

successful. We will go further, and admit, for a moment, the possibility of the autographs being forgeries;—is it probable that such a change could have taken place in their appearance as in this instance? The writings must have remained the same now as when first produced. But it is even asserted that they are very bad and glaring forgeries. Still worse, and still more inexplicable!

It appears singular that such men as Daunon and Villenave, and many others both English and Scotch who examined *these very bad* forgeries, should have been deceived, and it is particularly striking, that each person who saw them originally expressed himself so highly pleased with their “respectable” appearance! This feeling was evidently pretty strong, or why was it represented in Paris by the industrious agents of the Crown, that Lord Stirling had not put the original documents in Court, the writings on which had been declared genuine, but had substituted an imitation,—a bad copy? Why did not the Crown prove this? This was a strange argument certainly, and used, no doubt, to shake the confidence of those who believed and attested the genuineness of the writings. We have seen, also, two sets of fac-similies—one first struck off, bearing the best representation of the document, the other a daubed, ill-got up copy, put into the hands of Villenave and others, evidently with no good motive.

The first step taken by the Crown lawyers in order to gain time after the map of Canada was put into Court, was to get fac-similies made, by making a representation to the Court that it would take only *three weeks*, and in this way *six months or more* were lost to Lord Stirling. He found himself at the end of the long vacation, from July to November 1838, with no better chance of obtaining permission to prove