

a writing of some length *exactly at the back*, all admitted to be *genuine*. This writing also refers distinctly to the contents of the affidavit. Yet Lord Cockburn would, on the absurd and contemptible testimony of chemical men, who, on the late trial, contradicted themselves most flatly, have passed over this document on the ground of *suspicion*, says,* “ The evidence of this charge of fabrication (which “ is not directed against the defender personally)† consists “ of the appearance of the paper, and of the uncontradicted “ testimony of Dr. Fyffe and Dr. Gregory, two chemical “ gentlemen of undoubted character and skill. The Lord “ Ordinary is very unwilling to hold this painful charge to “ be legally established, and therefore he carries the result “ no further than this, that the paper is exposed to a degree “ of suspicion which makes it unsafe to rely on this docu- “ ment.” And yet, when in consequence of the vague style of this note, the counsel for Lord Stirling recounted to his Lordship the injury that had been done to their client by this accusation, and the necessity of some decision upon the point, his Lordship, we understand, complained of being pressed, and urged in excuse for refusing to entertain it, that “ no such charge was seriously intended.” If we are to rely at all upon chemical testimony, the facts ought to be laid before these gentlemen more fully. An eminent chemist named Kempt, of Edinburgh, was consulted for Lord Stirling upon this document. We have not his opinion now in our hands, but we recollect that, at first,

* See Lord Cockburn’s note. Appendix, p. xxv.—*Swinton’s Report*.

† His Lordship seems to insinuate throughout his note, that the defender’s *ancestors* might have been the forgers! For particulars of their well-known Christian character see the sketch, appended to this work, of Lord Stirling’s branch.