

1730. Maubile; that the perpetrators of the murder had not been discovered, but that throughout the district it was said openly that the Choctaws were to attack the fort and all the dwellings. The Commandant-General would gladly have concealed this news from the settlers, who were but too panic-stricken already; but it spread all over in less than no time, and the consternation became so great and so general that thirty Chaouachas, who lived below New Orleans, made the whole colony tremble; this obliged Mr. Perrier to send negroes and destroy them.

On the fifth he adopted the plan of sending the Saint Michael to France, to inform the Court and Company of the condition in which Louisiana was, and ask relief proportioned to its actual need. Two days after, one of the two Choctaw chiefs whom he had sent for, came to tell him that he had dispatched his letter to his nation, and invited all who were enemies of the Natchez to march against them, and that he advised him not to employ the smaller tribes, as he suspected them of being in concert with the Natchez. "I also suspect them," said Mr. Perrier, "but if they are in the plot, it is because they are convinced that you, too, are implicated; however, whether you are or not, I have given good orders everywhere, and I am very glad that you know that the secret has taken wind."

On the first day of January, uneasy at not receiving any dispatches from the *Sieur Regis*, who by his orders resided among the Choctaws, he dispatched the *Sieur de Lusser*, a Swiss captain, to ascertain the actual disposition of these Indians, and on the fourth he learned that the Natchez had gone to sing the calumet to them; this confirmed all his suspicions, and threw him into great perplexity.¹ But on the 16th he received a letter from the *Sieur Regis*, informing him that immediately after speaking to the Choctaws in his name, they had raised

¹ Perrier to the Minister, March ii., p. 205, makes the attack on the 18, 1730. Gayarré, i., pp. 244-7. Chaouachas after the Negro Plot, *Le Petit*, (Kip,) p. 295. Dumont, but is evidently wrong.