

their evidence *at the same time before the Commissioner*, trusting to their French witnesses being as bold in their declarations *at Paris*, as they were in Scotland; and the Civil Court, once fully enlightened, would have judged according to the truth. But the Officers of State took another course, and were only gaining time during eighteen months, to build up a case of a totally different description.

In the meantime, Lord Stirling, on finding the importance of ascertaining the name of the party who gave up the document, made unceasing demands for that purpose; and a course of action was recommended by eminent French counsel, for solving any doubt or difficulty about the document, which, had it been pursued, might have saved Lord Stirling from the unpleasant proceedings that followed. The true cause of the delay in this step was the want of sufficient funds for so expensive a proceeding, and also the hope that the commission to take evidence would still be granted, and that thus, under better circumstances, the advice might be more easily complied with.

It is clear that this document, which is a *French* document, never, of itself, could be judged of fairly in this country; that the conclusive proof of its genuineness could only be found in France, and that to produce it here, in the state it then was, for the judgment of persons who were strangers even to the very language in which it was written, was a most absurd proceeding. Several most eminent lawyers at the French bar have expressed themselves in the strongest terms of reprobation at the imprudence which had been manifested by lodging the documents in Court. Having pointed out the course to be followed in the enquiry, it is deeply to be regretted that his Lordship's pecuniary situation was such as to prevent their advice being pursued,