

duction by Brant. He had also a memorial from the Six Nations in which he is described as an "adopted chief." (Q. 299 p. 218.) The memorial asked for the whole twelve miles on the Grand River from its mouth to its source and relied on the transaction with Mr. President Russell in support of this claim. Several memorials and letters from Norton, all to the same effect were sent during 1804 (Q. 299, various pages, see also Q. 303, pp. 95, 102-104, &c.).

In 1808 Norton was back on the Grand River, whence he sent a long memorandum recommending measures to unite all the Indians in event of hostilities with the United States; to change the tenure of the land and to adopt means to civilize the Six Nations. In a letter containing a running commentary on Norton's proceedings, Lieutenant-Governor Gore, charges both Brant and Norton with attempts so to dispose of the land on the Grand River as to turn them to account for their own private advantage. According to his statement Norton made use of Brant's introduction to impose upon what Gore calls "high and respectable characters" as an Indian and a chief, he being on the contrary a Scotsman, who had been a private in the 65th regiment, and obtained his discharge in 1788, by the influence of Mr. Coffin, with whom Norton's mother was a servant. His employments are described by Gore until he settled down on the Grand River and assumed all the appearance, habits and manners of the Indians. (Q. 312—1. p. 126.) In this letter are serious charges against Brant and objections to a change in the tenure of the Indian lands.

Till 1812, the documents are silent as to Norton's movements. On the 6th of November of that year he was at a "Council of condolence," held at Fort George, on the occasion of the deaths of general Brock and others, and on the 22nd of December, Robert Dickson, Indian agent asked for his services, if he could be spared at Niagara. In both documents he is called "Captain Norton." (Series C, vol. 256, pp. 194-228.) He acknowledged on 1st of June, 1813, the thanks of Sir George Prevost to himself and friends for their services against the enemy (series C, vol. 257, p. 81), but those marks of favour apparently gave him a feeling of self importance not conducive to discipline. His relations with Claus, deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, were apparently as a consequence, anything but friendly as appears, among other evidence, from a letter written by Norton to Major Fulton, A.D.C., to Sir George Prevost, dated the 26th June, 1813, which begins: "As the Five Nations themselves appointed me a leading chief many years ago and the late General Brock when he nominated me captain also added and Commander of the warriors of the Five Nations." Hence he refused to pay obedience to Claus and denied his right to interfere with the people he (Norton) was appointed to lead.

On the 31st of July, 1813, General de Rottenburg acknowledged receipt of a letter from the military secretary, intimating Sir George Prevost's pleasure that "the Indian Chief Norton, may be allowed to be borne on the pay-list of the Indian Department with the rank and pay of a captain," but General de Rottenburg says that that order was unnecessary, as Norton had been on the pay-list in that capacity since the 2nd of June, 1812, but that the additional power to distribute presents to the Indians serving with him would be granted according to Sir George Prevost's orders. Evidently, General de Rottenburg had no very high opinion of Norton as a man. He wrote on the 15th August, 1813, (Series C, vol. 257, p. 116,) that he had vainly tried to reconcile Claus and Norton, "the latter", he says, "is certainly a great intriguer, but is a fighting man and may do a great deal of mischief if not supported."