The Morning Courier.

FOR THE COUNTRY.

Optimus est Reipublicæ status, ubi nihil deest nisi licentia pereundi.—SENECA.

VOL. II. MONTREAL, THURSDAY MORNING, AUGUST 11, 1836. No. 28.

Morning Courier.

MONTREAL, TUESDAY, AUG. 9, 1836

We gave already an anlysis of the Upper Canada House of Assembly, as to the national origin of the members and the political party to which they belong. We find the following as to their religious creed, in the *Toronto Patriot* of the 2d instant :—

Church of England	36
Church of Scotland	5
Church of Rome	5
Methodists (Wesleyan and Dissenting)	10
Presbyterians (not of the Kirk of Scotland)	4
Quaker	1
Total number o members	62

A petition is now lying in the News Room for signature. No Refurner can refuse to sign it. It is a plain statement to the Royal Commissioners of those evils which influence so injuriously the advancement of the colony.—We are really glad to see an attempt of this nature made to impress upon the Commission the more prominent of the grievances of which we have so much reason to complain.

The *Hermit*, we perceive, cautions its readers against signing the petition. Will that journal have the manliness and the ("reckless!") independence to tell the public what objections it has to the principles of the petition?

We publish an abridgment of the trial of NORTON vs MELBOURNE, to the exclusion of much other matter, prepared for this day's publication.

A terrible accident occurred at St. Martin on Saturday night last. Two young men of the names of S. NANTEL and F. X. CLEROUX were exercising their horses for the races next day. They had arrived opposite the church, and their horses were at the height of their speed when they were met by two other persons riding in an exactly opposite direction, and whom the darkness of the evening prevented them from seeing. The consequence was, that the horses of the two parties came into dreadful collision with each other. The riders were thrown to the ground. F. X. CLEROUX's head was severely cut, and that of S. NANTEL was so shockingly mangled that he only survived the accident two hours. The other two received no material injury.

Two of the horses were killed on the spot.

The body of an Irish emigrant named SHARPE, was taken out of the basin at the port yesterday. It bore the marks of violence about the face and breast. The unfortunate man had been missing since Wednesday last. We have not heard the result of the Coroner's inquest.

A check drawn by HAMILTON & Low, Hawkesbury Saw Mills, for £12, but altered to £112, was presented yesterday at the Montreal Bank. The forgery was immediately detected, and the man named LOUIS GEGAIRE, to whom the check belonged and who had offered it at a store in town, was secured and lodged in gaol. After a great deal of equivocation, and charging the forgery upon another who was to receive a part of the spoil, he admitted having committed it himself.

The number of visitors to the falls of Niagara this season is said to be unprecedented.

The Creek war which was stated some time ago to be at an end, has been renewed on the part of the Indians.

It is calculated that the aggregate length of canals in the United States is 3,000 miles, 678 of which are in New York; 517 in Pennsylvania; 516 in Ohio; 340 in Maryland and Pennsylvania; 100 in New Jersey; 100 in Louisiana, and 100 in South Carolina, &c.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

(BEFORE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.)

CRIM. CON.—NORTON v. MELBOURNE.

WEDNESDAY, *June* 22.

At half-past nine the Lord Chief Justice Tindal took his seat on the bench, when the case of Norton v Melbourne was immediately called on. The court was crowded to excess.

The following peers sat on the bench with his Lordship:—The Earl of Lichfield, the Earl of Lucan, and Lord Grantley, brother to the plaintiff.

The counsel engaged in the case were—for the plaintiff, Sir W. Follett, Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Crowder:—for the defendant, the Attorney-General, Mr. Sergeant Talfourd, and Mr. Theseiger.

Sir William Follett stated the case for the plaintiff. We collect the following from his statement:—The plaintiff, the Hon. Mr. Norton, was the brother of Lord Grantley, and heir presumptive to the title; and Mrs. Norton was the daughter of the late Thomas Sheridan, Esq. The parties were married in July, 1827. Mr. Norton at that time was 27 years of age, and Miss Sheridan at the same period, 19. It was a marriage of affection, and, on the part of Mr. Norton, of most unbounded affection. Their income, at the time of their union, was extremely limited. He took a small house near Storey's gate, adjoining St. James's-park, and he should have particularly to call the attention of the jury to the situation of the house, as that would be, by and-by, of great importance. At the time of their marriage, Lord Melbourne had no acquaintance whatever with either of the parties. In July, 1829, Mrs. Norton gave birth to a child, and the acquaintance between the family of Mr. Norton and Lord Melbourne first commenced in 1831. In that year there was a change in the commission of bankruptcy, and Mrs. Norton then wrote to Lord Melbourne for an appointment for her husband. The result of this letter was, that Lord Melbourne called upon Mrs. Norton, and he shortly afterwards appointed Mr. Norton a police magistrate of the Whitechapel district. The appointment took place in April, 1831. Now that appointment rendered it necessary that Mr. Norton should be absent from home a good deal. He left home every morning, and very seldom returned until the hour of dinner in the evening, and sometimes it was even necessary that he should dine from home to attend to his duties at the police-office. Let the jury remark, that, immediately after this, Lord Melbourne, who had no acquaintance whatever with the family before, now became a constant visitor at Storey's gate. He (Sir William Follett) would not say that his Lordship's visits were confined to the periods of Mr. Norton's absence. He on several occasions had visited both. He had dined in the house of Mr. Norton and was received with all the consideration which was dictated by the feelings of that gentleman, who felt the most unbounded gratitude to Lord Melbourne for his kind offices. He said his lordship had dined with both on several occasions, but it was further to be remarked, that he was constantly at the house in the absence of Mr. Norton. He came to the house, after quitting the Home Office, (the department his lordship then held,) three or four times every week. His Lordship was, however, in the habit of leaving before the return of Mr. Norton.—Shortly after this a criminal intercourse unhappily commenced between them, which continued for a long time. Shortly after the commencement of Lord Melbourne's visits, it appeared that Mr. Norton gave orders, that wherever his lordship was there no one else was, on any account, to be admitted; and it would be proved that the servants, in compliance with the commands of their mistress, denied access to the most intimate friends, and even relatives, wherever he was there. She had also given them orders never to come into the room unless they were rung for. Immediately after Lord Melbourne's arrival on such visits, the window-blinds were invariably drawn down: before the time of his arrival, it was observed, that Mrs. Norton would go up to her bed-room and prepare herself for his reception; she would dress herself, arrange her hair, and perform her toilette. While the noble defendant remained there she sometimes came out with her hair in a disordered state, again went to her dressing-room, arranged her hair, washed her hands, and again returned to the room where his Lordship was. A carriage, not her own, had on one or two occasions taken her from home to go to Lord Melbourne's. Now where, he asked, was she, and what was she doing, a young and beautiful woman, alone with Lord Melbourne? This might be consistent with innocence; the parties might be able to prove that it was so; but he could not deem it so. While she was ill—and this must be deemed a circumstance of an extraordinary nature—Lord Melbourne had gone into her bed-room, and remained with her one or two hours. In the manners of the present day this must, he repeated, be considered a most extraordinary circumstance; but the case did not rest there. The servants had gone to the room door while he was there; and they had seen kisses pass between them, and other improper familiarities; and had, moreover, witnessed circumstances which he (Sir W. Follett) could not even mention. There was a constant interchange of notes between the defendant and Mrs. Norton; where, then, it might be asked, were these notes? Whether they were of a description to satisfy the jury of the guilt of the defendant he could not tell, and whether they had been kept or destroyed he had no means of knowing; for when she left her home the whole of her letters and papers remained in the house, and Mr. Norton, with feelings which rekindled to his honour, did not even look at them; he gave strict injunctions to his servants that they should not be removed, but he did not open or read one of them. Mr. Norton, immediately after Mrs. Norton had left the house, went down into the country to his brother's house, Lord Grantly. Mrs. Norton's brother, immediately after the plaintiff had left town, went to the house, and, representing himself to be authorized to remove these letters and papers, took away the whole of them; but if they agree with three others which had been subsequently found, it was probable that they only related to his lordship's visits, and the hours at which he should come. The first of the letters so found was as follows:—

"I will call at half-past four. Yours."

Another was,

"How are you? (Laughter in court.) I shall not be able to call today, but probably will tomorrow."

The third was,

"There is no house today, but I will call at half-past four, after the levee. I will then explain about going to Vauxhall." (A general titter throughout the court.)

All these notes, proceeded Sir Wm. Follett, were without address or signature. These were not the notes of lovers, he confessed; but they exhibited the greatest caution on the part of the writer. It might be said, that Mr. Norton was careless of his wife; that he had allowed of those visits without interruption or remonstrance, and that he made no inquiries as to what had passed in his absence; but let it be remembered, that his absence was compulsory; and if it were not, was the circumstance of a man being absent to attend to his professional duties, or from any other cause, to be an excuse for another man seducing his wife, or to palliate, in this case, Lord Melbourne's having taken advantage of the defendant's absence to seduce the affections of his wife? The servants, however their suspicions might have been excited, had never mentioned those visits, nor insinuated their knowledge of any of these circumstances; they had not divulged a syllable until compelled to do so by Mr. Norton. Mrs. N. was a kind and indulgent mistress, and they were, therefore, doubtless, unwilling to offend or injure her by making any exposure. The letters to her husband were written with the most extreme apparent affection, and were just such letters as might be expected to be received from an affectionate wife by an absent husband. In these letters, she spoke of Lord M. as she would have done of any other person, and there was nothing whatever in their character or contents to excite suspicion. He appealed to the jury whether all the circumstances he had narrated were consistent with innocence? It was his conviction they were not, and he asked them whether they could entertain any doubt upon the subject? During a long period, it appeared that Lord M. had been carrying on an illicit connexion with plaintiff's wife. It was painful to him (Sir W. Follett) to speak harshly of any body; but was there one extenuating circumstance in the whole case? The rank of the defendant, his age, and the pretence that he was the friend of the father of the plaintiff's wife, all rendered the case more aggravated. Again, the circumstance, that in all probability the plaintiff's children were rendered illegitimate, was a greater aggravation. He (Sir W. Follett) did not ask for damages adequate to the compensation of this injury, for that was impossible; but he appealed to them as husbands, as fathers, and as men, to consider what amount of reparation in damages, which the law pointed out as the only way in their power to do, they would give to punish the conduct of the defendant for the evil which he had inflicted upon the plaintiff and his family.

George Compton Potts proved the marriage of the Honourable Mr. and Mrs. Norton, in July, 1827.

Mr. F. Norton, a relative of the plaintiff, and Mr. George Darby, a barrister, spoke to the affectionate terms upon which Mr. and Mrs. Norton lived together.

Georgina Veitch, or Betts, maid to Miss Norton, plaintiff's sister, who was on a visit at his house three months in 1832, said that when Lord Melbourne called, which was two or three times a week, no other visitor was admitted.

Trinette Elliot, housemaid and lady's maid to Mrs. Norton for nearly two years from the latter part of 1831, stated, that when Lord Melbourne came Mrs. Norton rung the bell, and the children were taken away. While Lord Melbourne was there, Mrs. Norton used to go to her bedroom and wash her hands, smooth her hair, and get a clean pocket handkerchief. On one occasion witness let Lord Melbourne in, and showed him up to the drawing-room, and while witness had the door handle in her hand, about to shut the door, she saw him kiss Mrs. Norton.—In cross-examination witness admitted that she was pregnant when she left Mrs. Norton's service.

Ellen Monk, nurse for six months from April, 1834, stated, that about three months after she went there, Mrs. Norton was ill, confined to her bed-room, being unable to come down stairs, and that Lord Melbourne was once with her in the bed-room about two hours, during half an hour of which time the children were there.—Mrs. Norton was on the sofa, and Lord Melbourne sat on a chair near the sofa.

Eliza Gibson, house-maid from February to September, 1833, stated she was told not to go into the drawing-room while Lord Melbourne was there. She once attempted to open the door of that room, but found it locked or bolted. She could not say whether Lord Melbourne was there at that time or not. No visitor was to come in while his lordship was there. Mrs. Norton's collar and her hair were generally tumbled when she came up stairs during Lord Melbourne's stay in the house; on these occasions she arranged her dress, hair, and collar, washed her hands, and put fresh rouge on her face. Notes passed between Mrs. Norton and Lord Melbourne. In cross-examination witnesses said, that Mrs. Norton arranged her hair, &c. every time that Lord Melbourne called, which was six times a week during July, August and September, 1833.

Thomas Bullinan, footman for a month in July, 1833, had been footman to Col. Armstrong before that time, and when the Colonel's daughter, Miss Armstrong, called on Mrs. Norton, the drawing-room blinds were down, and she was said to be "not at home." Tucker, then footman, and another servant, had told him that at those times Mrs. Norton was at home, and that Lord Melbourne was with her. Witness had gone with Colonel Armstrong's carriage, with Miss Armstrong and Mrs. Norton in it, and the carriage set the latter down at Lord Melbourne's in South-street, and then drove to make calls for ten or twenty minutes before the carriage returned thither to take up Mrs. Norton. Witness, while in Mr. Norton's service, had never received orders to keep out of the drawing-room, and he twice went in, with a note or message, when Lord Melbourne was there. Mrs. Norton and Lord Melbourne were sitting on the sofa; on one occasion his lordship had his hand on Mrs. Norton's shoulder. He drew it gently off when witness went in; he did not seem surprised. On the other occasion they were on the sofa, and it appeared to witness that they had been sitting close together, they appeared rather confused, and seemed as if they had recently moved. Mrs. Norton was putting up her hair on one side.—Witness had taken notes from Mrs. Norton to Lord Melbourne and sometimes brought answers back. In cross-examination, witness said that Lord Melbourne sometimes remained till Mrs. Norton came home in the evening, and that he occasionally dined with Mr. and Mrs. Norton.

Thomas Tucker, footman between seven and eight months, from 26th December, 1833, said he had frequently told Bullinan, when he came with Miss Armstrong, and Mrs. Norton was denied, that she was at home, with Lord Melbourne with her. He had carried notes from Mrs. Norton to Lord Melbourne, and brought back answers; and he had seen them sitting together on the sofa. In cross-examination the witness said, that Lord Melbourne might have frequently remained to dine, having come before Mrs. Norton had returned home. Mrs. Norton used crayons for chalk drawing. The muslin curtains fell sweeping down, covering a great part of the windows. Witness was then examined at some length as to where he had been recently. He admitted having been out of place for three months; that he had been in Devonshire; that he had lived three or four days with Bullinan, the last witness, with whom he denied having any conversation on the subject of the trial.

William Lawley, a job coachman, in the service of Colonel Armstrong, spoke to the same facts as Bullinan, as to driving Mrs. Norton to Lord Melbourne's in South-street.

John Flook, or Fluke, Mr. Norton's coachman from 1830 to March, 1834, had taken notes to Lord Melbourne and brought back answers. On one occasion witness had been sent to pay a box-ticket, and on his return he knocked twice at the drawing-room door, and, receiving no answer, he thought Mrs. Norton was not in the room, and he opened the door and went in. Lord Melbourne was sitting on the left hand on a chair at the fire, with his elbows on his knees, his head reclining on his hands, and his face turned towards Mrs. Norton. She was lying down on her right side, with her feet towards the door, and her head upon the hearth-rug. Mrs. Norton, the moment witness got into the middle of the room, when he was going to deliver the message, shifted herself with her hand, and rose up a little. Lord Melbourne looked at her, and she looked again at his lordship; she then turned round and never said anything, but gave witness a bow, as much as to say, "That is enough," after the witness had delivered the message. Mrs. Norton's clothes were up, and he saw the thick part of her thigh. Witness turned round, retired from the room, and went down stairs immediately. He mentioned this circumstance to his wife, to Mrs. Figgis, the cook, and to Mr. Saunders, a coachmaker. On another occasion, he opened the drawing-room door for Lord Melbourne: the moment Mrs. Norton met his lordship, he said, "Well, dear Cary, how do you do?" and witness believed she kissed his lordship.—This witness underwent a long cross-examination by the Attorney-General, in the course of which it appeared, that while in Mr. Norton's service he kept a cab, a fly, and a gig, which he hired out; that he had since sold them all, and kept an old clothes' shop in Monmouth-street, living in the cellar with his wife and three children; that he was in embarrassed circumstances before he left Mr. Norton's service, and had not yet paid his creditors; that he had been found out in this cellar about six weeks ago, and applied to become a witness; he had then left the cellar, and gone with his wife and children to Wonersh, [in Surrey, where Lord Grantley, plaintiff's brother, resides,] having first been examined by Mr. Norton and the attorney. He stayed at the Grantly Arms public-house, Wonersh, a week, and afterwards took a room in the village, where he had been till the day before the trial, amusing himself as well as he could. Sometimes he had gone out fishing.—(Laughter.) He had twice seen Lord Grantly there, and spoken to him once. He might have said that he was under examination nine days, but he could not recollect. He had never said that Lord Wynford had examined him; or that they were sure of having a verdict on his evidence. He denied that he had ever said, that Lord Wynford had examined him; or that they were sure of having a verdict on his evidence. He denied that he had ever said, that although Lord Wynford had examined him, his lordship did not know what he would say upon the trial. He left Mr. Norton's because he got a drop too much one court day. Mr. and Mrs. Norton fell out (quarrelled) in the carriage, and, of course, they put their spite on witness, and he was discharged. He was not drunk every day, but "middling, as we generally all are." He was sober going to the Queen's ball, but, when going to the Marquis of Lansdowne's in the evening, he certainly got a drop too much, and then the black horse began to gallop. Mr. Norton got out of the coach, and mounted the box in his opera hat; and witness, being a goodish sort of coachman didn't wish to see his master make a fool of himself in a crowd; so he told him, "If you will drive you must drive by yourself."—Witness had one of his own horses and one of his master's, in the carriage, and he did not like to see his own horse doing all the work, so he preferred walking. When he got to the Marquis of Lansdowne's, he expected to see the carriage at the door; but instead of that he saw a parcel of fellows cutting at his horse, and he said to his master, "Let me drive, and I'll soon get you up. The truth is, you look rather foolish." Mr. Norton refused to give up the reins, and witness then said, "if you will be obstinate, I must take my horse out." (Roars of laughter.) So he went to take it out, and Mr. Norton said, John, John, don't do that; policeman, take that John away." (Great laughter.) Witness did not take the horse out; a policeman came up, and took him to the watch-house, and the next morning at the office he was fined 5s. for being intoxicated, though he was as sober as now. He did not recollect he had said that d——b——, Mrs. Norton, had got him discharged; he might have said that he was the principal witness against the premier of England; he might have said that he was one of them. He did not recollect that he had ever said he was to get £500 or £600 after the trial, that he would then retire to Scotland, and need not care for nobody. He could not swear that he might not have said so. He never said so to his knowledge. He had not said to John Sly, a leather-cutter, that he was employed to "fish up the evidence." He might have said he was going after his fellow-servant as a witness. He did not recollect ever saying to Sly, that he would take care of himself, and that most likely he should be able to leave London after this trial and retire into the country. He could not swear he did not say so, for he did not recollect. He did not know how much he owed just now for the cab and gig. He gave no notice to his creditors when he gave up that concern, and when he went away he owed money to other persons in the neighbourhood, but not £100. Witness did not recollect Mr. Norton ever giving him some money to pay a subscription, and he denied into his mind without any reason whatever; he has been abused for political purposes, which any respectable member of the party opposed to Lord Melbourne would abhor and spurn at. This is not their warfare; this is not the way in which a public man or party is attacked. So would have said Sir Robert Peel, and so I think he would say if he were associated with you in the jury-box, and so would say any honorable member of the party honourably opposed in politics to Lord Melbourne. But it is quite clear that some persons have made Mr. Norton a tool, an instrument of shame; he has been persuaded to allow his name to be used, and used merely for party and political purposes. Before I conclude, I think it right, in the name of Lord Melbourne, to declare, as he instructed me to do, in the most clear, emphatic, and solemn manner, that he never had criminal intercourse with Mrs. Norton, nor did he ever do any thing in the slightest degree to abuse the confidence which Mr. Norton reposed in him. I allow that you must find your verdict according to the evidence, and that you must not allow yourselves to be swayed by the solemn declaration of Lord Melbourne. You must look to the evidence, I wish you to do so; but looking at the evidence, I say that it is utterly impossible to find a verdict for the plaintiff. Under the circumstances, how am I to call witnesses? It is impossible. I cannot call Lord Melbourne nor Mrs. Norton; one is the defendant, and the other the wife of the plaintiff. It is utterly impossible that direct evidence can be brought forward; and this being the case, I willingly, and unhesitatingly trust to the discrimination, the justice, and the impartiality of an English jury." (The learned gentleman sat down amidst some cheering, which, however, was quickly repressed.)

The Lord Chief Justice then commenced summing up the case to the jury. That there had been great familiarity, and the closest intimacy, was most undoubtedly proved; but that was not sufficient; the action was not brought for the familiarity, but for the actual fact of adultery, and they were to say upon the oaths they had taken if they were satisfied that, from a just and necessary conclusion from the facts, the act of adultery had been committed. Certain circumstances had been brought in review before them, upon which they would have to form their deliberate judgment, none of which came down to a later period than the month of November, 1833, and the circumstances related as having taken place at that time were the strongest that had been brought forward. The counsel had made their comments upon the evidence of Fluke, as to this and other circumstances, and he had nothing more to offer than by calling their attention to the man's own account of himself, from which they might judge of the value of his testimony. He certainly had given an account of himself not favourable to his dealings as an honest man. When they were looking at the witness to weigh him, it was not immaterial to see whether he was a moral and honest man in other points, though that did not come precisely to the question whether he was committing perjury or not. When asked questions as to circumstances of a late period, he did not answer very clearly. When asked whether he had not expressed that he had formed certain expectations, he had given answers that would induce surprise that he did not recollect. He said he had no knowledge, though he would not bring himself to say he did not say it. His lordship observed, in conclusion, that he was leaving the case in very safe hands when leaving it in those of the jury. He should not give even the shade of an opinion of his own upon it; for he should be sorry to throw that weight, if so it could be said to be, into the scale in favour of either party. Besides, his doing so would be taking from them what the law had conferred upon them exclusively,—namely, the power of deciding upon the subject. He, therefore, left it completely in their hands, confident that they would decide justly.

The Foreman of the Jury instantly addressed the Court, and said—"My Lord, we are agreed. It is my duty to say, that we have agreed to a verdict for *the defendant*."

At this announcement some one at the extreme end of the court exclaimed "Bravo!" Several persons there upon commenced cheering, which was followed by hisses from a different part of the court. The Lord Chief Justice observed, that this was most disgraceful conduct, and called upon the police to bring before him any person whom they could perceive guilty of this contempt of court. Silence was immediately observed in the court, but a similar expression of feeling took place on the result being made known to those who were assembled outside. The trial terminated at 20 minutes before twelve o'clock.

Were Lord Melbourne a private instead of a public man, we should rejoice unfeignedly in his acquittal, by a jury of his countrymen, of the heinous offence against law and morals with which he had been so falsely charged. But, when we consider, that he is not only a public man, but the King's Prime Minister, and that on his conviction or acquittal depended political consequences of no light moment, his Lordship's triumphant acquittal is a cause for national rejoicing. The people are deeply interested in the stability of the Reform Ministry of which he is the head; but it were folly to attempt to disguise the fact, that, had the verdict of the jury been for the plaintiff, instead of for the defendant, in the recent action, Lord Melbourne would have been compelled to resign the high and responsible post which he now so worthily and so efficiently fills. His Lordship's resignation might not have been followed by a total break-up of the Ministry! the probability, however, is that it would. The Tories would, once more, have had place and power placed within their grasp; and they would have assisted in their attempt to retain them by the moral indignation, carefully and artfully fanned, which the disclosures of the Minister's frailty would have excited in the public mind. The Tories, who gloated, in imagination, on the probable conviction of Lord Melbourne, would have made the most of its actual occurrence. The result, there is no denying it, would have been to deprive the Reform party, for a time, of some of its moral power, and to give the enemies of the people a tenure of office which, though it might have been only temporary, like their last, might have enabled them to retard the progress of improvement, certainly for months, and probably for years. We suspect, nay, we have no doubt, that the charge which had, for two months, been suspended over Lord Melbourne's head had paralyzed the proceedings of the Ministry of which he is the chief, to an extent which none but persons in possession of Cabinet secrets will ever know. To that charge, so suspended over his head, we are inclined to attribute much of the indecision, much of the apparent trimming, much of the delay which have been observable in the conduct of Ministers. That charge is now wholly removed: Melbourne's "himself again;" and his Ministry, strong in morals as it is in political power, will now, we hope and trust, act with an energy, a vigour, a decision which will give it an easy triumph over the insolent oligarchy that is madly attempting to make its will, instead of the will of the people, the rule of government, in England, and in the nineteenth century!

Next to our pleasure at the acquittal of Lord Melbourne, is our pleasure at the innocence of Mrs. Norton; an innocence which the evidence establishes morally as well as legally. The tales which her discarded servants told of her "come not within the compass of belief." Their very monstrousness render them incredible, and proves the base, and sordid, and malignant motives of the wretches by whom the were invented. A woman of remarkable beauty; of "high and plenteous wit and invention;" endowed with great conversational powers; at once famous in the world of letters and of fashion, Mrs. Norton seems to have been "the observed of all observers," and her house the rendezvous of men of rank as well as well as of genius. Among the number of her visitors was Lord Melbourne, who frequented her house for five years, with the knowledge, because often in the presence, of the lady's husband, without either that husband or any of his servants ever suspecting (for Fluke's story is wholly unworthy of belief) the existence of an improper intercourse between the parties.

How Mr. Norton was first led to suspect his wife's infidelity and his own dishonour does not

Public Record Office Reference C.O. 47/42

COPYRIGHT OF PHOTOGRAPH RESERVED TO PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. FOR PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE, APPLY TO PUBLIC ARCHIVES, OTTAWA.