

1639, *but under the destination of the three original charters of the 10th of September, 1621, the 12th of July, 1625, (Novo-Damus of the first) and the 2nd of February, 1628; all which charters were granted to Sir William Alexander before he was raised to the peerage, and are all upon record in the register of the Great Seal.*

Under these circumstances, it was most unjustifiable and unfair on the part of these Officers of State, to rake up the excerpt copy of the charter of Novo-Damus, for the purpose of charging Lord Stirling with having fabricated it, and afterwards occupying uselessly upwards of two days of the trial, in examining witnesses, and trying chemical experiments *upon that document*, for no other object than to get it decreed a forgery; using the opportunity thus afforded them, to make the jury, the auditory, and the world in general, run away with the idea that Lord Stirling founded his claims, and had been served heir, under a charter *not* upon record, and *not* believed (by them) to have ever existed. The Crown lawyers and Court must have known perfectly well that the excerpt was a document used only before Sir Wm. Rae, when Lord Advocate in 1829, and in the action for proving the tenor, in the early part of 1830, being instantly and finally abandoned by Lord Stirling, the moment he was led to suspect its genuineness! It was never used in other proceedings, and *not one* of his Lordship's services was obtained by exhibiting it!

The letters of Banks to Lord Stirling and Mr. Lockhart, were convincing proofs of the manner in which it came into his Lordship's possession, and ought to have been read.

Mr. Ivory was very bitter in alluding to the general and special services of heirship. This is a subject which would take up, at present, too much time and space, to examine in