The first section of the fourth Article of the Constitution of the United States delegates to Congress the power to prescribe the manner in which the public acts, the records, and the judicial proceedings of each State may be proved in every other State, and the effect thereof. And Congress have passed several Acts in execution of this power. But those laws of the Federal Government cannot be allowed to regulate the matter now under consideration; because, an answer to a bill filed in this Court, or indeed any other portion of its proceedings, wherever it may be authenticated or wherever the person may reside from whom it may be derived must be deemed to all intents and purposes a record or judicial proceeding of this State only, and not of any other State. It is, therefore, perfectly obvious, that this Federal law can have no direct and positive application to the mode of authenticating answers, or any other part of the judicial proceedings of this Court. *Gibson* v. *Tilton*, 1 *Bland*, 352.

It is quite common for the Courts of one nation to seek the aid of the magistrates of foreign countries; and to ask to be allowed to collect testimony, and obtain from them and under their authority * the means of administering justice at home. The Acts, **283** testimonials and documents thus drawn from abroad, are accepted as a courtesy from the foreign nation, and accredited, not upon the ground of their having any force or operation in the country from which they are derived; *Kennedy* v. *Earl of Cassillis*, 2 *Swan.* 322; but because of the value set upon them by the tribunal before which they are used. They are nothing where taken; but duly and properly appreciated here where they are allowed to be, to a certain extent, available, *Parsons* v. *Dunne*, 2 *Ves.* 60; *Gason* v. *Wordsworth*, 2 *Ves.* 325, 336; *Minet* v. *Hyde*, 2 *Bro. Ch. C.* 663; *Bourdillon* v. *Adair*, 3 *Bro. C. C.* 237; *Hornby* v. *Pemberton*, *Mosely*, 58; *Campbell* v. *French*, 3 *Ves.* 321; *Garvey* v. *Hibbert*, 1 *Jac. & Walk.* 180; *Thurlt* v. *Faber*, 18 *Com. Law Rep.* 136; *Turnbull* v. *Moreton*, 18 *Con. Law. Rep.* 215.

Considering the great intercourse between the several States of our Union, it is obvious, that in many cases it would be difficult to do justice unless the Courts of the several States should lend their aid to each other in matters, from any jurisdiction over which, all other judicial power was excluded. *Kennedy* v. *Earl of Cassillis*, 2 *Swan.* 313. (*i*) It seems that some of the English Courts have held,

(*i*) TAYLOR *v.* TAYLOR.—"This 5th day of March, 1713, a commission came from Doctors Commons to the Honorable the President and Council; or any of them, to examine witnesses in a cause depending at said Commons, betwixt John Taylor, of the City of London, merchant, and Mary Taylor, in said Commons, fourteen days notice to be given to Robert Bradley, substituted for the proctor of the said Mary. His Honor EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., (then Chancellor,) Orders, that summons issue for such evidences as Charles Carroll, Esq., substituted for the proctor of the said John Taylor, shall require."—*Chancery Proceedings, lib. P. L. fol.* 63.