouver, 16 July 1826. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/2/20-21.

1826b Letter to Governor, etc., Fort Vancouver, 1 September 1826. In E. E. Rich 1941:36.

1926c Letter to John Dease, Fort Vancouver, 18 November 1826. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/2/37-38.

McLoughlin, John

1829a Letter to John Dease, Fort Vancouver, 4 July 1829. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/5-6d.

1829b Letter to John Work, Fort Vancouver, 7 September 1829. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/5/20.

1830a Letter to Francis Heron, Fort Vancouver, 13(?) July 1830. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/6/7c.

1833a Letter to Francis Heron, Fort Vancouver, 2 February 1833. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/8/46.

1834a Letter to Francis Heron, Fort Vancouver, 2 May 1834. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/10/5a-6.

1834b Letter to Archibald McDonald, Fort Vancouver, 17 February 1834. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/9/24a.

1834c Letter to Francis Heron, Fort Vancouver, October 1834. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/10.

1835a Letter to Francis Ermatinger, Fort Vancouver, 20 June 1835. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/11/15a-16.

1835b Letter to William G. Rae, Fort Vancouver, 20 June 1835. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/11/16a.

1835c Letter to Officer in charge of Colvile, Fort Vancouver, 29 August 1835. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/11/24.

Mactavish, Dugald

1857a Letter to George Simpson, Fort Vancouver, 19 August 1857. H.B.C.A. A.11/71/722.

1862a Letter to Thomas Fraser, Victoria, 30 September 1862. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/20/306-308.

Manring, Benjamin F.

1912 *The conquest of the Coeur d'Alenes, Spokanes, and Palouses.* Spokane: John W. Graham and Company.

Merk, Frederick, editor

1931 *Fur trade and empire: George Simpson's journal: remarks connected with the fur trade in the course of a voyage from New York Factory to Fort George and back to York Factory, 1824 - 1825; together with accompanying documents.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Morgan, Dale L.

1969 *Jedediah Smith and the opening of the West.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Morton, Arthur S.

1929 *The journal of Duncan M'Gillivray of the Northwest Company at Fort George on the Saskatchewan, 1794-5.* Toronto: MacMillan Company.

Nicks, G. C.
1970 Toward a trait list of the North Saskatchewan River in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. *The Western Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 1(2):35-53.

Ogden, Peter Skene
1825 Letter to Governor, etc., Snake Plains, 27 June 1825. In Rich 1941:298.

1850 Letter to George Simpson, Vancouver, 1 February 1850. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/39/33-33d.

1851 Letter to Governor, etc., Vancouver, 20 March 1851. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/39/68d-69.

Ogden, P. S. and James Douglas
1847a Letter to George Simpson, Fort Vancouver, 15 March 1847. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/35/76-76d.

1847a Letter to George Simpson, Fort Vancouver, 19 March 1847. H.B.C.A. D.5/19/414-415.

1848 Letter to Governor, etc., Fort Vancouver, 1 June 1848. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/32/17d-17.

Ogden, P. S. and Dugald Mactavish
1853a Letter to George Simpson, Vancouver, 25 November 1853. H.B.C.A. B.223/b/41/25d-26.

1853b Letter to Archibald Barclay, Vancouver, 21 November 1853. H.B.C.A. A.11/71/344.

Pate, John

1928a Stray leaves. In *The Western News*, Libby, Montana, 11 October 1928.

1928b Stray leaves. In *The Western News*, 18 October 1928.

1928c Stray leaves. In *The Western News*, 25 October 1928.

1929 Article in *The Western News,* 14 March 1929.

1930 More light on location of Kootenai early-day fur trading posts near Libby. *The Western News*, 18 September 1930.

Payette, B. C.
1962 *The Oregon Country under the Union Jack.* Montreal: Payette Radio Ltd.

1964 *The Northwest.* Montreal: Payette Radio Ltd.

Pleasonton, Captain
1859 Sketch map of the northern Rocky Mountains based on material supplied by DeSmet. Photostat in the Northwest Collection Suzzalo Library, University of Washington.

Ray, Verne F.
1942 Culture element distributions:22:Plateau. *Anthropological Records* 8(2):99-257. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Register
n.d. Red River register of burials. H.B.C.A. E.4/1.

Rich, E. E.
1941 *The letters of John McLoughlin from Fort Vancouver to the Governor and Committee: First Series, 1825-38.* Toronto: Champlain Society.

Ross, Alexander
1825 Journal, 26 November 1824 - 25 March 1825. H.B.C.A. B.69/a/1.

1904 *Adventures of the first settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River.* Reuben Gold Thwaites, editor, Early Western Travels 7. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clarke.

1956 *The fur hunters of the Far West.* Kenneth A. Spaulding, editor. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Ross, Lester A.
1975 Early nineteenth-century Euroamerican technology within the Columbia River drainage system. *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes* 9(1): 32-50.

Schaeffer, Claude E.
1940 The subsistence quest of the Kutenai: a study of the interaction of culture and environment. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

1965 The Kutenai female berdache: courier, guide, prophetess, and warrior. *Ethnohistory* 12(3):193-236.

1966 Le Blanc and La Gasse: predecessors of David Thompson in the Columbia Plateau. *Studies in Plains Anthropology and History*, No. 3. Browning, Montana: Museum of the Plains Indian.

Simpson, George
1825a Letter to John Work, Columbia [Arrow] Lake, 16 April 1825. In Elliott (1941a:98-99).

1825b Letter to the Rev. D. T. Jones, York Factor, 26 August 1825. H.B.C.A. D.4/5/169.

1829a Letter to John Dease, Fort Vancouver, 17 February 1829. H.B.C.A. D.4/16/20-22.

1829b Letter to John McLoughlin, Fort Vancouver, 15 March 1829. H.B.C.A. D.5/16/26-27.

1834a Letter to Governor and Committee, York Factory, 21 July 1834. H.B.C.A. D.4/101/7-7d.

Simpson, George
1835a Letter to Governor, etc., 10 June 1835. H.B.C.A. D.4/101.

1941 Journal. H.B.C.A. D.3/2.

1846 Letter to Ogden, Douglas, and Work, Red River, 17 June 1846. H.B.C.A. D.4/35/1-17.

1847 Narrative of a journey round the world. London: H. Colburn.

Smyth, David
1978 Provisioning a fur trade post: the case of Rocky Mountain House. *Parks Canada Research Bulletin* No. 99, Ottawa.

Spry, Irene
1968 *The papers of the Palliser expedition, 1857-1860.* Toronto: Champlain Society.

Stanley, George F. G., editor
1970 *Mapping the frontier: Charles Wilson's diary of the survey of the 49th parallel, 1858-1862, while secretary of the British Boundary Commission.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Stansbury, H. H., delineator
1938 Map (U.S. Army) prepared under the direction of Col. J. J. Abert "Exhibiting the various trading depots or forts occupied by the British Hudson Bay Co . . . ." Northwest Collection, Suzzalo Library, University of Washington, Seattle.

Stevens, Isaac I.
1854 Report in 33rd Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Executive Documents No. 1, p. 460, Serial 746.

Taylor, Dee C.
1969 Archaeological investigation in the Libby Reservoir area. Report to the National Park Service.

Teit, James
1930 The Salishan tribes of the western plateaus, Edited by Franz Boas. *45th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*:23-396.

Thiebodo, Augustus
1940 Diary of Northwest exploring expedition, 1859. *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 31(3):287-348.

Thompson, David
n.d. Journals (mss). Toronto, Archives of Ontario.

Tolmie, William Fraser
1864a Letter to Angus McDonald, Victoria, 8 June 1864. H.B.C.A. B.226/b.

1864b Letter to Thomas Fraser, Victoria, 14 May 1864. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/27/112.

Tolmie, William Fraser
1865a Letter to Thomas Fraser, Victoria, 11 October 1865. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/27/304-306.

1867 Letter to W. G. Smith, Victoria, 14 August 1867. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/34/152-153.

1868a Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 9 March 1868. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/35/724.

1868b Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 5 June 1868. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/35/912-913d.

1868c Letter to W. G. Smith, Victoria, 15 August 1868. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/34/346-7.

1868d Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 18 November 1868. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/44/128-129.

1869a Letter to W. G. Smith, Victoria, 23 July 1869. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/40/85 and A.11/84/325.

1869b Letter to Joseph Hardisty, Victoria, 10 June 1869. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/44/316.

1869c Letter to Joseph Hardisty, [Victoria], 26 October 1869. H.B.C.A. B.226/b/44/464.

Turney-High, Harry Holbert
1941 Ethnography of the Kutenai. *American Anthropological Association Memoir* No. 56.

Tyrrell, J. B., editor
1961 *David Thompson's narrative of his explorations in western America, 1784-1812.* Toronto: Champlain Society.

Voorhis, Ernest
1930 *Historic forts and posts of the French regime and British fur trading companies.* Ottawa: Department of the Interior.

Warre, Henry
1845 Journal. Public Archives of Canada, MG24,F71,Vol. 1, Ottawa.

Warre, Henry and Mervin Vavasour
1845 Letter to Secretary of State for the Colonies, Fort Vancouver, 3 December 1845. Public Record Office FO 5/457 (1946), London.

White, Catherine
1950 *David Thompson's journals relating to Montana and adjacent regions: 1808-1812.* Missoula: University of Montana Press.

Wilkes, Charles (supervising officer)
1841 Map of the Oregon Territory. A sketch copy if presented in Ayers et al (1979) and the source is given as U.S. National Archives, "Map No. 687."

Wilson, Charles
1866 Report on the Indian tribes inhabiting the country in the vicinity of the 49th parallel of north latitude. *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* (n.s.) 4:273-332.

Winther, Oscar Osburn
1969 *The Old Oregon Country: a history of frontier trade, transportation, and travel.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Work, John
1826 Journal. B.C.P.A. A/B/40/W89.5A.

1828a Letter to George Simpson, Colvile, 21 October 1828. H.B.C.A. D.4/122/1.

1829a Answers to queries on natural history, Fort Colvile, 1 April 1829. H.B.C.A. B.45/e/2/1-14.

1829b Letter to Edward Ermatinger, Colvile, 28 March and 10 April 1829. B.C.P.A. A/B/40/Er62.4.

1830a Some information relative to Colvile District, April 1820. H.B.C.A. B.45/e/3/1-14.

Wormington, H. M. and R. G. Forbis
1965 An introduction to the archaeology of Alberta, Canada. *Proceedings of the Denver Museum of Natural History,* No. 11.

OUTSTANDING ARCHIVAL SOURCES

1. Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg.

   Many possibilities, including:

   Letter of Kittson written at Kootenay.
   Letter orders to Montour in 1830.
   Governor Simpson's Diary of 1841.
   Kittson's account of navigating the Kootenay River.
   Mrs. Berland's account of Edward's death.
   Personnel and pay records.
   Papers of the North West Company.

2. British Columbia Provincial Archives, Victoria.

   Jacob Meyers' letters on Kootenay posts.
   A transcript of H.B.C. material on Kootenay posts, 1820-1849.
   Peter O'Reilly letterbooks on Kootenay, 1865-66.
   Fort Victoria correspondence and accounts.
   Cartographic and photographic files.

3. John Campbell Letters of 1913 and 1915, published in the *Kootenai Times* or the *Libby Times*.

4. Royal Observatory, Greenwich, England.

   Records of the British Northwest Boundary Commission, including cartographic records and notes, and ethnographic notes; photographs.

5. Unpublished report of U. S. Commissioner Archibald Campbell on the boundary survey. Probably in either the U. S. National Archives or the Library of Congress.

6. Northwest boundary survey papers on 16 reels of microfilm at the University of Washington. I spot-checked 3 reels and found that they contain original correspondence, and data on H.B.C. holdings in the United States. These records do not overlap these in Greenwich very much, and they only partially overlap materials in the U. S. National Archives.

7. A. F. Chamberlain's manuscript (n.d.) of about 153 pages on the cultural relations of the Kutenai and Blackfeet. Copy held by the British Columbia Indian Language Project, Victoria.

8. Claude Schaeffer's field notes on the Kutenai, at the Glenbow Foundation, Calgary.

9. The DeSmet collection at the Washington State University Library, Pullman. The world's largest DeSmet corpus.

10. The Jesuit Archives at Gonzaga University, Spokane, which contains the largest collection of Jesuit correspondence and other records of the Rocky Mountain Mission. This is the best place to look for records relating to Father Joseph Menetrey, and other missionaries to the Kutenai.

11. The Henry Warre Diary of 1845. Public Archives of Canada. Certain to be of much value.

12. U. S. National Archives, Washington, D.C. Included here are Kutenai Dockets 61 and 154 of the Indian Claims Commission proceedings, especially the unpublished exhibits, records of the U. S. part of the Northwest Boundary Survey Commission, and valuable military cartographic files. Here also are the important records of the Montana and Idaho Indian Superintendencies. Clues concerning the purposes and findings -- or even the reality -- of the Hamilton expedition of 1858 perhaps will be found in the military files.

13. The John W. Jones Diary of 1858-59, including a record of passage through the Kutenai country. At the Newberry Library, Chicago.

14. The David Thompson journals at the Archives of Ontario, Toronto. These are of great value for the early Kootenay posts and for early Kutenai ethnohistory.

15. A letter by John Campbell to T. C. Elliott dated December 14, 1913. At the Lincoln Country Free Library, Libby, Montana.

16. The Montana State Historical Society, Helena. Likely to have materials from the 1850s and 1860s.

17. Recently I have seen evidence that reminiscences by Michael Phillips are extant, probably in British Columbia.