ought to have pleaded for himself? Every blunder, every false statement made, was taken up and corrected by him; why were his notes and instructions not attended to? Had prompt and *bold* interference been determined upon and persevered in, the trial need not have occupied the Court half the time it did. The duty of a counsel is to defend his client as he would himself; much more so, when the case is one of undisguised and open oppression. But we will proceed.

A serious error has been committed by mixing the Peerage question with the *only* question before the Court, that of pedigree. The judges in the Civil Court ought, from the beginning, to have confined their attention to that object; the jury in the Criminal Court had only to decide, upon the evidence brought forward, *whether the documents produced by Lord Stirling in the civil process, as evidence in support of* PEDIGREE, were or were not forged by him, or uttered by him knowing them to be forgeries. But the jury, under the direction of Lord Meadowbank, exceeded their powers, when they found the writings upon the map and excerpt charter forgeries. They were not called upon, in the indictment, to declare further, than whether the *charge* against *Lord Stirling* was proved or not proved. Thus was he most unfairly dealt with. The peerage case and status, are subjects with which the Courts Civil, or Criminal, had nothing whatever to do. The *services of heirship*, general and special, which, for more than *six years*, it has been the object of the Officers of State to reduce, were obtained upon evidence of descent from the Honorable John Alexander, of Gartmore, fourth son of William, first Earl of Stirling, and *not* under the limitations and destinations of the charter of Novo-Damus of the 7th of December,