

tunities of examining the writings since first produced, states, that the general appearance of the document is quite altered, and even the *style* of the handwriting of some parts, and that he considers no such alteration could have arisen otherwise than by design.

This brings us to consider, shortly, another point; namely, the accusation formerly directed against a document being an affidavit of one Henry Hovenden, at one time considered of great importance in the case. This document was in Lord Stirling's possession more than four years, and during the whole of that time was shown to many of his friends as a curiosity, being once in the possession of his grandfather, and as clear and distinct as any old document could be. Nevertheless, after it had been sent to Scotland to be used there as evidence in Lord Stirling's descent before several different juries, it became so totally altered, that when Lord Stirling was called up from England at the instigation of the Crown lawyers, to *abide* by his productions in March 1834, in the presence of Lord Moncrief, he could not at first recognise his own document! Of this fact all parties are quite aware. The injury done to this affidavit formed the first excuse on the part of the Crown to oppose Lord Stirling, after he had completed his titles according to law. Indeed the Officers of State do not seem to have well understood what to do to get a footing in the case, for, in a crude and careless sort of way, they charge *all the productions* in the case as forgeries, even a deposition of Lord Stirling's own living sister! Having eventually settled down upon Hovenden, they alleged that the whole, or part, of the writing of one side of that document had been taken out and altered, though it was never attempted to be shown how that could be done without injury to the signatures, and to