

see what pretext would have been put forward if La Fontaine had been called. *She* had no business to lose.

The thieving servant-girl, or cow-driver, the cobbler, and the street-hawker of maps, may well be grateful for the treatment they met with in Edinburgh. The ladies of the Crown counsel invited them to their houses day after day, took them to the theatre, showed them about the town!—in short, nothing could equal the attention paid to these lions, whose *elegant* manners and accomplishments must have been highly gratifying. We must not forget to mention that they were all newly clothed at the expense of the Crown. One cannot but be amused at the change from their appearance in their working dresses in Paris. Enough, however, of these *witnesses*; we will now advert to other points in the case.

Stress is laid in the Crown “report,” on the statement of a Crown witness, named Tyrrell, that *he*, when Lord Stirling’s agent, borrowed £13,000 for him. This man was employed to represent his difficulties in a most exaggerated light, and to show that he existed upon the money borrowed through *him* (Tyrrell); it was also stated, that, besides the sum already mentioned, many thousand pounds worth of bonds were given for pictures. Of this money, scarcely as many hundreds ever reached Lord Stirling’s pocket—only a portion of the money, less than half, was ever paid—and of this his Lordship was robbed at the moment of payment by the very people who pretended to supply it. The securities were given for pictures represented to be of the great masters. A sham sale took place, from which, according to Tyrrell’s own account, seventeen of the best paintings had been privately removed. Lord Stirling demanded his bonds back, he could not get them; he asked