The Grand Duke was not then at Baden, but soon returned. Baron d'Ende told me he was going to ask permission of the Grand Duke. I went with him to the door; he returned in about half an hour, and said he had bad news for me, he had not permission to go. He expressed his regret, and said, put your hand to my heart and feel how it beats. Next morning I wrote him a letter on the subject, and took it, but he was gone out when I called, so I left it. I have a copy of the letter here. I received a verbal message by a friend of the Baron's, a Lieutenant in the Guards of the Grand Duke. His name was Scheveitzer. The answer was, that he could not make the depositions without the consent of the Grand Duke, and that he did not like to send a written answer to the Queen's letter.

In answer to a question from the Earl of Darnley, witness stated, when he saw the Baron D'Ende, he appeared in perfect health, and that he was about 40 years of age.

Mr. Brougham.—"My Lords, the difficulties which her Majesty's Counsel labour under in further proceeding on this trial are great and manifold: no blame is attachable to any person, but to the proceeding itself, which has placed us in a situation of unparalleled difficulty and hardship. The witness Barbara Kress, who was examined against the Queen, has sworn, that M. Berstett compelled her to come. M. Berstett did not at least compel Baron d'Ende to come; he gives him leave either to go or not, and permission only to come back; a sort of leave that is given when you never wish to see the person again. It is the way in which Ministers retire when their services are no longer agreeable—for Ministers are never turned out, but obtain permission to retire, either for the benefit of their health, or to be relieved from the cares of office! The Baron no sooner saw this permission in fair German characters, than the very part which he wished Mr. Leman to touch became sensibly affected, spasms succeeded, very naturally, and there is no doubt that the Baron d'Ende is actually ill. The woman Barbara Kress was forced to be a witness, not, to be sure, by our Government, but by the Government of Hanover. I blame them not; they laboured in their vocation, and the English Government has laboured in theirs, and has honourably attempted to get the attendance of the Baron. I seriously and solemnly call on your Lordships (continued the Learned Counsel) to consider all the circumstances of this extraordinary case. You have found that our Ministers at home and abroad cannot run into those places whence witnesses have been brought against the Queen, and whence they could not be brought for her. I blame no one: but there is now an *utter impossibility of continuing this case with justice to the Queen; and I am sure that his Majesty, if he is the other party, does not wish the inquiry to continue a single hour longer than it can be done with perfect justice.*"

The Clerk, by desire of Lord Holland, now read that part of the evidence of Barbara Kress which related to the threat that was used by the Minister Berstett, in order to compel her to come over to be a witness for the prosecution—and then the letter by Berstett to Mr. Lamb, in which he boasts of his "impartiality and justice."—*(The repetition of these expressions called forth a laugh from a number of the Peers.)*

The Lord Chancellor desired her Majesty's Counsel to proceed.

Mr. Brougham.—"My Lords, under such circumstances as these, and with the recollection of what passed in the matter of Rastelli, *we feel it utterly impossible to proceed further in her Majesty's Defence.*

The Lord Chancellor asked the Attorney-General if he had any witnesses to produce to rebut any points of the Defence. If he had, he must now proceed with their examination, as the Counsel for her Majesty could not be called upon to address the House on the whole case, until the Counsel for the Bill produced all their evidence.

The Attorney-General applied for time to call Colonel Browne, in order that he, and other witnesses, now ready, might repel the foul aspersions which had been heaped on the character of the Gentlemen designated the Milan Commission.

Mr. Brougham, with his countenance much flushed, and with great vehemence of manner, asked, "Is it now, my Lords, we are to be told this is a Court of Justice?"

The Solicitor-General contended that the Milan Commission, after the manner in which they had been aspersed, ought to be allowed an opportunity of vindicating themselves.

Mr. Brougham.—"Am I now to be told that your Lordships are, or are not, a Court of Justice? *(Hear, hear!)* My Lords, was there ever a proposition made that was half so gross, so monstrously injurious to the character and situation of an accused, so exceedingly unjust to my Illustrious Client? What, my Lords, after all the odious persecution of her Majesty, after all the wicked hiring of witnesses, after all the perjury and lies, after all the delay, since the villainous reports were first circulated against her Majesty, after her Enemies have enthralled themselves in their own wickedness, after they have entangled themselves in their own abominable and cruel treachery, and after her Majesty has broken thro' all their arts and wiles, and has concluded her Defence, and proved her innocence, will your Lordships, in the face of Justice and the Country, suffer this, above all others, most unjust and wicked proposition to be allowed? Is her Majesty to be tied down to the rules and practices of Courts of Justice, in one instance, when it makes against her, and to be compelled to depart from them, and to suffer the effects of delay, (especially at this time,) when her innocence ought to be pronounced, when such a course is diametrically opposite to all rules and all practices in Courts of Law. I say, is she to be tied down to the rules of Courts of Law, and are they to be departed from when it serves her Enemies? Was ever such an application as this made in any trial, Civil or Criminal, in a Court of Law. What! after her Majesty has proved her innocence; after she has thrown back the accusations upon the heads of her Accusers; and when she demands her acquittal at the hands of your Lordships, is she to be told, that before her innocence is pronounced, Lieutenant-Colonel Browne, of some Hussars, I don't know what, a Member of the celebrated Milan Commission, must be sent for from Italy, and must clear himself from charges of which he is said to be guilty? I ask you, my Lords, whether my Client, who has from the beginning said, "I wish to clear myself from the false and wicked charges of my Enemies, without any the least possible delay," is now, after she has gone through her Defence, to have her case put off to an indefinite period? It was not true that the Counsel for the Bill were taken by surprise—they knew that a conspiracy was part of the Defence, and if in his opening he (Mr. Brougham) had not directly charged any man as a conspirator, he still adhered to the fact of a conspiracy; and if he had abandoned the man, it was only to stick closer to the thing. Could any man believe (making what allowance they pleased for the statement of Counsel) that, for an instant, it was not intended to bring evidence of the plotting against her Majesty? and could it be supposed that Colonel Browne was entirely out of the case? Did any man imagine that the innocent Col. Browne would be entirely omitted? Upon the common sense of any honest man he was willing to rest his case. Could it be said that the other side had been taken by surprise, when by reference to the evidence of Pomarti it would be seen, that his Learned Friends had cross-examined the witness, putting questions to him, which, if they had not had certain information of what he was to swear, they could not have imagined? No sooner had the name of Bonfiglio Pomarti escaped his (Mr. Brougham's) lips, than these innocent parties, agents to the still more artless individuals forming the Milan Commission, caught at it with avidity; and now they complained that they had been taken by surprise. The intelligence of the other side regarding Pomarti had been derived from a suit instituted at Milan, to recover damages for the base conduct of Vimicarti in procuring the Papers belonging to her Majesty—that very conduct which formed the proof of the conspiracy of these innocent, artless, harmless individuals. Would their Lordships stop short in these proceedings—would they continue this state of torment and irritation by which his Illustrious Client was at this moment so severely afflicted? Would they permit this deviation—this plunge out of all regularity of proceeding, for the sake of giving the other side an opportunity of mending a rotten case, which the evidence of artlessness had shattered still more, and thereby of adding new torments to the situation of the Queen, in consequence of this proceeding, compounded of needless, gratuitous, shameless cruelty, as well as of the most crying injustice?

Mr. Denman followed on the same side. The proceeding was one of a most anomalous nature; and the application of the Attorney-General was as extraordinary as the rest of the case. Upon what ground of equity or of justice could this delay be asked? It was an absurdity to say, that Col. Browne could not be here, because the same ship which conveyed his instructions to this country, might have brought the individual himself. But what was asked by the other side? That the character of the Colonel should be cleared, that the character of every one was to be cleared, but that of her Majesty! Her Majesty asked for no indulgence; it was a right which she demanded, that the case must be concluded without further delay. After observing at considerable length on the evidence which had been adduced for the Prosecution, and alluding to the application which had been made by the Attorney-General in the course of the Inquiry, for delay on account of the absence of fictitious witnesses from Lugano, he concluded, with much vehemence, with declaring that he would satisfy their Lordships, the Country, and Posterity, that her Majesty was entitled to an honourable acquittal.

The Attorney-General complained of the unwarrantable attacks which were made by his Learned Friends on the other side, and declared that he would persist in the discharge of his duty, in defiance of the calumnies on the other side of the bar, or rumours without. He did not make the application for delay by the advice of his employers, as had been broadly charged by Mr. Denman; but he was bound to do it to rebut that evidence which they, the Counsel on the other side, had gone into, and which involved the name of Colonel Browne, and imposed upon him (the Attorney-General) the necessity of calling that Gentleman to their Lordships' bar.

The Lord Chancellor rose amidst the most profound silence. His Lordship stated, that, agreeably to the rule of evidence, the application was very properly made; and that the Defending Counsel had only done their duty by opposing it if they thought it injurious to their cause. The Noble and Learned Lord then requested that the House would adjourn till to-morrow to enable him, after an accurate examination of the whole evidence, to ascertain whether the delay should be granted.

Earl Grey rose to express his satisfaction and concurrence in the request.—Adjourned.

The Waterford Chronicle.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28.

The proceedings in the case of the Queen are brought down to the adjournment of the House of Lords on Monday, which was the Thirty-ninth day of the Trial. It will be seen from the details, that the Counsel for the Defence have closed their case, and that the Counsel for the Prosecution have applied for further time, in order to bring Colonel Brown from Milan. This was most warmly resisted by the Queen's Counsel, and the decision on the point was postponed to Tuesday. The mail of that day not having arrived, the result has not reached us.

In the Court of King's Bench, Thos. Davison was found guilty of publishing a Pamphlet called "*The Deist's Magazine.*" Mrs. Carlile was found guilty of publishing a number of *The Republican.*

Three per Cent. Consols were at 67⅛ and, for Account, 67⅜. Exchange, Dublin on London, 5.

Natural History.—We beg leave to remind the Public, that Mr. Harwood's Lectures on this subject will commence at One o'clock on Monday, at the large room in the Chamber of Commerce, and that they will be repeated at Eight in the Evening, and at the same hours on the two succeeding days.

THE MARKETS.

London Corn-Exchange, Oct. 23.—Our Market was but moderately supplied with Wheat this morning, and consisted of land carriage samples from Essex and Kent, the late adverse gales having prevented any arrivals from the Suffolk coast. A few fine runs from the above Counties sold at 2s. per quarter higher than on this day se'nnight, but the trade was not quite so brisk as on Friday. Fine Barley continues scarce; a few prime samples obtained 1s. per quarter above last Monday's prices, but there is no amendment in the inferior qualities, which met heavy sale.—Fine fresh Oats are 1s. per quarter dearer, but the ordinary and light qualities are dull sale, and rather cheaper. In Peas and Beans no alteration.

Dublin Corn-Exchange, Oct. 25.—The supply of Grain was not so large to-day, owing it is supposed to the wetness of the weather, but fully equalled the demand. Wheat was in fair request at from 23s. to 25s. for red; and from 24s. to 27s. 6d. for white; a few large lots at those prices were bought up for exports. Oats remained steady at from about 10s. to 12s. Barley in pretty good demand, viz. Distillers' from 12s. 6d. to 13s. 6d.; Brewers' from 12s. 6d. to 14s. Very little done in Flour or Oatmeal, the former may be quoted at from 16s. 6d. to 17s. 6d. for good Bakers', the latter from 12s. to 14s. Vetches rather doll at from 18s. to 20s. Rapeseed from 28s. to 32s.—Dublin Whiskey (old) from 9s. 6d. to 9s. 9d. per gal.; 2020 gallons remained in stores on Saturday last: new Dublin Whiskey from 8s. 6d. to 9s. per gallon; very little appeared yet.

Cork Markets, Oct. 26.—Little Grain coming in—Grinding Barley in better demand—a smart advance on Oats. Wheat, 24s. Oats, 18s. to 21s. Barley, 16s. to 18s. to 22s. per barrel.—Butter to Merchants 71s.—67s.—63s.—61s.—59s. Do. to the Country, 60s.—55s.—52s.—50s.—48s.

Limerick Markets, Oct. 25.—Wheat, 1s. to 1s. 3½d. per stone. Oats, 7¼d. Barley, 7d.—Flour, 30s. to 32s. per bag. Oatmeal, 10s. 6d. per cwt. Potatoes, 2d. per stone. Rapeseed, 30s. Pork, 20s. per cwt. Butter, 72s. 66s. 56s. 46s. 40s. 34s. per cwt. The Slaughtering Season commenced yesterday in this City.

Return of Corn and Grain sold in Limerick last week:

Barrels,		Cost.	Average.
5903	Wheat, ...	£6871 8 7	£1 3 3
2428	Barley, ...	1203 18 1	9 11
10712	Oats, ...	4523 3 9	8 5

The great fair of Newport, County Tipperary, on Monday, was not well attended. The quantity of horned cattle exhibited was bought up at rather higher prices than those given at Ballinasloe, but at about £4 less each head than offered last year.

The fair of St. Canice (Irishtown), Kilkenny, on Monday last, was well attended. There was a very fine shew of pigs in particular. But as to business—it afforded no exception to the general reports from fairs throughout the country.

WATERFORD MARKETS.

There was scarcely any difference between the price of *Butter* at the market-house yesterday and the rate of the few days preceding; the general currency was 77s. for first quality, but 77s. 6d. was paid for some, and 78s. in a few instances. Crane returns—Thursday, 90 firkins; yesterday, 265. The receipts of Grain from Farmers continue very light. *Wheat* appeared rather less brisk yesterday than in the early part of the week; the general currency did not exceed 25s. for prime qualities, tho' 25s. 6d. was paid for a few picked samples. Best Potato *Oats* rated in the morning, as on the preceding days, at 10s. generally, and 10s. 3d. by a few purchasers; but towards the close of the market a slight degree of dulness was apparent in the demand, and the former price, tho' supported, was not exceeded. *Barley* has not varied for some days, 10s. being still the highest limit for good grinding and malting qualities.—*Singed Pigs* have remained stationary at 28s. to 29s. generally, with scarcely any instance of an advance lately beyond the latter rate. *Scalded Pigs* were higher yesterday than on any previous day since the opening of the season; 27s. per cwt. was paid for some, and 27s. 6d. for a few very prime. No change has occurred in *Flour* since this day se'nnight—Seconds remain at 30s. to 31s.; Thirds, 22s. to 26s., and 28s. for fine sharps; Fourths, 14s. to 18s. *Oatmeal* still languid, at 10s. 6d. to 11s. and 11s. 6d. per cwt. by retail. New Scotch Herrings, 34s. to 36s. per barrel.

SHIP NEWS. The brig *Sally*, of Workington, Mitchinson, from Trinidad for Hull, with sugar, &c. put into Smelwick harbour, five miles from Dingle, about a week ago, with loss of sails, rigging, &c., when, in the violent gale, on Sunday last, she went on shore, and, in sight of a number of persons, unable to afford any assistance, she was totally destroyed, and nine of the crew, with two respectable Revenue Officers of Dingle, named Neligan and Kennedy, perished; one man only of those on board escaped—his name is George Foster. The Captain fortunately was not on board, having, immediately on the vessel's arrival, come off for Cork, to procure the necessary materials, &c. for refitting. The Revenue Officers have left large families, and were much esteemed.—*Southern Reporter.*

PORT NEWS—PASSAGE, OCT. 27.

ARRIVED,

25th—None.

26th—Success, ——, Cork, flour, furniture, &c. for Dublin.

SAILED,

25th—Sophia, Rogers, Bristol, oats and flour; Expedition, Stacy, Bristol, butter, bacon, flour, &c.

26th—Ceres, Hincks—and Union, Lethaby, Belfast, barley.

27th—Wind N. W. at 8 morning.

DEATHS.

On Monday morning, at Middleton, Co. Cork, Stephen Wm. Coppinger, Esq. a gentleman most sincerely and deservedly regretted.

At his son's house in Patrick-street, Cork, at an advanced age, Mr. Samuel Newsom, a very respectable Member of the Society of Friends.

HERRINGS.

EDWARDS & LEARY
HAVE FOR SALE,
AT THEIR STORES IN SARGENT'S-LANE,
NEAR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, KING-STREET,
BETWEEN 5 AND 600 BARRELS OF
PRIME, NEW, CROWN-BRAND, SCOTCH HERRINGS.
Waterford, Oct. 28, 1820.

AUCTION OF HAY.

ANTHONY JACKSON
INTENDS SELLING BY AUCTION,
ON THE FIRST OF NEXT MONTH, AT 12 O'CLOCK,
At his residence at Newtown, in the County of Kilkenny,
TWO LARGE RICKS OF
PRIME UPLAND HAY.
TERMS AT SALE.
Newtown, 27th of 10th mo. 1820.

KELP, POTASHES, &c.

JOSHUA & THOMAS MASON
HAVE ARRIVED TO THEM,
A CARGO OF PRIME NEW KELP,
WHICH THEY OFFER FOR SALE, WITH
Sixty Casks Montreal First Quality POTASHES,
And daily expect the Arrival of
TWENTY CASKS OF
YELLOW RUSSIA CANDLE TALLOW.
Waterford, 10th mo. 28th, 1820.

WATERFORD BRIDGE.

I request a *MEETING of the BRIDGE PROPRIETORS* at One o'Clock on the First of next Month, at the New Lodge, on urgent Business.
GEORGE P. RIDGWAY,
Chairman of Proprietors.
10 Mo. 28, 1820.

CORN STORES, CARRICK-ON-SUIR.

TO BE LET,
AND IMMEDIATE POSSESSION GIVEN.
A very good STORE at the River Side, at the end of Oven-Lane, joining Sause's Quay. Also a large STORE, lately occupied by Mr. Pierse Doyle, on the Quay in Carrickbeg. Both Stores are very commodious in Accommodation and Situation.
Apply to Richard Power, Esq. Carrick-on-Suir.
October 18, 1820.

O'NEILL & KEHOE
OFFER FOR SALE,
100 Chests *TEA,*
65 Hhds. *Muscovado* } *SUGAR,*
5 *Ditto Refined* }
24 *Boxes SUGAR CANDY,*
40 *Kegs New MUSTARD,*
20 *Casks Refined* } *SALTPETRE.*
20 *Bags Rough* }
THEY DAILY EXPECT THE ARRIVAL OF
103 *Chests TEA,*
15 *Hhds. Muscovado* } *SUGAR,*
9 *Ditto Refined* }
12 *Baskets CHEESE;*
Which, with their present Stock of SPICES, WICK-YARN, Spanish and East India INDIGO, PITCH, TAR, ROSIN, &c. &c. will be disposed of on the most reasonable Terms. Waterford, Oct. 17, 1820.
☞ *An APPRENTICE wanted.*

Lessee of William Henry Hassard, Esq. v. the casual Ejector.
Lessee of Same v. Same.
TO BE LET, pending these Suits, and immediate possession given, all those, the several untenanted parts of the LANDS of FAITHLEGG, in the County of Waterford, lately in the possession of Cornelius Bolton, Esq. and his under-Tenants. Security will be required for the Rent.
Apply to Messrs. Ivie and Mortimer, Solicitors, Waterford.

WATERFORD:
Printed and Published by BENJAMIN PERRIN, Chronicle-Office, Quay.
Agents for England—Messrs. Newton and Co. Warwick-square, London.
Agents for Ireland—J. K. Johnston and Co. No. ... Lower Sackville-street, Dublin.

Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No. 12,625. *TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1820.* PRICE FIVE PENCE.

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

HOUSE OF LORDS—TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24.

After the Peers' names had been called over.

Earl Grey rose. He said that, pursuing the analogy of the practice of the Courts below, the House should call for the original depositions of the witnesses for the Bill, taken at Milan. He stated, that at the proper stage he would make a specific motion on the subject.

The Lord Chancellor thought it necessary to say, that, having given the best consideration to the Attorney-General's demand of yesterday, he thought it ought not to be conceded. Very little had been said to affect Colonel Browne in any way, and the little that had appeared in evidence against him had been sworn to two months ago.

Lord Darnley entered his solemn protest against any further proceeding upon the present Bill; this protest he founded upon the impossibility of pursuing the investigation of the Milan Commission Conspiracy, and the impediments which had been offered to obstruct the attendance of Baron d'Ende.

Marquis Camden bore testimony to Colonel Browne's merits during fourteen years' military service, in the course of which he was seven times wounded. He pledged himself for the Colonel's readiness to face any inquiry.

Lord Holland objected to any noble Lord rising and pronouncing any panegyrics upon persons incidentally mentioned in the course of the proceedings. Such panegyrics would call for the expression of different opinions.

Counsel were called in.

Captain Briggs was called in, and examined by the Attorney General.

Q. You have stated that you commanded the *Leviathan* at the time her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales was on board that ship? I have. Q. Do you remember Lieut. Hownam being on board with her Royal Highness? I do. Q. Do you recollect having any conversation with Lieut. Hownam on the subject of Bergami? I do. Was it a conversation about Bergami being admitted to a seat at her Royal Highness's table? It was. Q. State what Lieut. Hownam told you on that occasion? I observed to Lieut. Hownam, in conversation, that Captain Pechel had told me that Bergami stood behind his chair when the Princess first embarked on board the *Clorinde* frigate, and asked him how it was, that he was now admitted to a seat at her Royal Highness's table? He replied, that he was sorry it was so; that is, that he was sorry the Princess had admitted him (Bergami) to her table, and that he (Lieut. Hownam) had entreated her Royal Highness, down on his knees, with tears in his eyes, not to admit him to her table, but all to no purpose. Q. Did he state when that happened? No, he did not state when it happened. Q. Had he said any thing on the subject of the time at which this happened? I recollect he intimated—

Mr. Brougham objected, and desired to know what had been said.

The Attorney-General.—I ask, to the best of your recollection, what did he say on the subject? To the best of my recollection, he said this happened on the very day that Bergami's situation was changed—that is, on the first day that he dined at the table of her Royal Highness. This is what I meant to say I understood.

Cross-examined by Mr. Brougham.

Q. Captain Briggs, when did this, of which you speak, happen on board the *Leviathan*? It happened when the ship was on her passage between Ferrara and Palermo.—Q. In what year? It was in 1815. Q. At what time of the year? In the month of November. Q. Who was present at the time? I do not recollect that any one was. Q. Try if you cannot recollect? We were in conversation together, I and Lieutenant Hownam, walking the deck.—Q. You were frequently in conversation with him, I believe? Occasionally. Q. Occasionally I mean; I do not suppose you held conversations with him every half hour? No, nor even every day. Q. But this was not the only conversation you had with him? No. Q. Have you ever seen him since? Yes. Q. You have conversed with him since? Yes; he came down to me from Brandenburgh-House, and wanted to find out from me the nature of the evidence I meant to give here. I declined to converse with him on this subject.

Mr. Brougham sarcastically remarked, that was very proper.

The Attorney-General complained of the conduct of his Learned Friend in interrupting a witness in the course of his answer.

The witness resumed.—It was at seven in the morning that he came to me. On taking leave, he said he should feel obliged to me, if I could tell him whether any alteration had been made in the cabin of the *Leviathan*, for he did not recollect that there had been any; upon which I expressed to him my surprise at hearing him say so, and brought to his recollection that alterations had been made in the cabin, and made in his presence. Q. Very well—In short he had forgotten the circumstance? I must presume so. Q. You mentioned to him (Lieut Hownam) what Captain Pechel had said of Bergami.—Then Pechel, I suppose, had made some difficulty—had started some objection to her Royal Highness dining on board his ship? He positively refused to sit down with Bergami; he had no objection at all to her Royal Highness. Q. He would not sit down with Bergami? I do not know that positively, as I was not on board that ship. Q. What led to the conversation you were speaking of—were you talking about Bergami sitting down to her Royal Highness's table? No; not about that. Q. I understood the conversation to begin with a statement that Captain Pechel had seen Bergami standing behind his chair? No. Q. You have mentioned the observation Lieutenant Hownam made to you; did that observation operate on Captain Pechel as a reason against his sitting down at the same table with Bergami? No; I cannot say that: it occurred long afterwards; it was when Captain Pechel saw her Royal Highness for the second time. Q. Did you make any note of the conversation you have mentioned, at the time it took place? None whatever. Q. You have now spoken then to what you recollect of a conversation that took place five years ago? I have a perfect recollection of that conversation. Q. When did you first mention it? I believe I have mentioned it several times. Q. But do you recollect any one particular time? I remember that it was brought particularly to my recollection by a letter which I received, inquiring, if I recollected such a conversation. Q. At what time did you receive that letter—since these proceedings commenced? Since the House met the first time. Q. You say the conversation was brought to your recollection by that letter? It was never absent from my recollection; and when I was written to to know if such a conversation had taken place I answered, to say that it had, and that it was true. Q. It was never a moment from your recollection? I always remembered it well. Q. Now, Captain Briggs, as this conversation was always more or less in your recollection, will you mention one of the occasions on which you spoke of it? I have mentioned it on several occasions that I could name; I once mentioned it to Sir G. Cockburn. Q. O! you mentioned it to Sir G. Cockburn;—you mean one of the Lords of the Admiralty? Yes. Q. About when? This is some time ago. Q. How long? Many months ago: some four or five. I mentioned it to him long before I knew that I should have to mention it here. Q. Had Sir G. Cockburn questioned you on the subject? No. Q. How did you begin the conversation—what led to it? I forget what led to the conversation; but I remember the fact of my mentioning it to him. Q. You say this was four or five months ago? Yes. You have had the honour of dining with the King lately—have you not? I have, at Portsmouth. Q. Since you were last examined in this House? Yes; since I was last examined in this House.

Re-examined by the Attorney-General.

Q. I believe you have the command of a guard-ship at Portsmouth? I have the command of the *Britannia*.—Q. Had you that command at the time his Majesty was at Portsmouth? Yes. Q. Did you dine with his Majesty, in company with the other officers of the fleet who paid their respects to his Majesty? Yes, the officers of the navy at Portsmouth, every one of the Captains, without exception.

Examined by Lord Morley.

Q. Now, in narrating the conversation which took place between you and Lieut. Hownam, can you take upon yourself positively to swear, that the words were, *He had gone down upon his knees to ask her Majesty not to let Bergami sit at her table*—or, I could have done so? I understood him to have said, he had *entreated* her upon his knees, not to suffer Bergami to sit at her table? Q. I understood you to say, that you made no memorandum of what passed? Yes. Q. And that this conversation took place in the month of November, 1815, and consequently 5 years ago? Yes. Q. Now be good enough to say whether you can recollect private conversation by hearsay? The circumstance of my having had that conversation.—Q. When this conversation at first passed, did you conceive it passed from the incidental circumstances of Bergami's first introduction to the table—or do you suppose it arose from a previous arrangement for that introduction?

The Attorney General.—My Lords, I am unwilling to interpose any objection; but do your Lordships think that what this gentleman "conceives" can be evidence?

The Lord Chancellor.—The question is, what was said by one to the other.

Examination resumed.

Q I would ask whether or not Lieut. Hownam stated this to him the first time on which Bergami dined at the table of her Majesty, or did it arise from incidental circumstances, or in consequence of previous arrangement? I understood him to say so, in answer to a question I had asked him; and I understood it to have happened on the day the change took place, from the circumstance of that change.

The Attorney General.—My Lords, as the case now stands, I will not trouble your Lordships with any more witnesses. Will you allow me to state that Captain Briggs, having a command at Portsmouth, which requires his constant attendance, he requests you will indulge him by allowing him to go to Portsmouth.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Leave was given to other witnesses under similar circumstances.

Mr. Brougham.—I have not the slightest objection to it, my Lords. I have no wish to incommode either Captain Briggs or the service.

The Duke of SOMERSET expressed a wish, before the Counsel for the Queen summed up, that he might be allowed to recall Lieut. Hownam.

Mr. Brougham, interposing, said, that perhaps it became him to state whether he had any evidence to offer in rejoinder. He added, that, under the circumstances in which he was placed, he had no evidence to offer further.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL, in reference to the request of the Duke of Somerset, observed, that as the object of the Noble Lord's motion was the re-examination of a witness who had been already done with, it might perhaps be convenient to state the particular points with reference to which the re-examination was desired.

The Duke of SOMERSET stated, that he wished to ask Lieut. Hownam some particulars, as to the tent or awning on the deck of the polacca, which to his Lordship's mind were not exactly clear.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL had not the slightest objection to Lieutenant Hownam's being recalled, nor would he now enter into any argument with reference to the right of Noble Lords to call back witnesses; but he would suggest to his Noble friend whether for convenience sake, as well as for the sake of regularity, it would not be better that the examination which had been closed should rest where it did; because if one witness were re-called so state more particularly any minor fact, all the witnesses might be recalled for the same purpose.

The Marquis of LANSDOWN perfectly concurred in the observations of Lord Liverpool. If the proposed course were to be pursued, every witness might be recalled who had not clearly and conclusively established any particular fact to which he had been interrogated. He was sure the Noble Duke would abstain from a course which might be productive of much inconvenience.

The Duke of SOMERSET withdrew his application.

Earl GROSVENOR, for the same prudential reasons, declined making a similar application for the like object. Cries of "*Go on, go on,*" now proceeded from various parts of the House.

Mr. Brougham.—My Lords, to save your Lordships' time and trouble, my friend, Mr. Denman, tells me he is ready to go on.

SUMMING UP OF THE EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFENCE.

Mr. Denman rose and addressed the House as follows—"My Lords—Under any circumstances in which it is possible for any advocate to be called on to proceed to the discharge of the solemn duty now imposed on me, I might well request some indulgence from your Lordships; and it may be that there are circumstances in my situation that seem more particularly to entitle me to a more than ordinary share of your kindness. For, after the application which was yesterday made to your Lordships by the Attorney-General, to postpone the further proceedings in this case, until he should be enabled to procure the attendance of Col. Browne, it might have been expected that not a solitary witness, not a single point of evidence, was all that it was contemplated to produce in support of this case, in addition to those which had been so amply supplied at the commencement. This I conceive to be the more deserving of your Lordships' consideration, when you reflect that the cross-examination of the witnesses for the Defence led to the inference, that it was the intention of the Learned Counsel for the Bill to go at length into evidence in reply, and that this must have tended to divert our minds from that connexion with the case made upon the other side, which it was necessary for us to preserve, in the contemplation of being required to proceed immediately without summing up. But I should have been wanting in my duty if I had suffered any circumstance so far to draw aside my attention from all the prominent points of this case, as to be under the necessity of requiring any delay in the discharge of my particular duty, which might have occasioned a delay in the proceedings, or any inconvenience to your Lordships. I shall therefore my Lords proceed without further flourish to lay before you some observations on the case, by which I trust I shall satisfy your Lordships, and convince the public mind, if any conviction yet be wanting, that the Queen has established her complete defence, and is entitled to a full acquittal from all and every one of those charges which your Lordships have permitted yourselves to try against the Queen of England. I will endeavour, my Lords, to proceed with all the calmness and mildness due to the truth; but if, during the proceedings, there has been a tone of temper which may have drawn down the animadversions of my opponents, I trust that I shall require no other apology with your Lordships than the enormity of the charges and complete disproof which we have offered. I feel it due to the Attorney General to disclaim what has been attributed to me of personal disrespect towards him; and if I could believe that what dropped from me yesterday was construed by him into a doubt of his veracity, I should know of no adequate reparation for such an attack upon his feelings. Warm I may have been, and it is impossible for any man who comes here with right feelings not to be so; but I would be the last person in the world to wound the feelings of those who are opposed to me in the discharge of an unpleasant duty. When I consider that the Queen of England has been, from the hour of her first landing in this Country to the present moment, visited by the most cruel persecution, it is impossible for me not to feel influenced by those sensations which must influence every feeling mind. These sensations have occasionally perhaps made me more warm than I should have been, as it regards my Learned Friend the Attorney General in his personal character; but I will not for one moment forego my right of animadverting upon his conduct as an Advocate. I will not scruple to assert, that he has betrayed too much of the spirit of this Prosecution, which, in its disgraceful duties, has weighed him down, and for which no honours, however extensive, can compensate: a Prosecution, my Lords, which I would not have conducted for any earthly consideration—for I feel that no purchase can be large enough for the disgrace which must attach to those who upon such grounds have sought to crush the wife of the present King of England.

Without further preface, then, my Lords, I shall proceed to the discharge of that awful and arduous task which now devolves upon me. In order to see what the nature of the charge against her Majesty is, it is necessary that you, my Lords, should look to the mode in which it is framed in the Indictment. The Bill, or rather, as I said before, the Indictment, charges, "that her Majesty, while at Milan, in Italy, had engaged in her service an individual, in a menial capacity, and that, while in that situation, a most unbecoming and degrading intimacy soon commenced between her Royal Highness and that individual; that he was not only advanced to a high situation in her Royal Highness's household, but that he was received by her Royal Highness with great and extraordinary marks of favour and distinction; and that she, unmindful of her exalted rank and station, and wholly regardless of her own honour and character, had conducted herself towards him, both in public and private, in the various places and countries which she visited, with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom, and carried on a licentious, disgraceful, and adulterous intercourse with the said Bergami, by which conduct of her Royal Highness, great scandal and dishonour had been brought upon her R. H's family and this Kingdom." I am aware, my Lords, that you are now upon the second reading of this Bill, and that the single question to which I have to apply myself is, whether these allegations have been proved in evidence. I am willing, in the first instance, to admit that it is true, as has been charged in the preamble to this Bill, that this man was received into her Royal Highness's household in a menial capacity. It is true that he has received great marks of favour, and that several of his Relations have been received into the service of her Royal Highness; but then I think it is really too much to state, as has been said in this Bill, that the whole of the Orders of Knighthood, and other honours which have been conferred upon him, have been conferred either by, or through the intervention of, her Royal Highness. If this had been the case, which I deny, I submit that evidence should have been called to support the fact. All that has appeared on this subject is, that these titles and honours have been received; but of the quarter from whence they have come, or the circumstances under which they have been obtained, not a tittle of evidence has been offered—The only testimony offered on this point is, that her Royal Highness did, upon her own authority, confer upon him a pretended Order of Knighthood, which she herself instituted without any just or lawful authority. You have heard, my Lords, a good deal of disgracing Orders of Knighthood; but I apprehend it is unnecessary for me to state, that such Orders have frequently been conferred by persons in a much less exalted situation than that of my Illustrious Client. Several Orders have been established by Individuals in a capacity infinitely more humble. Three brothers in Italy created an Order of Knighthood, to reward their faithful followers; a Merchant adopted a similar course; and many other instances could be cited of a similar character. I make these observations merely to shew, that there is no real ground for the seriousness with which this act of her Majesty has been treated in the Bill. When a Person in her exalted situation for the first time paid a visit to the Holy Sepulchre, it appears to me that no great offence has been committed, if, pleased with the enterprise she had undertaken—delighted with the novelty of the scenes which were presented to her observation—and impressed by the extraordinary circumstances in which she was placed—she took upon herself, like the Duke of Orleans, or Duke of Bourbon, of former times, to establish an Order of Knighthood, to reward the individuals by whom she had been accompanied, and faithfully served on that occasion. I can hardly suppose there is any thing criminal in such an act, or that it can be visited by this House with any degree of severity. Lord Bacon says, that Princes are fond of toys, sometimes erecting buildings, and at other times creating Orders. The Princess of Wales did both; she put wings to the Villa d'Este and made it a Palace, which did no discredit to her taste, though it was not a Kremlin or a Pavilion. My Lords, I believe that I have dwelt longer on this point than it required; but as it is alleged as an offence that my Client instituted an Order—I thought it my duty not to slightly handle this charge, but to satisfactorily show to your Lordships, as I trust I have, that the charge ought not to have been in the preamble of the Bill.

I next come to that part of the case which charges Indecent Conduct and Adulterous Intercourse. The next question here to be tried is, whether that intercourse has actually taken place, and whether, having taken place, it has occurred so as to bring scandal on the person of the King and dishonour on the People of England. Here, my Lords, I must say, that we, her Majesty's Counsel, approach this case under every disadvantage that a defendant in any case can take. Up to the very hour of trial, we were in utter darkness of all the charges to be brought against Her Majesty. It was only from the opening of the Attorney-General that we got at the first specification of the charges to be refuted; not, indeed, a specification of witnesses—for, I believe, my Learned Friend did not mention a witness in the course of his speech—but only the charges to which our defence was to be directed. I shall therefore refer to his speech as to the case we must answer, and must inquire how his statements have been supported by the witnesses he has called. The first count, or the first overt act of high treason, said to have been committed by her Royal Highness, was on the first night of the Opera at Naples; and certainly there was never a series of facts more calculated, or more likely to produce an effect, than the Attorney-General's statement of that part of the case. It went not only to prove that the adulterous intercourse commenced on that night, but it gave a colour to every subsequent act. For what was his statement? He said that the person whom he charged as the paramour of her R. Highness, and who before slept at a distance, was, on that night, removed to a chamber near her Royal Highness. I will give you his own statement.—"On that night," said the Attorney-General, "her Majesty ordered her paramour to sleep in a room adjoining to her own, that she might have easy access to him, he having up to that time always slept at a distance from her. Wm. Austin, a child about seven years of age, who till that night slept in her Majesty's apartment, was removed to another room to sleep, to enable them to carry on the adulterous intercourse now the subject of these proceedings. Her Majesty returned early that night from the Opera, and was seen going to the room of Bergami, and she was noticed by her female attendant (De Mont) to be extremely agitated, and next morning it was observed that the bed of her Royal Highness had not been slept in." This was not all; he further said, "And her Majesty next morning did not leave her apartments till it was very late, but was shut up with Bergami in the cabinet; and although persons of rank called upon her, yet they were turned away without seeing her—they were refused admittance to her presence." This was the statement the Attorney-General ventured to make, and he added to it this also—"Now, my Lords, if such are the facts which I shall prove in evidence—and I have no doubt but I shall—I say, my Lords, if I prove these charges in evidence, there is only one conclusion to be drawn, and that is, that on that night an Adulterous Intercourse took place." Such was the Charge made by my Learned Friend in his Opening Speech; and if he had supported that Charge, I grant that only one conclusion could be drawn.

Your Lordships will see presently how this charge has been proved, or rather disproved. If these facts had occurred—if Bergami had been permitted to enjoy the unlawful embraces of his Royal Mistress, would, my Lords, his behaviour have been what it has been proved to be afterwards towards her Majesty? The Gentlemen who have been examined on the part of the Queen, Sir William Gell and the Hon. Keppel Craven, have both sworn that his behaviour was becoming the situation he filled; that he was respectful to her Majesty, and that his demeanour was as proper as it could possibly be. If this person had done that which he was charged with, would not he have been forward, impudent, and familiar? His behaviour to her Majesty alone gave the lie to the foul charges. But, my Lords, if I shall show that it has been proved, that, instead of her Royal Highness ordering Bergami's bed-room to be next to her's, that the arrangements of the rooms was made by the steward, Sicard; that the alteration was afterwards made without her Majesty's direction or knowledge, in consequence of the great inconvenience to the suite, the house being too small; that Bergami was placed near the window leading into the garden, on account of her Majesty entertaining apprehensions of danger, and for the purpose of protecting her; if it is proved that the boy was not removed to allow the criminal indulgence charged in the Bill, but that he was removed in consequence of his age, which was 14 years, and not seven, as the Attorney-General said; that her Majesty had been remonstrated with some time before by her Chamberlain on account of his sleeping in her room; and that, before her Majesty's arrival at Naples, he had slept in another apartment when there was room for him; if it be proved, that, instead of her Majesty returning early from the Opera, she returned very late, and that Sir W. Gell saw her to her bed-room; that, instead of De Mont's being accidentally present, she had been sent for by her Royal Highness; that instead of being locked up for the greater part of the next day with Bergami, her Royal Highness came down to breakfast at the usual hour next morning; that Bergami, instead of being absent, was seen that morning, as usual; that no persons of rank had been refused admission to her Royal Highness on that day; and if, in addition to all this, it be shown that there was nothing in the conduct of her Royal Highness or Bergami, which could lead to the slightest suspicion; then, my Lords, I ask your Lordships, where are the proofs of criminal intercourse? I ask your Lordships to dismiss the evidence of De Mont altogether. I ask your Lordships, when you find all of her evidence which is known to other persons completely disproved, to refuse to give any credit to those assertions which rest solely on her evidence, and are not confirmed by the testimony of others; for it is impossible for me to bring evidence to show the falsehood of charges which she says occurred when no other person was present. De Mont said that her Majesty, on her return from the Opera, was agitated; it was what any person might have said, without fear of contradiction; but the inference to be drawn was, that her Majesty was so in love with her courier, that she returned early from the Opera to gratify a criminal passion

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21.

[In the account of this day's proceedings published in the *Chronicle* of Thursday, want of space compelled us to exclude the following Evidence.]

The Chevalier Carlo Vassali was called, and examined by Mr. Denman.

Q. Of what place are you a native? Of Milan. Q. Does the witness understand English? A little. Q. What is your profession? I have the honour to be an equerry to the Queen of England. Q. When did you first become acquainted with her Majesty? At Tortona, at the villa of General Pino. Q. Had you the honour of seeing her Royal Highness at the house of General Pino at Milan? Yes. Q. Did you dine with her Royal Highness at General Pino's? I did. Q. In what year was that? Between 1816 and 1817. Q. Do you know Bergami? I do. Q. Was he there at the same time? Yes. Q. Did he dine at General Pino's? Yes. Q. Did her Royal Highness invite you to accompany her upon any journey? She did. Q. On what journey? Her journey from Milan to Turin. Q. Did you accompany her Royal Highness on that journey? I did. Q. Did you afterwards accompany her Royal Highness on her tour thro' Germany? Yes. Q. Before you set out, did her Royal Highness employ you in her household? I set out from Milan to perform the office of vice equerry. Q. How long did you continue in her Royal Highness's service? Since her Royal Highness went to Caprini. Q. Do you remember what time was that? I believe it was in 1818. Q. Ask him to recollect himself; was that so? I have said I believed it was at such time; the exact time I do not remember. Q. Did you enter the service of her Royal Highness at any subsequent period? Yes. Q. In what capacity? As equerry. Q. Have you continued in her Royal Highness's service ever since? As far as St. Omer. Q. Was Bergami in her Royal Highness's service all the time that you were? Yes. Q. In what employment? As chamberlain. Q. Had Bergami any thing to do with the household? He had the regulation of the house. Q. Was it his duty to hire and dismiss the servants? I believe it was his duty. Q. Have you seen her Royal Highness and Bergami walking together at any time? I have. Q. Did you ever see them walking together alone? Sometimes in the garden, and under the portico. Q. Have you seen them riding out together? I have seen them in a carriage with others. Q. Did you ever see them walking or riding together without attendants, except in the garden or about the house? I have said that I have seen them walking together alone in the garden and under the portico; but when I said they were alone, I was wrong; they were not alone, for when I was looking at them I myself was within a little distance of them. Q. Do you know whether Bergami was received at the tables of the neighbouring families of distinction? Of what neighbourhood? Q. Of the neighbourhood of Pesaro? Yes. Q. Were you with her Royal Highness at Munich? Yes. Q. Do you remember if her Royal Highness dined with her suite with the King of Bavaria? Yes. Q. Do you know if Bergami dined at the table of the King? Yes. Q. Did he dine with the King? He dined at the table with the King. Q. Do you know of any civility passing between the King and Bergami? I have seen him treat Bergami with great affability. Q. Were any presents given by the King to Bergami? Yes. Q. What were they? A gold snuff-box, surrounded with brilliants, and adorned with the name of the King. Q. Was that present given by the King to Bergami? The man who gave it to Bergami shewed it to me, and said the King presented it to Bergami. Q. Have you seen it afterwards in the possession of Bergami? Yes. Q. What were the initials or name on the box? "M. J." signifying "Maximilian Joseph." Q. Was there any crown upon it? No. Q. Were you at the Barona with her Royal Highness? Yes. Q. How long were you there? You must mention the time you allude to. Q. I mean the time when the balls were given? I believe about 6 weeks. Q. Was that the time of the carnival? It was. Q. Do you know for whose amusement those balls were given? For that of the family—the suite of her Royal Highness. Q. What number of persons were present? It would be difficult to state the precise number, but I believe about 50 persons. Q. Does that include the whole company, the suite and others? All. Q. Do you recollect if the neighbouring gentry attended those balls occasionally? From the neighbourhood came the family of the tenant of the farm at Barona. Q. Did you ever see the Prefect there? I have seen him. Q. And the Baron Cavaletti? Yes. Q. Were any clerical Gentlemen there? The Curate of the Barona. Q. Did the Queen invite the company to dinner on those occasions? Frequently. Q. Were the families of the Prefect and the Baron Cavaletti present on those occasions? Many times. Q. Were their wives there? Yes. Q. Their daughters? I do not think they were. Q. After dinner, did her Royal Highness and her company go into the room where the dancing was going forward? In the evening. Q. Did her Royal Highness and the visitors remain there any length of time? They came into the ball-room, and then her Royal Highness withdrew into the adjoining room to play. Q. Do you mean at cards? At cards, chess, and sometimes she played on the piano. Q. After her Royal Highness left the room where the dancing was, did the servants and children continue to amuse themselves? The servants did not come in before, consequently they could not continue. They came in after her Royal Highness had withdrawn. Q. Did her Royal Highness come into the ball-room, drawing-room to dance? She came into the ball-room, and sometimes she danced, but seldom. Q. Describe the conduct of the persons collected on those occasions? It was most regular. Q. Did you ever see any thing indecent or improper in the conduct of those persons, on those occasions? Never. Q. You have said that you went upon the German tour with her Royal Highness; were you at Carlsruhe with her? Yes. Q. Do you remember on what day you arrived at this place? Yes. Q. Mention the day? The 25th March. Q. In what year? I think in 1818. Q. At what time of the day did you arrive? About mid-day. Q. Do you remember where you dined on that day? I remember perfectly. Q. Where? At the Margravine's. Q. Was the Princess there? She was. Q. And Bergami? Yes. Q. And Madame Oldi? Yes. Q. Where did you sup on that first day? At the Grand Duke's. Q. Do you remember whether the Baron Von Ende was Chamberlain at the Grand Duke's? I remember it perfectly. Q. Do you remember where you dined on the second day? At the Grand Duke's. Q. Did her Royal Highness dine there? Yes. Q. Did Bergami dine there? He did. Q. And the Countess of Oldi? Yes. Q. Did Bergami and the Countess Oldi remain there during the whole afternoon? No. Q. What did they do? Bergami complained of a head-ache, and asked his sister to accompany him to the Inn. Q. At what time of the evening was that? About five o'clock. Q. Did her Royal Highness leave the Grand Duke's at that time? She remained with the Grand Duchess. Q. Did you remain? I did. Q. Did you come away with the Princess? I did. Q. At what hour? Late in the evening—(*verso sera.*) Q. What was done at the Grand Duke's after Bergami and the Countess went home? Amongst other things, they were singing. Q. Did you sing? Yes; with the Grand Duchess. Q. On the third day where did her Royal Highness dine? At the Margravine's. Q. Were you present at that dinner? I was. Q. How was that evening employed? We went to the theatre, and then to supper with the Grand Duke. Q. Were her Royal Highness and suite at dinner and at the play? Yes. Q. On the fourth day did you remain at Carlsruhe, or go any where else? We went to Baden. Q. Where did you dine? At the Inn. Q. At Baden? Yes. Q. How far is Baden from Carlsruhe? About I think about four hours' ride. Q. On the day after you went to Baden where did you dine? At the Margravine's. Q. Did her Royal H. and suite sleep at Baden on the night of your arrival? On the day we reached Baden, we slept there. Q. Then, on the following day, that you dined at the Margravine's, how did you spend the afternoon? In a musical society. Q. When at the Margravine's, at what hour did you return to the inn? About ten o'clock. Q. Be so good as to say what you did the following day? I believe we went to the Grand Duke's. Q. Do you remember going with Bergami from Scharnitz to Inspruck about passports? Yes. Q. At what time did you set off? We set out about afternoon—about noon—after dinner. Q. At what hour did you return to Scharnitz? About two or three in the morning. Q. Where did you go on your return to Scharnitz; into what room did you go? Into her Royal Highness's room. Q. Where was her Royal Highness at that time? Sitting on a bed, half leaning, half lying. Q. Was she dressed, or undressed? She was covered with a veil. Q. Was there any person with her? Who was there at that time? Bergami at first, then came Schiavini, and afterwards the Countess Oldi out of her own room. Q. What room was that? It adjoined her Royal Highness's room. Q. Did you see little Victorine that morning? Yes. Q. Where? Sitting on a bed. Q. What bed? Her Royal Highness's. Q. Did you see any one else? Yes. Q. Did you see Demont? I did. Q. Was she dressed, or undressed? Dressed. Q. Did any one from the Police come that morning? Not in the morning, but a few minutes after our return. Q. Did you speak to him? Yes. Q. Did you, after that, return to the room of her Royal Highness? Yes, often. Q. How came you to go often into her Royal Highness's room? First, to give her an account of those who had arrived; second, to know if she wanted any thing; and lastly, to give her an account of the weather, and tell her the roads had been cleared of the snow. Did her Royal Highness's suite make preparations to set out for Scharnitz? Yes; they remained up the whole night. You have said that you were in her Royal Highness's room; did you see any other persons in it during those preparations? Yes; the same as I saw before. Were there beds for her Royal Highness's suite to sleep on? There was straw. Where? In the corridor adjoining her Royal Highness's room. Do you mean the corridor into which her Royal Highness's room opened? Yes. Were her Royal Highness's suite there lying on the straw? I saw nobody lying there, for they were all up when I came. What time did you set out on the journey? At daybreak. Had the preparations lasted till that time?—There were no preparations to make, the horses were engaged the day before. While the preparations were making, did you see Bergami? Many times. Was he at any of those times undressed? Never. Where did you see Bergami? In the kitchen, on the stairs, at the door, and in the room of her Royal Highness. Do you remember, on the German tour, stopping at Trieste? Yes. How long did her Royal Highness remain there? A day and a half.—Where did she go to then? To Venice. Were you ever at Rome with her Royal Highness? Many times. Do you remember one time, when her Royal Highness went from Rome to Senegaglia? Very well. How long did the journey from Rome to Senegaglia last? I cannot say precisely, about three or four days. Do you remember what carriage her Royal Highness travelled in? Yes. What sort of a carriage was it? An English landaulet. Who travelled in it? Her Royal Highness, Bergami, Countess Oldi, and the little Victorine. Who travelled as Courier to her Royal Highness? I saw Carlo Forti as Courier. Did you see Sacchi ride as Courier? I did not. How long had Carlo Forti been in the service of her Royal Highness? He began the service in Italy. Where was Sacchini hired as Courier in the service of her Royal Highness; at Loretto? Yes. Was he sent to Rome with any despatches? Not that I know of. Do you remember any circumstance to prevent his being sent? I believe he was spared, because he was tired; I don't know it, but I believe it. Do you know whether the Queen or Bergami had a *padovinella*? Neither. Do you know whether any of the suite had a *padovinella*? I believe Luigi Bergami had one. Will you describe what kind of a carriage that was with regard to springs, &c.? A *padovinella* is a carriage which can convey but one person, without springs, with two wheels and wheels? Did you ever see her Royal Highness ride in such a carriage as that? Never. Have you ever seen a dance performed by a person named Majomet? I have. Was it ever performed in the presence of her Royal Highness? Many times. I believe, she saw it. Upon these occasions did Majomet do any thing indecent with his dress? It was a most simple dance, and there was nothing indecent. Will you be good enough to mention whether, while residing at Pesaro, her Royal Highness was visited by people of rank? Her R. Highness received all the persons of condition at Pesaro. Do you remember the Legate? Yes. Was he frequently at her Royal Highness's Villa? For some time he was frequently. Do you mean to say he paid a visit of some days? Yes, it lasted a considerable time. What is the name of the Legate? Gandolphin. Do you remember the Marquis Andalgo?—Yes. Did any of them hold any office? They were both Lawyers; one was an Advocate. Was the Prefect there? Yes. Were these persons in the habit of visiting her Royal Highness? Very frequently.—Did any of them hold any office under Government? Yes; Gandolphin and the Marquis. Did Bergami visit at their houses? At all of them. Do you know whether he was received by persons of distinction, when not in attendance on her Royal Highness? I know it. Was he so received? I have said he was so received. Have you been there on such occasions? Many times. When at Rome, was her Royal Highness in the habit of being visited by persons of distinction? By the first Nobility of Rome. At any time when you have seen Bergami and her Royal Highness together, have you perceived the least impropriety in either to each other? Never. How long have you been in the army? From the year 1805 to 1815. When in the army, had you ever the honour to bear any Order? I was honoured with the Order of the Iron Crown on my return from the Russian Campaign.

Cross examined by the Attorney-General.

You say that you were in the army from the year 1805 to 1815; in what rank did you enter? In the guard of honour belonging to the Viceroy of Italy. What do you mean by guard of honour? When I say guard, I mean simply a soldier. What guard of honour? The guard of honour to the King of Italy. When were you the first time in company with her Royal Highness? At Tortona, the country house of General Pino. I ask the time, I do not ask the place? It was after her Royal Highness's return from the long voyage; I had seen her at Tortona, the house of General Pino, and at the Villa d'Este. Then you had only seen her three times before? I saw her at three places, but I saw her several times. I think you said that when you first entered the service of her Royal Highness, you held the office of Sub-equerry; what salary had you? No salary at all. What salary had you as Equerry? Two hundred louis a year. How long did you remain as Sub-equerry? Till the arrival at Caprini. When did you quit the service of her Royal Highness? I did not leave the service of her R. H.—I received a letter of dismissal. Do you mean to say that you remained with her all the time from your first entering at Turin until you left at St. Omers? Yes. How long were you at Munich? Ten or fifteen days I believe. You have said that when you accompanied her R. Highness to Munich, Bergami danced there with the King? Yes. Many times? Yes. How often? I cannot decidedly say. Where did her Royal Highness dine the first day? At the inn. Where the second day? I believe with the King. Where the third day? I cannot precisely say where her Royal Highness dined every day. Where did her Royal Highness pass the third evening? To the third day I cannot answer. Where did her Royal Highness dine the fourth day? I have said that I cannot repeat where she dined every day. Where did her Royal Highness pass the evening of the fourth day? Some evenings at the inn, some evenings at the Princess Beauharnois', but I cannot precisely say where every evening. How often did the Princess dine with the King? Twice at the palace and twice in his company. Where did you go from Munich? I believe to Nuremburg. Where did you go from Nuremburg? I cannot precisely recollect. How long were you in that town? I should suppose about three months. How many days were you at Carlsruhe? Six days, including that of arrival. At what time of the day did you arrive? After dinner. How far is the inn at Carlsruhe from the Grand Duke's palace? I cannot precisely say; about three minutes' ride in the carriage.—How far was the palace of the Margravine from the inn? Near a mile. What time did you dine at Carlsruhe?—At three o'clock. How long did you sit at dinner? About an hour and a half. What hour did you go to the theatre? I believe about five o'clock. Where did you dine at Carlsruhe on the first day? With the Margravine. Was Bergami there? Yes. Are you quite sure? Yes. Where did her Royal Highness dine on the second day? With the Grand Duke. Will you swear that? Yes. Did Bergami dine every day with her Royal Highness at Carlsruhe? Yes. When was Bergami taken ill after your arrival at Carlsruhe? On the second day. What time was he taken ill? After dinner. Soon after dinner? Yes. When Bergami returned to the inn, did he rejoin your party the same evening? He did. At what hour? Between seven and eight o'clock. Why recollect so precisely what passed at Carlsruhe, and not at Munich? A man may recollect one thing and not another. When you returned with Bergami to Scharnitz, was it between two and three o'clock in the morning? Yes. At what time did you set out that day to Scharnitz? At day-break. In what month? It was cold and during winter, but I cannot say precisely. Was it broad day-light? About day-break. Was it broad day? It was not broad day, but I could see very well.—What preparations did you make for that journey? I made no preparations; the preparations were made at the inn. Did you not sit up all night after your return to Inspruck? Yes. What were you doing all that time? I went backward and forward to attend upon her Royal Highness.—How many times did you go to her Royal Highness, and for what purpose? Sometimes to carry refreshments to her Royal Highness; sometimes to ask her commands, and to tranquillize her mind in regard to the clearing away of the snow. Before you set out, did you see Bergami that morning? I did. What was he doing? The same as I was. But you said that you were doing nothing? It is impossible to describe minutely the nature of the attendance required for a lady of the rank of her Royal Highness, and the various duties and avocations which it necessarily imposes upon her suite. Do you know the distance in miles between Inspruck and Scharnitz? I do not; we were four or five hours on the road; I went back from Scharnitz to Inspruck, but not on horseback; I went part of the way on a sledge, and the other part by the post; I set out from Scharnitz to Inspruck about noon; I cannot tell how long we were on the road when we arrived at Scharnitz; I do not remember the hour in the morning at which we set out; we were some hours on the road; I can't recollect how long; when the mistake occurred at Scharnitz, I delayed there about an hour before I set out. When you returned from Inspruck, were you not very much fatigued? Witness looked at the Attorney-General with a most expressive smile, and shaking his head, said—"To a man who has been accustomed to perform campaigns it is not possible that such a journey could produce fatigue." Witness went on to answer the questioning put to him. I swear that I did not sleep after my return; I was not lying on the straw even for a moment; I did not see Bergami sleep after my return; the carriages were not unloaded at Scharnitz; her Royal Highness had carriages on her route from Rome to Senegaglia; he set out from Rome about 12 o'clock in the evening; it was not hot at night, but during the day it was excessively hot; her Royal Highness, the Countess Oldi, Bergami, and the child Victorine, travelled in the first carriage; in the second carriage were, I believe, Mr Hownam, Demont, and Brunette; William Austin, myself, and, I believe, a servant, in the third carriage. The fourth was, I think, occupied by servants.—Louis Bergami was not on that journey. I don't recollect the servants who occupied the fourth carriage. I think Soliman, a Greek servant, and another servant were in it. The first morning we stopped at ——

Witness went on to state the names of the other places at which her R. Highness stopped in her route. To a question whether it was not the intention of her Royal Highness to stop at Fougno witness said, he could not tell what the intentions of her Royal Highness were. I do not remember that any person was sent on from Foligno, to order horses to convey us to Lacera. I do not know whether we arrived at Senegaglia on the third or fourth day after our leaving Rome. We stopped at Fano, perhaps an hour or two. We arrived at Fano by day, but I do not recollect at what hour. I remember the Theatre at Fano. I did not desire Forti to set out before me, for the purpose of informing my friends I was coming; but I told him, if he arrived before me, to do so. I do not remember seeing Sacchi at Fano. I will swear it. I know a place called Carli. On our way to Senegaglia, we stopped there to take some thing in the way of refreshment; I do not know what it was. I do not remember taking ices there. Bergami took something. I do not know whether it was hot or cold; he took it in the carriage. A servant brought it. I do not remember what servant. I do not remember that it was Sacchi. I will not swear that it was not Sacchi, because I do not remember it. I don't recollect Sacchi speaking to Austin. I will swear I do not remember seeing Sacchi on that journey. I cannot swear he was not, for I don't remember whether he was or not; the Countess Oldi always rode on the same journey with her Royal Highness; on that journey we arrived at Senegaglia by day, before dinner I think. I cannot positively swear it was not in the afternoon; we arrived three or four days after we left Rome; I know a person called Ratti; he was on that journey, he travelled on the box of the coach in which the maid-servants were; Cavaletti, of whom I spoke as being at the balls, was not in her Royal Highness's service; he lived at Milan; I know Antongina; his daughters were at the ball; he was a tenant of the Barona; I recollect others who were at the ball; Dr Mochetti & the Curate of the Barona; I do not remember the others; I danced with the most of the company; I did not see any of them in any other room, except the dancing-room; her Royal Highness sometimes danced with them; my family were at Milan while I was at the Barona; none of them were presented to her Royal Highness. I know the wife of Bergami; I never saw her at any of the balls; I last saw Bergami when I was coming from Rome; I saw him at Milan, the Barona, and Villa Ritorno, the last time I was at Milan; I have frequently been with him and Gen. Pino; the witnesses offered themselves to come and give their testimony; it is not my character to offer to indemnify them for their trouble. I have not made any agreement with them; I have executed the agreement of the Advocate Henry; his agreement with the witness was ten livres a day, for their support each; a franc a day for each of their wives, and half a franc for each of their children; the Ambassador would not grant the passport until this agreement was made; he came to England because he was sent for by her Royal Highness; the second time he was eight or nine days; he then was sent to Milan, to facilitate the coming of the witnesses for her Majesty; forty or fifty have come, two came with him—Pomarti, one of the witnesses for the Queen; he never represented him as his (witness's) Servant; he frequently saw Bergami at Milan; he did not see him every day at Milan, and never at General Pino's; he saw Bergami at Pesaro; he left her Royal Highness at St. Omers; Bergami and another, and two maid servants, also left her Royal Highness; he went from St. Omers with Bergami to Paris, and little Victorine was with them; they lived at the Hotel Roscati, Rue de Richelieu; they were at a little auburge for a few days; he paid the expenses of the journey and Bergami reimbursed him—they travelled to Paris in two carriages, one of which belonged to her Royal Highness—Francesco, Sardi, and Riego Carnadi, and two or three others accompanied them—he left Bergami at Paris; the first time he saw him after was at Milan; he saw Countess Oldi at her own house at Milan; he left Louis Bergami at Milan; he saw Bergami's mother at Milan; he believes he saw Bergami's wife at the Barona; the last time he saw her was at Paris; he has no salary, but a pension of about five thousand francs, or two hundred Louis, from her Royal Highness; his wife is in London, in Sablonaire's hotel, Leicester-square; he has not yet been even paid for his journey—but Government is to pay his expenses; he could not go out to the Continent without money; Mr. Coutts gave him one hundred pounds to go to Milan; he did not take a letter of credit to Milan; he received at Milan 52,000 livres of Milan, from Marietti, by order of Mr. Henry; he received 100 Napoleons at Venice, which is the whole; he went from Venice, with the son of Mr. Wood, to Milan; he (witness) paid the expenses; a courier travelled with them; he also travelled with Meone, but with no other person; he also travelled, besides to Venice and Milan to Rome; not to Switzerland; he is a native of Milan; he has some fortune of his own, besides a pension from her Majesty.

By the PEERS.—No person that he knows slept in the Princess's room at Charnitz. Carlo Forti entered her Royal Highness's service at Rome, but provisionally; he set out from Loretto with a despatch. He (witness) accompanied her Royal Highness from Milan to Loretto; Carlo Forti went as a private individual during that journey with the suite; Carlo went with her Royal Highness from Loretto to Rome. He saw one bed in her Royal Highness's room at Charnitz. The dance of Majomet was a ridiculous dance, but there was nothing improper or indecent in it. When her Royal Highness returned to the inn, at Carlsruhe, she went into the saloon; Bergami was dressed in uniform, and her Royal Highness in great splendor; it was between seven and eight o'clock in the afternoon.

After some further examination, the witness was ordered to withdraw.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23.

At half-past 10 o'clock Counsel were called in.

The Earl of HARROWBY then laid on the table the Report of the Secret Committee, respecting the correspondence between Mr. Powell and Colonel Browne, on the subject of Rastelli's mission to Milan.

The Report was read by the Clerk, and was in substance as follows:—That the Secret Committee had examined the whole of the extracts, copied from the correspondence between Col. Browne and J. A. Powell, Esq. and verified the same with the original letters of the former, dated at Milan, and the copies of those sent by the latter from Lincoln's Inn. The Committee then divided their Report into two heads, the first relating to the urgent anxiety expressed by Colonel Browne to have a person despatched with letters from the Italian witnesses here to their friends abroad, to allay the injurious reports industriously circulated there of their treatment here, and the rumour of one of them having been murdered at Dover, and that Rastelli himself had actually lost an eye, in a violent assault committed upon him. The Colonel earnestly conjured Mr. Powell to have these reports allayed as quickly as possible by letters from the parties. These communications were repeated by Col. Browne, in several letters dated the 14th September, and during the first week in October.

The second head of the Report comprised the pains taken by Mr. Powell to allay these unfounded apprehensions abroad respecting the witnesses, and his letters to Colonel Browne shewed that he had sent Rastelli, as being the person best calculated to convince the friends and families of the witnesses respecting their treatment; but earnestly urging the Colonel to send Rastelli back without delay, with whatever information and evidence which he (the Colonel) had collected, so as that Rastelli should be back in London about the 3d Oct., as it was material he should not be absent when Parliament re-assembled.

The latter part of the Report contained extracts from several letters which passed between Col. Browne and Mr. Powell respecting Rastelli, who was taken ill of a violent fever just as he returned to Milan, and who was but slowly recovering at the dates of these letters, early in the present month. It also appeared that Rastelli, who stated he had suffered severely on the sea voyage, and discharged a large quantity of blood while on board ship, had a strong repugnance to hurrying again to a sea voyage. The anxiety of Mr. Powell to get him back was such, that he had despatched Krous specially to accompany him back, and his letters to Colonel Browne evinced the strongest anxiety that every means should be taken to hurry him back, lest advantage should be taken of his absence to prejudice the cause. This was the substance of the report which was laid on the table and the original papers ordered to be returned to Mr. Powell in a sealed packet.

Mr. BROUGHAM then said he wished to have Mademoiselle Demont recalled, for the purpose of examination. It appeared, however, that Mr. Vizard, the Queen's Solicitor, had told Mr. Maule he should not want her till twelve o'clock.

Mr. BROUGHAM then offered, in the interim, to give in, as evidence of the reception of the Queen abroad, the following paragraph, which he read from a *Trieste Observer* of April, 1817:

"TRIESTE, APRIL 16.—The Princess of Wales, the wife of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of England, in passing from the higher Germany, arrived in this City yesterday about mid-day. In the evening, our new Grand Theatre, where the exalted Princess went to the grand spectacle of a new opera, was, in honour of her Royal Highness, splendidly illuminated. Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales left this city the 16th of this month, at five o'clock in the evening, for her delightful country residence on the Lake of Como."

The Learned Counsel contended, that as the preamble of the Bill charged her Majesty with a disgusting and indecent familiarity with one of her suite, which reflected scandal and dishonour upon her, and compromised the dignity of the Crown and the morals of the Country, it was open to him to show, by authoritative documents, that no such opinion of her conduct prevailed abroad.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL felt it to be his duty to object to the evidence which had been offered. His Learned Friend must know that it was impossible for it to be received by their Lordships, and he must complain that his Learned Friend, knowing this, should have read that which he did to the House. This must have been done to produce an effect on the minds of their Lordships, which the evidence given at the Bar would not produce. He would not have been allowed to bring forward, in support of the Prosecution, statements of reports or facts to the prejudice of her Majesty (if such had existed), which had appeared in the newspapers; and therefore it was absolutely impossible for such evidence to be received in support of the Defence.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL followed on the same side, in support of this objection.

Mr. BROUGHAM begged leave to say, in answer to the observations of the Attorney and Solicitor-General, that, in a case like this, where the accused was to be tried by the adverse party—where those who appeared as prosecutors on one day, were to sit as Judges, to decide on their own case, on the next—since an anomaly was admitted on the part of the Plaintiff, he thought substantial justice required that an anomaly should be admitted on behalf of the Defendant, in order that she might be in some respects protected against that of which he complained on the other side.

The LORD CHANCELLOR decided that the papers could not be received as evidence.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE, if Lieut. Hownam was in waiting, would propose that he should now be called in to produce the diploma of the Order of St. Caroline.

Lieutenant Hownam was then placed at the bar, delivered in the diploma, and withdrew.

The diploma was then translated, and rendered as follows:—

"*Jerusalem*, 14th *July*, 1816.

"By these presents, subscribed (or signed) in the handwriting of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, and bearing her seal, is instituted and created a new Order of Knighthood, to recompense (or reward) the faithful Knights who have had the honour to accompany her Royal Highness in her peregrinage (pilgrimage) to the Holy Land.

"First—This Order shall be given to, and worn only by, those who have accompanied her Royal Highness to Jerusalem, with the exception of the physician to her Royal Highness (his name is here inserted in the diploma), who was only prevented by accident from following her Royal Highness.

"Second—Sieur Bartholomew Bergami, Baron Francini, Knight of the Grand Order of Malta and of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem, Equerry to her Royal Highness, shall be Grand Master of the Order; and his children, as well male and female, shall succeed him in it, and wear the same Order, which shall descend to their progeny from generation to generation to the end of the world.

"Thirdly—The same advantage is granted to the Knight of the Holy Sepulchre, Mr. Wm. Austin; and his legitimate children, either male or female, for ever, shall enjoy this honour.

"Fourthly—This honour shall be granted to you, Joseph Robert Hownam, Captain in the English Navy, who are created Knight in the suite of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales; this distinction to be enjoyed by you merely as a personal honour, the Cross and Patent on your demise to be restored to the Grand Master.

"Fifthly—The Grand Master shall wear the Cross of the Order round his neck, and the other Knights shall wear it at the button-holes on the left-hand side of the coat.

"Sixthly—The above-mentioned Order shall consist of a red cross, with the motto "*Honi soit qui mal y pense,*" and shall be called by the name of Santa Carolina of Jerusalem. The ribbon thereof shall be lilac and silver.

(Signed) "CAROLINA.

"Bartholomo Bergami, Knight of Malta.
"Baron Francini, Knight of the Holy Sepulchre,
Grand Master of the Order.

"To you, Joseph Hownam, Knight, in the suite of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales."

The Interpreter begged to state, that he had read the date of the letter, 1816. It might be that the date was meant to be 1815. He could not speak positively to this; but their Lordships, on inspecting the document, might be best able to judge which it was.

The LORD CHANCELLOR directed the translation of the diploma to be taken down, and inserted in the minutes with the original.

EXPENSE OF THE TRIAL.

Lord HOLLAND wished to ask the Noble Lord opposite a question on the subject of the papers lately laid before the House, relative to the expenses incurred by the present proceedings. In those documents he found an item of £18,000 for secret service. He wished the Noble Earl to state what was meant by this, and what secret services had been performed, for which this £18,000 should be paid.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL said, the sum in question was marked in the way described, to indicate that it was taken from a sum of money annually voted on estimate by Parliament for Secret Service. From that fund, up to a certain period, it had been thought right to take the sums called for to conduct the proceedings which had been instituted.

The Earl of DARNLEY felt called upon, as this subject had been mentioned by his Noble Friend, to ask another question or two on those papers.—He wished to know if these papers set forth the whole expense hitherto incurred by the proceedings of the Milan Commission; and, if the whole of the expense incurred in procuring witnesses appeared in these documents.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL had no objection to answer the question of the Noble Earl, and to say, that the two items alluded to included the whole of the expenses incurred by the Milan Commission, and by procuring witnesses to appear in behalf of the Bill, as far as the same could be made up, with the exception of the expenses incurred by messengers.

MADEMOISELLE DE MONT.

Mr. DENMAN, before the witness came to the Bar, wished to state the grounds on which they called for the indulgence which they had solicited. It was not the intention of the Counsel for the Defence to attempt to prove any particular fact.—They would merely question her as to a certain conversation. If she admitted it, they would take the benefit of such admission—if she denied it, they would then be at liberty to bring evidence to contradict her.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought it right to state, that the object of the Learned Counsel in re-calling the witness should have been stated before. As the House in one instance had recalled a witness under such circumstances, and, in another, had seemed as if it would agree to such a course, he had little doubt, that they would agree to it.

The witness De Mont was then put to the bar, and examined by Mr. Williams.

Q. I wish to know whether the witness knows a woman called Fanchette Martine? I do not; I believe not. Q. Does she know a man named Henry Martine? I do not recollect any such name. Q. Does she know a place in Switzerland called Mauge? Yes. Q. The woman of whom I speak is a milliner of that place? I know a person, a milliner, at Mauge, of the name of Martini, not Martine. Q. I wish to know whether she recollects seeing that person, under the amended pronunciation, at Mauge, in April, 1818? I have seen her several times. Q. Have you seen her in 1818? I do not recollect; but I may have seen her in the course of that year. Q. Do you recollect sending for her, to make a bonnet for you? I cannot recollect sending for her, as I did not meet her at Mauge. Q. But did you see her on the subject of making a bonnet? I may have seen her; but I cannot say yes or no to that. Q. Do you know her? Yes, I know her. Q. Have you had any conversation with her on the subject of the Princess of Wales? As I do not recollect my seeing her in the course of that year, I do not, of course, recollect such a conversation. Q. After you left the Princess, did you see her? Yes. Q. Had you, then, some conversation with her respecting the Princess of Wales? I do not recollect whether I had any conversation with her relative to the Princess of Wales. Q. Will you swear you had not? I do not recollect; it may be, but I do not recollect. Q. Do you recollect Martini speaking to you relative to your Journal? I do not. Q. Do you mean to say, you had no conversation with her on the subject? Don't recollect; it may be. Q. Do you recollect this woman speaking to you on the subject of the P. of W.? I do not recollect. Q. Nor do you recollect having said any thing respecting the persons who surrounded the Princess? I don't recollect; I have often spoken about the Princess since I have left her, but not about the persons who surrounded her. Q. Did not this person ask you about the character of the Princess? I do not recollect having any conversation with her on that subject. Q. Do you recollect being at Mauge? Yes; several times. Q. Now, I beg to know, whether Martini did not put this question, "whether the Princess was not a woman of intrigue?" I do not recollect; I do not at all recollect having any such conversation on this subject. Q. Will you swear that you had no such conversation, or that she did not ask that question, namely, whether the Princess was not a woman of intrigue? I do not recollect if this question was put to me. I have not the least recollection of it. Q. Do you recollect that you were angry on this question being put to you? I do not recollect this conversation; I have not the least recollection of it. Q. Did you not say it was all a calumny, and that it was the Princess's enemies who spread such rumours against her character?—I don't recollect it; I do not recollect any thing like it. Q. Will you swear you did not say so? I will not swear it. It may be; but I have not the least idea of it. Before I was sworn, I would be put upon my oath, that I never had such a conversation to my recollection. Q. Will you swear you never had a conversation to that effect? I have not the least idea of such a conversation. I have no recollection of it. Q. Did you not say to this Madame Martini, that, at the time the Princess of Wales left England, she was surrounded by spies? I could not have said it, because I never saw any spies about her. Q. Will you swear you never said it? I do not recollect it. Q. But I understand you to say, you could not have said it, because you never saw any spies about her? I do believe I never said so at all. Q. But will you swear you never said it? I will not swear it; but I do believe I never did hold such a conversation. Q. "Again, "that the most simple actions of her life were always misinterpreted?" I do not recollect such a conversation at all. Q. It is a very long conversation. Have you a bad memory; will you swear that the conversation, or any part of it, never passed? I cannot swear what I do not recollect; I have not any idea of it. Q. Do you recollect being on a visit at Madame Jacroit's at Mauge? Yes. Q. When was that? I have been there several times. Q. Were you there in 1818? I have been there several times after I left the service of the Princess of Wales. Q. Were you there in the year 1818, I ask you? I do not recollect being there in that year. Q. Do you not recollect a bonnet being altered for you at Madame Martini's? I do not at all recollect this conversation. Q. Did not Madame Martini say, "that as you were about her person, you must know all about her?" I have not the least recollection of it. Q. Did not Madame Martini ask whether there had not been indecency in the Princess of Wales's conduct? I do not recollect it at all. Q. Did she not use these words, or words to that effect? I cannot swear it; I do not recollect it at all. Q. And will you swear you did not say in answer, "My God! I never in my life! It is impossible for any body to be more virtuous than the Princess of Wales?" I do not remember it. Q. Will you swear that you did not say this in a conversation with Madame Martini? I do not recollect that I did. Q. Was such a question put to you by Madame Martini? I do not recollect such a question; but, if this question took place, I do not believe I made such an answer. Q. Did you not also observe, that in all the persecutions of the Princess, she had no friend but the late King? I do not recollect.

Q. Will the witness swear she did not say so? I will not swear that I did or did not; but I do not believe I ever said so. Q. Was not the witness again at Mauge in the month of November, in the same year? I have been several times at Mauge. Q. Has she any recollection whether or not she was at Mauge in November, 1818? I may have been there in that month, but I do not exactly recollect. I was there either at the end of November, or the beginning of December. Q. Did not Martini ask you whether the Princess was not greatly afflicted at the loss of the Princess Charlotte? I do not recollect such a conversation. Will she swear that Martini did not put that question to her? I cannot positively swear it; but I have not the least idea of it. Q. Ask whether the witness did not in answer say, "Yes, it was very natural, as she had lost every thing in losing her child?" I have not the least idea of such a conversation.—Q. I wish the witness to be asked, whether she believes that such a conversation took place with Madame Martini? I do not believe that any such conversation took place. Q. I wish the witness to be asked, whether, after the death of the Princess, she was not asked whether her Royal Highness would not make some diminution in her household? I have not the least idea of such a conversation. I assure you I do not recollect it. Q. Will you swear it did not take place? I will not positively swear; but I have not the least idea of it. Q. Where was the witness when she was first put upon her oath?

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Has she said in this examination that she was put upon her oath?

Mr. WILLIAMS.—Yes, my Lord.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Read what she said.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—Does not your Lordship think, that, independent of what she may have already said, this question ought to be put?

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that if it were meant to call a witness to contradict this evidence, it was extremely material that some explanations should be given as to the view with which the question was meant to be proposed.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—She has in her evidence used the very terms.

The following answer was then read from Mr. Gurney's notes:—

"I will swear that before I was put upon my oath, I never said anything of what passed in the house of her Royal Highness."

When was it you were, for the first time, put upon your oath?

The question and answer in which the witness alluded to having been put upon her oath was then read to her, and she was asked,

What do you mean by before you were put upon your oath? I mean before I was examined and put upon my oath at this bar.

Mr. WILLIAMS.—I do not wish to put any further question.

Re examined by the Solicitor General.

Q. Before you were examined here at this bar, had you been examined any where else? I had been examined at Milan. Q. Had you ever stated any thing about her Royal Highness before you were examined at this place—in this house? I have spoken often of her Royal Highness before I was examined at Milan. Q. What does the witness mean by saying, that before she was put upon her oath, she never said any thing of what passed in the house of her Royal Highness? The meaning is, that I never said any thing of her conduct with Count Bergami. Q. Do you mean that before you was sworn in this place, that you never said anything respecting the conduct of her Royal Highness and Bergami? I made my deposition at Milan.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said, that if he were entitled, he wished to ask the witness some particulars relative to the journey from Rome to Senegaglia.

The LORD CHANCELLOR gave it as his opinion, that the re-appearance of the witness was on an especial point, and unless the question contemplated by the Learned Solicitor had connexion with what she had now deposed, it could not be put.

The question was not put.

By Lord LAUDERDALE.—Does the witness recollect the day of the month on which she left the service of her Royal Highness at Pesaro? In the beginning of November.

To a second question put by his Lordship, which some interruption prevented our hearing, the witness replied—I wrote the letter on the same day, on the evening of my arrival at the inn.

Ask the witness whether, antecedently to her leaving the service of the Princess of Wales at Pesaro, any account had arrived of the death of the Princess Charlotte of Wales? No. (*Withdraw!*)

Mr. BROUGHAM wished, before the witness withdrew, to confront her with another witness.

The LORD CHANCELLOR was not aware of the motive which induced the wish of the Learned Counsel; but apprehended that it was quite an anomalous course.

Mr. BROUGHAM said, that he thought if she were confronted with the witness he had in view, she (Louisa De Mont) would give quite different answers to the interrogatories.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL objected to the course contemplated by his Learned Friend on the other side, as wholly unreasonable and irregular.

Mr. BROUGHAM would not persist in anything unreasonable; but when his Learned Friend styled his request irregular, he begged leave to remind him, that the whole proceeding was irregular and anomalous.

The witness was now ordered to withdraw; and Mr. BROUGHAM proceeded to call

Franchetti Martini, who was examined by Mr. Williams.

She appeared to be a decently dressed woman, apparently forty years of age. Q. Are you the wife of Henry Martini? Yes. Q. Of what place? Mauge. Q. Do you keep a milliner's shop there? Yes. Q. Do you know Louisa De Mont? Yes. How long have you known her? From the time she was at Mauge, when she was quite young, and learning to work. Q. Was that before she went into the service of her Royal Highness? A long time before. Q. To the best of your judgment, of what age was De Mont when you became first acquainted with her? She might be about sixteen. Q. Have you frequently seen De Mont at Mauge? From the moment I became acquainted with her, I have seen her very often. Q. Do you remember seeing De Mont at Mauge any time in 1818? I saw her in the month of April. Q. On what occasion was it that you saw Louisa De Mont? At the country house of the Demoiselles Jacquerau, whither I was called on account of some work which was to be done of Mademoiselle De Mont. Q. Before that time, had you seen any journal of Louisa De Mont's? I read it. Q. When you saw De Mont, as you have said, on the subject of some work, did you enter into any conversation with her on the subject of that journal, or of the Princess of Wales? Yes. Q. Do you remember asking her any question about the conduct of the Princess of Wales? The first time I spoke to her about her travels, because I had seen her journal. Q. I am speaking of the time when you were called to do work for De Mont? I understand. Q. Did you ask De Mont any question respecting the conduct of the Princess of Wales, or about the Princess generally? Yes. Q. What question did you put?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL wished to know whether their Lordships were of opinion, that the evidence which this question proposed to let in, could legally be received.

After some discussion,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, it appeared to be the sense of the House that the question should be put.

The question was then repeated to the witness:—What question did you put to Louisa Demont? I observed to Demont, that the Princess of Wales was a libertine. I said so frankly, because such was my opinion. Q. What answer did Demont make to this observation? She put herself in a great passion, and said it was nothing but calumny, invented by her enemies, in order to ruin her. Q. Did Demont say any thing more? She said every thing that was good of the Princess; that she had never observed any thing of the Princess but what was good. Q. Do you recollect Demont saying any thing about spies? She told me that ever since the Princess had quitted England, she had always been surrounded with spies; she said something more—that every action that she did, even the simplest actions, done with the best intentions, were misinterpreted,—that the Princess knew very well that she was surrounded with spies; but that she did nothing which she was not willing all the world might know. Q. Do you remember inquiring of Demont any thing about the chastity of the Princess? Yes; I asked her whether she had ever observed any thing of the Princess? Q. What was her answer?—she answered no; that she had never observed any thing; and farther, that it was impossible for any person to be more virtuous than "my Princess." Do you remember any thing being said by Demont about the late King—the old King? She said, in the course of the conversation, that the old King was the only prop the Princess had. Q. Did you know Demont well—and did she know you well? Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS said, that as there was no material contradiction in Demont's evidence, as to the next conversation, about the Princess Charlotte, he would not pursue the examination of the witness any further.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.

Q. How came you to recollect a conversation which you had with De Mont so long ago as 1818? Because I saw her deposition in the public papers, and then I openly manifested my indignation that she could have said what she did to me, and afterwards have made such a deposition. Q. What circumstance led you to think that this conversation took place in the year 1818? Because she employed me in altering a bonnet, and took it back on the 22d of April, 1818, as it appeared by the entries in the day-book. Q. Was that the year in which your husband fell into embarrassed circumstances? He never was in embarrassed circumstances. Q. Do you swear he never was a bankrupt? My Lords, yes; neither he nor I. (*A laugh.*)

After some other unimportant questions, the witness said—The Demoiselles Jacquerau were present, besides myself and De Mont, when this conversation took place; De Mont was on a visit at their house. They heard almost the whole conversation, for they were coming in and going out constantly. There are several particulars which they recollect, and they even found fault with my observations to De Mont. I was examined on the subject of the conversation, in Switzerland, by a Gentleman, I believe, named Johnson. My deposition was taken down in writing. They did not leave a copy with me, nor did I take a copy myself. Mr. Barry came with me to this country.—Q. Did any one else come with you? Yes, my husband. I could not travel without my husband along the public roads. (*A laugh.*) Q. Was any money promised to you for coming over as a witness? They told me we should be indemnified in a just and fair manner by the Government of this Country. Q. Was no sum mentioned? As I did not know the gentlemen, I would not trust to their word, for two years ago an Englishman, named Anderson, occasioned to me a loss of 50 Louis. On this account they have placed £100 at a banking house, as a security for the performance of their promise. Q. Is that £100 to be paid to you? Nothing can be paid to me without an order, for it is placed as a security. Q. Is the promise they made to you £100? No. I expect what is just and fair, because they said they did not wish to buy witnesses. Q. Do you mean to swear that no promise was made to you or your husband since you came to this country? By nobody, I swear; I speak the exact truth. Q. Have you received any thing? Yes. £10 on account; for there is a suit against me, which will be decided against me if I do not go over before the 24th of next month, and not knowing how long I might be obliged to stay in London, I receive that sum on account. Q. Where do you live now? We arrived late yesterday, at midnight. We were placed somewhere, I do not know where, and here I am to day. (*A laugh.*)

Re-examined by Mr. Williams.

On the 22d April I heard that De Mont made a deposition against the Princess. Q. Had you any conversation with the Demoiselles Jacquerau afterwards upon this subject?

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL objected to the question.

Examined by their Lordships.

Lord DARLINGTON.—Was De Mont acquainted with your husband? No.

Lord HARROWBY.—In your conversation with De Mont, did you ask her any questions as to the manner in which the Princess was affected by the death of her daughter, the Princess Charlotte? She said, that the Princess was extremely affected; that she shed tears, and said she had lost all that was most dear to her.

After one or two uninteresting questions from the Earl of LAUDERDALE, the witness was permitted to withdraw.

Mr. BROUGHAM wished again to call the attention of their Lordships to the subject he had alluded to on Saturday—as to the difficulties and obstacles under which her Majesty's counsel lay. From what took place in the House on Saturday, and from the papers that had been laid on the table, he wished to call William Leman, clerk to the Queen's Solicitor.

William Leman examined by Mr. Tyndall.

I arrived at Carlsruhe on the 14th of September. I inquired for the Baron d'Ende. He was not at Carlsuhe, but at Baden. I set out and met him returning. I said, I believe I have the honour to address the Baron d'Ende? He said, Yes, I am the Baron d Ende. I then gave him the Queen's letter. He read it, and invited me into his carriage, and we went to Carlsruhe, to the Baron's house. I conversed with him. I had not the slightest doubt that it was the Baron d'Ende. He informed me that he would be detained there until Tuesday, and that he had not his minutes which he made while the Queen was at Carlsruhe, and therefore he could not then answer my questions. I saw the Baron on Wednesday morning; he took me with him in his carriage to Baden. He referred to his Journal, and showed me some letters he had received from her Majesty. I remained at Baden until Thursday Evening.

Did the Chamberlain say he would come to England? Yes, he said he would come, but as his testimony would be official, he afterwards thought that he ought not to go without the consent of the Grand Duke.