

they were burned by setting fire to the building.<sup>1</sup> That building would have been a capital place for a detachment of George Rogers Clark's soldiers to have used as quarters.

This building, Prof. Butler says, it seems to him, was more properly a fort than a log-house; but the man who describes the building—who was in it—who helped to take “out about three hundred packs of the best skins,”—declares, “the merchants’ peltry, in packs, was in a log-house, guarded by Captain Langlade and some Indians;”<sup>2</sup>—quite different language from my critic, who says “it was defended by a body of armed men, as forts are wont to be.”

But my critics are, after all, suspicious that this log-house was the supposed French fort. Secretary Draper has previously given it as his opinion that the tradition concerning the burning of the fort referred to the burning of that building; and Dr. Butler, by declaring that the log-house seems to him properly “named a fort,” prepares himself for the following sentence: “It was so named by almost everybody known to have been acquainted with those who had seen it.” This implies that many persons whose names are known knew people who had seen the structure, and that these many persons all called it a fort because those who had seen it called it so. I challenge Dr. Butler to produce the name of one single person who has placed on record that he called it a fort because some one who had seen it called it so.<sup>3</sup> But, had one person or a great many persons so called it, would that make it a fort? Not at all.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Butler says, “there is no evidence that the house was burned.” Dr. Draper (in Wisconsin State Historical Society's *Collections*, vol. ix, p. 290, note) says it is the “Brisbois tradition” that it was burned.

<sup>2</sup> J. Long's *Voyages and Travels*, p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> “My father, Michael Brisbois, told me that he had never seen a fort of any kind on the ‘prairie’ at an early day; that what he did see were remains thought to have been vestiges of a French fort; and no person, my father said, ever told him that he had seen anything except what were these remains supposed to be such a fort, on the ‘prairie.’” Verbal statement of B. W. Brisbois to the writer, in January, 1884. Compare, in this connection, the Certificate of B. W. Brisbois, in the *History of Crawford County*, p. xiii, wherein he approves, inferentially, of all said in that work as to the supposed French fort.