the Villa of the great favourite—and who were at those balls? The worst—the very refuse of society; and amongst the rest, the flower of gentility!—(*a laugh*)—the daughter of the innkeeper of St Christophero. Who had been excluded from those balls, given, as they were, for the innocent amusement of the domestics? One who was, indeed, very nearly related to Bergami. If the neighbourhood and the domestics were to be entertained, and that the disposition of her Royal Highness to give happiness to all around her was so remarkable, why had not the wife of one of those domestics been present? The wife of Bergami was in the neighbourhood—why was she excluded from those mirthful scenes? No, no; as long as a Royal Princess was to remain, so long was the unfortunate wife of Bergami to be shut out from the society of her husband. Could the evidence of Pomi be ever forgotten? He, on being asked about the presence of a particular female at the balls, in his anxiety said she was there, but she *was not a prostitute*. Was not this a proof of the description of persons—of "the flowers of gentlefolk" who visited at the Villa of Bergami?

Mr. DENMAN here said, that there had been no proof that at that time the Villa was Bergami's.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I say that Pomi proves the fact as much as it is necessary. He proves that Bergami lived there, that it was mortgaged, and then he was absent some time, but afterwards lived there again. The place was his residence, and bears his name, and can any doubt but it was his? I now come to the Theatre at Villa d'Este: at this place, it is admitted by Mr. Hownam, that her Majesty played the part of an automaton which was wound up to any thing; that Bergami played, and that Louis Bergami played Harlequin. Was not this degrading to her Majesty, such familiarity with her menial servants? Your Lordships remember the evidence as to the playing of her Royal Highness and Bergami on a bench in the garden at the Villa d'Este; no evidence has been called to disprove this. I believe, my Lords, that I have now gone through the case on the part of the Bill which has been so completely supported by proofs unquestionable.

We now arrive at the evidence given for the Defence of her Majesty. The first was Colonel St. Leger, who proved nothing; but they were determined to have an Englishman, if he had proved less than nothing. Then followed Lord Guildford, Lady Lindsay, and Lord Glenbervie; and they only prove, that, for a short period, during which they had an opportunity of seeing her Majesty, her behaviour towards Bergami, and that of Bergami towards her, was proper and respectful. Lord Llandaff was next called, and to prove an extraordinary fact, viz. the costume of the country in which her Majesty resided—or, as we lawyers would say, to prove the custom of gentlemen visiting ladies in a morning before they had risen from their beds. The amount of proof is this, that Lord Llandaff had visited ladies in a morning, before they had risen from their beds. (*A laugh.*) Is that any excuse for a servant, a courier, being in the bed room of his mistress, a Princess, at the time the *fille de chambre* was dressing and undressing his mistress. (The Attorney General then commented upon the evidence of Sir William Gell, Carrington, Doctor Holland, and Sicard, and wished to convince their Lordships, that Gell, Holland, and Sicard, left her Majesty by the particular suggestion and wish of the Queen, that she might carry on an adulterous intercourse without their observation.—He then adverted to the evidence of Lieutenant Hownam, who had sworn that he believed he had never said to Captain Briggs, that he had entreated her Majesty, with tears in his eyes, not to suffer Bergami to dine at her Majesty's table; and to the evidence of Captain Briggs, who swore positively that Hownam did say so to him on the deck of the ship.)—The Att.-Gen. then proceeded:—Why was not the sister of De Mont called, & the Countess of Oldi, Bergami, Louis Bergami, and others, to contradict the witnesses on the part of the Bill? Because they would have proved her Majesty's guilt, instead of shewing her innocence. What, call Bergami, said one of my Learned Friends—call the person charged with adultery! who ever heard of such a thing? It is no great time back since a person was called who was charged with being an adulterer. In 1699, Major Hook, the person who was said to have been criminal with the accused in the case, was examined at the Bar of this House. My Learned Friends, though challenged to contradict the facts proved, dare not call the witnesses. He believed that Bergami was still her Majesty's Chamberlain; he had not heard of his being dismissed, but he had heard of Vice Chamberlains. Why were not Faustina and the Countess Oldi, who had been brought to this country for the purpose of being examined, produced? Was it not strange, that when a female's character was to be cleared up, there was only one female witness—that she was to be left without even a *dame d'honneur*! Why was not Mr. William Austin produced? Was not he a competent witness? Had he not accompanied her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales on all her journeys and voyages? Where was Hieronimus? Why, he was at Brandenburgh house; but he had not been produced. Where is Schiavini, Louis Bergami—where was the objection to their being called? Camera had not been produced; nor had Livington, the blind fiddler; Carlini, who had been on board the polacre, and at Aum, had not been produced. None of these material witnesses had been produced, tho' it had been stated that the other side were to contradict the whole of the charges. He had fairly commented upon the evidence—at least as fairly as was in his power, and it was for their Lordships to determine whether that evidence was sufficient. He considered that he had done his duty; but he was told that there was another duty for an Advocate to perform—a duty, which must be performed, even though it involved his Country in the horrors of ruin and confusion. His Learned Friends on the other side had not confined themselves to the defence of the Queen's character; but they had launched into invectives against all established authority—even their Monarch was not spared; but an odious comparison was made between him and the most detested tyrant that was to be found in History, and insisted on as a parallel case. The Public, the Learned Gentleman contended, had pronounced no verdict; there was, however, a part of the community who had taken the most base and insidious means to deceive the loyal and good part of the People. They have the cause of the Queen in their mouths, but the cause of Revolution and anarchy in their hearts. The Learned Gentleman concluded nearly as follows:—

"My Lords, the honour and dignity of the Crown will be best preserved by your pronouncing a verdict according to the evidence before you—and I have no doubt but that verdict will be that of Guilty, which, I think, will be satisfactory to your consciences, and sooner or later to the Country at large."

The Learned Gentleman concluded about a quarter to two, when the Solicitor General immediately followed.

On Monday, three per cent. Consols were at 67¾, 68, 67⅞. Omnium, 2¼ dis. Exchange, Dublin on London, 5¼ ½.

The Waterford Chronicle.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4.

On Monday, the SOLICITOR-GENERAL, for the Prosecution against the QUEEN, concluded his speech at half past one o'clock. Mr. BROUGHAM then addressed the Lords to induce them to receive the letters of OMPTEDA, which he considered so important for HER MAJESTY's defence. He stated, that they were addressed to the Director of the Police at Pesaro, and would shew, that the BARON was the medium through which MARIETTE BRON was to carry on her intercourse with her Sister DEMONT, and also, that the BARON had hopes of HIERONYMUS being a man whom he could trust—a sufficient answer to his Learned Friends why those persons had not been called. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL contended, that the letters ought not to be received. A discussion ensued, on a motion of the Duke of HAMILTON, for allowing the Counsel for her MAJESTY to prove at the Bar the letters of OMPTEDA. Earl GREY opposed the motion, because the House had ruled against admitting evidence of the conspiracy against the Milan Commissioners. The Earl of CARNARVON supported it, because he thought their Lordships were bound to admit any evidence which would lead them to the discovery of the truth, on a legislative proceeding of this important nature. Lord HOLLAND opposed the motion for the same reasons that he should oppose the Bill. The Marquis of LANSDOWN supported the motion. The House divided, when there appeared to be—Non-Contents, 145—Contents, 16—Majority against admitting the letters, 129. The House immediately adjourned to ten o'clock on last Thursday.

On Sunday, the Duke of SUSSEX arrived at Brandenburgh-House from Tunbridge Wells, to visit the QUEEN; after remaining an hour with HER MAJESTY, he returned back to Tunbridge. Lord and Lady FITZWILLIAM also visited HER MAJESTY. The QUEEN is not seriously indisposed; she received Prince LEOPOLD in the presence of Lady ANN HAMILTON, the Marquis ANTALDI, and her Chamberlains; she afterwards withdrew with his Royal Highness into another room.

On Saturday, at an interview which Mr. Sheriff WAITHMAN had with the QUEEN, he expressed to HER MAJESTY, that it was the anxious wish of the LORD MAYOR Elect & the SHERIFFS, that HER MAJESTY would condescend to honour the City of London with her presence at the approaching festival, in Guildhall, on the LORD MAYOR's day; and that the LORD MAYOR elect and the SHERIFFS would wait upon HER MAJESTY in state, with an invitation in due form, at any time HER MAJESTY might please to appoint; or would feel themselves highly honoured to receive HER MAJESTY's commands on the subject. The QUEEN expressed herself most grateful for this mark of their attention; but, as she was not provided with a proper establishment, she could not attend on the occasion in the state suitable to her rank, and was, therefore, prevented from acceding to their wishes.

The *Globe* of Monday has the following paragraph—"It is now said, that Ministers, conscious of the complete failure of their case against the QUEEN, but not possessing magnanimity enough to confess it, are endeavouring to make a decent retreat. With this view, they give out, that, if the House will agree to the second reading of the Bill, it is their intention to pare it down in the Committee, so as to meet the minor charges, which would not amount to more than levity and indiscretion. This would bring the present case to the precise result of the former conspiracy against HER MAJESTY, and would break the fall of her enemies. A compromise of this kind would be an injustice to HER MAJESTY, who is entitled to an unqualified and triumphant verdict of acquittal. The partisans of Ministers, however, flatter themselves, that, by this paltry, temporising manœuvre, they will be able to carry the Second Reading."

The *Courier* observes—"It is of infinite importance, that these speeches (of the ATTORNEY & SOLICITOR-GENERAL for the prosecution) should not be mutilated, for they dissipate at once the flimsy case for the defence. A man might as well say, that two and two do not make four, as deny the demonstrations of the ATTORNEY and SOLICITOR-GENERAL, founded, as they are, upon a close and unanswerable comparison of the whole evidence."

Rumours, but wholly unauthenticated, were current of a total change of Administration. It was even said, that Lord LIVERPOOL had actually given in his resignation, and that Earl GREY would be called upon to form a new Ministry.

The following is the deposition of FANNA, the Venetian Jeweller, relative to a gold chain asserted to have been bought from him by the QUEEN, and bestowed upon BERGAMI. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL for the prosecution affirmed, that this document had no existence:—

"VENICE, SEPT. 21, 1820.—I, the undersigned, certify, that I did not sell to her Royal Highness the PRINCESS of WALES any sort of chain at the time of her stay here in Venice; in assurance whereof I sign my name.

"ANDREW FANNA."

The *Star* has the following paragraph on the subject of visits to the QUEEN:—"It is said, that *young* Lady JERSEY, the daughter of Lord WESTMORLAND, is also *going over*, and it is understood, that even Lady CASTLEREAGH has declared for *the enemy*! Should the *grey mare* prove the *better horse*, what may we next expect?"

On Sunday, Lieutenant FOWLER arrived from France with despatches for Lord CASTLEREAGH.—Two additional witnesses, now too late, from Italy, came with him, for the QUEEN's defence.

It is said, that ALI PACHA is completely destroyed. The *Piedmont Gazette* states, that General PEPE had taken possession of the gates of Palermo, after meeting with an obstinate resistance under the walls of that town." It was also reported, that the Austrian troops were immediately to arrive at Ancona, and that considerable corps of Neapolitans were approaching the frontiers of the Ecclesiastical States. One Mail due.

CARRICK-ON-SUIR.

We have the greatest pleasure in giving publicity to the following Address. It marks strongly and impressively the feelings of gratitude by which the Writer of it is animated; and the exertions which were made in furtherance of his views confer the highest honour on the Inhabitants of Carrick, and furnish, as is truly estimated, an example of generous beneficence to the Country at large. Works of this kind are of the very noblest description; nor can any thing be more pleasing to the liberal mind than to witness the cordial union of all religious parties, and to see them embarked in support of one great and common cause. Charity is the essence of practical religion, comprehending, as it does, the evidence of love to GOD, and of justice and humanity towards Man; and all those who promote these important objects may regard themselves as engaged in labours most acceptable in the sight of Heaven:—

TO THE INHABITANTS OF CARRICK-ON-SUIR.

Although unaccustomed to present addresses in the Public Prints, I, however, feel myself emboldened, by the strongest principles of justice and gratitude to do so on the present occasion, in order to assure you, in the most unequivocal and public manner, of my warmest thanks for the generous and spirited manner in which you have assisted me in rebuilding my Chapel. And this act of Charity is still enhanced by the zealous and ardent manner in which the donations have been offered. To the Protestants of Carrick, for their exertions and liberality on this occasion, particularly to Charles William Wall, Esq. of Coolnamuck, I must feel for ever indebted. They have given to Ireland a strong proof of their attachment to religion, to morality, and to society—and what is more, they prove to the world that the spirit of illiberality is banished from amongst us, and that a brighter and calmer day has approached upon our horizon. This discordant spirit has for years past disturbed a brave and generous People, but we trust it is buried in the grave of forgetfulness, without the hope of resurrection or even the shadow of a remembrance—and if on a future day it shall be asked, who was it that erected this Chapel?—the answer will be, it was not erected at the expense of private individuals—nor solely by the Roman Catholics of the Parish (notwithstanding their characteristic liberality)—it is a national work, resting upon the united generosity of Irishmen. This answer will console your posterity, and rouse them to an imitation of the godly virtues of their fathers—and, like the Sun of Heaven, the higher it advances in its course, the more abundantly it will pour forth warmth, pleasure, and consolation. The Benefactors of this Establishment have given a great and splendid example to the Country. In various parts of Ireland we trust the same spirit of benevolence will be upheld—and thus will knowledge, morality, and the sacred cause of Religion flourish, and be handed down in triumph, not only amongst us, but even to generations yet unborn. Gentlemen, whilst I again sincerely thank you for your generous co-operation on the present occasion, allow me to subscribe myself, your much obliged and very obedient humble Servant,

M. FLEMING.

Franciscan Convent, Carrick.

WATERFORD MARKETS.

BUTTER.—The supply at the market-house yesterday was the largest that has appeared there within the last four weeks; the general currency, as on the preceding day, was 80s. for first quality, and 81s. was paid for some superior lots.—The inferior qualities went off more readily, and bore a nearer proportion to the price of firsts, than has been the case lately—Second Quality (called Thirds at the market-house), 75s. to 78s.; Thirds (here termed Fourths), 65s. to 70s. Crane Returns—Thursday, 101—Friday, 370 firkins.

PIGS.—There has been an appearance of improvement within these two days in Singed Pigs; some prime lots have again brought 30s. per cwt.; but the general rate, as yet, can scarcely be said to exceed 29s. The disparity in price between light and heavy Bacon Pigs, which in the commencement of the Season was considerable, is every day diminishing—few or none of the latter are now bought less than 28s. Scalded Pigs also appear to be again on the advance; the general rate for prime heavy Pigs was yesterday 27s. per cwt. and 27s. 6d. was paid for a considerable number.—Light young Pigs, of about 1 cwt. have been lately in demand for what is called Berwick or Kitt Pork; some of these, being rather scarce, have gone as high as 30s. and even 32s. Pork Offal, 14s. to 16s. Pigs' Heads, 16s. to 18s.

GRAIN, &c.—The receipts of all Grain from Farmers this week have been unusually small, probably owing to their being now busily employed in the country; this was peculiarly the case yesterday. Prime Wheat sold freely at 26s. and 6d. over for picked Millers' samples. Good Potato Oats kept steadily at 10s. to 10s. 3d. Grinding Barley, as before, 9s. 6d. to 10s. Prime Malting Do. 10s. to 10s. 3d. No change since last week in Flour—Seconds, 31s. to 33s.—3ds., 24s. to 27s.—4ths., 14s. to 18s. per bag—odd bags of each, about 1s. over. Oatmeal stationary at 11s. to 11s. 6d. per cwt.

LONDON CORN EXCHANGE, OCT. 30.—The supply of Wheat was rather large. Picked samples 2s. per quarter higher than last Monday's prices; all other descriptions as per last Monday. Fine Barley sold from 1s. to 2s. per quarter higher; and the ordinary sorts at from 2[illegible] to 25.—In Oats, Peas, and Beans, there is no alteration.

BONMAHON MEETING.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28.

The Gold Cup, with £10 added—rode by Gentlemen—12 st. each.

Mr. Langley's c. g. *Pastor*	3	2	1	1
Mr. Lorenzo Power's b. g. *Shepherd*	1	3	dr.	
Mr. Voss's g. g. *Whalebone*	4	1	2	2
Mr. Hearn's bl. m. *Blackjoke*	2	dist.		
Mr. P. O'Shee's br. m. *Maid of Orleans*	5	5	3	3

Mr. HEARN's mare the favourite at starting, but fell in running the Second Heat. After the First Heat, 2 to 1 on *Shepherd*. Third Heat, *Whalebone* the favourite, 3 to 1; after which, 5 to 1 on *Pastor*.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30.

£30 given by Mr. P. O'Shee, with Sweepstakes of 3 guineas each, P. P. 4 miles.

Mr. Butler's br. g. *Cockfighter*, rode by Mr. J. Briscoe, 1
Mr. L. Power's br. g. *Whitefaced Dandy*, Mr. K. Briscoe, 2
Mr. Phelan's g. g. *Monk*, ... by the Owner, 3

This was generally admitted to be the fastest and best contested Steeple Chace ever run in this Country—the four miles were run over in less than 13 minutes, and won by half a neck.

The Farmers' Steeple Chace was run for on Thursday, and afforded excellent sport; it was won with difficulty by Mr. FIELDING's Mare, beating seven others.

PROPOSALS for supplying the FEVER HOSPITAL with SWEET and SOUR MILK, for One Year, will be received, on or before the 9th instant, by

JOSHUA W. STRANGMAN.

11th mo. 2d, 1820.

AUCTION OF LINENS.

ON MONDAY, THE 20TH OF NOVEMBER INST. *WILL BE SOLD BY AUCTION,* AT THE HOUSE OF EDW. BATEMAN, MAIN-STREET, YOUGHAL,

58 *Pieces of Strong* ⅞ *LINENS, and*
13 *Pieces of a superior Bleach,*

ALL DIRECT FROM THE NORTH.

The Whole will be Sold without Reserve, in Lots of One Piece each.

Sale to commence at 12 o'Clock said Day.

RICHARD COX, Auctioneer.

Youghal, Nov. 2, 1820.

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION,

AT PILLTOWN, COUNTY OF KILKENNY,

On Wednesday, the 8th day of November instant,

A LARGE QUANTITY OF

GROSS ASH TREES,

OF VARIOUS DIMENSIONS.

On making a Deposit of 1-6th of the Purchase, 3 Months will be allowed for drawing and paying for the Timber.

N. B. There is a great Quantity of OAK and well-saved OAK BARK on hands, and the usual Credit will be given to Purchasers. November 4, 1820.

FOR SALE,

CONSIDERABLY UNDER FIRST COST.

THE following fashionable Collection of FANCY GOODS, HABERDASHERY, &c.

Millinery,	*Rich Tissue Scarfs,*
Ready-made Dresses,	*Straw Bonnets, &c. &c.*
Black & Coloured Bombasins,	*Feathers and Flowers,*
Figured and Plain Sarsnets,	*Thread Lace and Veils,*
Do. Do. Satins,	*Fans and Parasols,*
White and Coloured Gauzes,	*Hair Caps and Bandeaus,*
Gauze Dresses,	*Corsets, of superior quality,*
Lace Do.	*Children's Do.*
Rich Worked Robes,	*Ribbons, and a great Variety*
Chintz Do.	*of Articles in the Haber-*
London Prints,	*dashery line, Gloves, &c.*
Plain and Figured Muslins,	*Silk and Cotton Hose, for*
Rockspun Scarfs and Shawls,	*Ladies and Gentlemen,*
Camel-hair Do. Do.	*&c. &c. &c.*
Merino Do. Do.	

S. M'MAHON

BEGS respectfully to inform the Ladies of Waterford and the Public, that having just returned from London, and intending to decline Business in Waterford, she will continue to dispose of her present STOCK, consisting chiefly of the above splendid and fashionable variety, until about the middle of January next, when she will dispose of the remainder, together with the FURNITURE of her House, by AUCTION, of which due notice shall be given.

N. B. MILLINERY and DRESSES, in the mean time, made up in the most fashionable manner, as usual.

Mall, Waterford, Nov. 4, 1820.

WATERFORD SCHOOL,

Conducted by the Rev. JOHN GREHAM, *A. B.*

AS the Establishment will in future be conducted by Mr. GREHAM solely, in compliance with the practice usual on such occasions, he submits to the Public the following Testimonials to his Character and Qualifications, which he hopes may prove satisfactory:—

We, the undersigned, having known the Rev. JOHN GREHAM, *A. B. during his College Course, can bear testimony to the uniform good Conduct, Assiduity and Talent which he displayed in it.—We regard him as perfectly well qualified to superintend the Education of Youth, and conceive that Persons committed to his Care may derive peculiar Advantages from his Knowledge of the Mathematical Sciences.*

BART. LLOYD, S.F.T.C.D.	JAMES WILSON, S.F.T.C.D.
HENRY WRAY, F.T.C.D.	FRANC. SADLEIR, F.T.C.D.
C. M. ELRINGTON, F.T.C.D.	J. H. SINGER, F.T.C.D.

T. R. ROBINSON, F.T.C.D.

I certify that the following is a correct List of the Academic Honours obtained by the Rev. J. GREHAM, *while a Pupil of mine, in his College Course:—"First place at Entrance, in July, 1808—Three Premiums in Classics, Three in Science, One in both combined—Eight Certificates in Classics, Eight in Science, One in both combined—Scholarship on Eight Best Marks, and the Gold Medal."*

J. H. SINGER, F.T.C.D.

☞ Mr. GREHAM has engaged, as his First Assistant, a Gentleman who obtained Scholarship on Eight Best Marks.

TERMS.

Boarders—Thirty-five Guineas per Annum.
Day-Scholars—Six Guineas Do.

No Entrance Fee required.—Payments Quarterly, in advance.—Further particulars to be learned by application at the School-house, Stephen-street.

November 3, 1820.

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. 1, *Lower Sackville-street, Dublin.*

Ramsey's Waterford Chronicle.

No 12,628. *TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1820.* *PRICE FIVE PENCE.*

THE LETTERS OF BARON OMPTEDA.

Rome, Feb. 24, 1819.

SIR—Convinced of your amiable complaisance, of which you have already given decisive proofs, I venture to ask a favour of you.

It is my wish that the enclosed letter, written by the late Swiss *femme de chambre* Mad. De Mont, to her relative, who is still in the service of the Princess (and who, according to the address, is called Mariette Bron, although I believe that she is also called De Mont), may be delivered according to the direction which I have received, that is to say, into the hands of Bron herself, without the knowledge of the Princess and of her confidants, who intercept all letters addressed to persons of her suite. You will doubtless find means of conveying the letter to the girl, without her knowing that the authorities of Pesaro have had any thing to do with it, and also without her learning that it has passed through my hands; and it would be well, perhaps, to lead her to suppose that the letter was sent from Bologna. The person who delivers it to her should offer to take charge of her answer, which you would be good enough to transmit to me, and which I shall forward according to its address.

What is doing with you? I make no doubt of the bustle and trouble which the length of the Princess's fatiguing visit occasions.

Use your endeavours, therefore, to make her embark, and try to persuade her that it is absolutely false that the English gentlemen propose to come and find her at Pesaro. I learn that that supposition induces her to delay her departure, and I think that in this manner she might wait a long time. Be assured, Sir, how alive I am to all your proceedings; and believe me, with sentiments of the most perfect esteem,

Your very humble and obedient Servant,

D'OMPTEDA, Minister of Hanover.

P.S.—Is Hieronymus, the maitre d'hotel, still with the Princess? and do you think that he still is attached to her?

To Monsieur la Chevalier Bischl, Director-General of the Police at Pesaro.

Rome, March 6, 1819.

SIR—I have received with much gratitude your lines of the 28th, and regret extremely the embarrassment and the trouble imposed upon you by the favour which I requested of you. I hasten, in consequence, to tell you that I decide for the measure which you propose in intrusting the letter to a person of your acquaintance who would hand it to Mad. B., without enjoining any other secresy than that the delivery of it may not be seen by the family of the Baron. If Hieronymos were to see it, I do not think that there would be much danger. The essential point is, that the girl should be *informed of the contents*. If afterwards, by any folly or treachery, it should come to the knowledge of the Princess, the misfortune would not be great. We must endeavour, however, as much as possible, to avoid such an inconvenience. I desire only that the person whom you may choose to execute the commission should have sufficient address, and inspire sufficient confidence, to enable him to deliver the answer which Madame D. will return to the letter in question, and in respect to which I am anxious that it should pass through my hands.

It appears to me that the attempt of the English at Milan rests on a very false conjecture.—Have the goodness to tell me your opinion of it, as well as of the dispositions of M. Olivieri towards the Princess, whose service he quits. What opinion is to be formed of Vassali? I learn, likewise, that several new Roman servants have been received, whose names I should be curious to know.

Excuse all the trouble to which I put you; not being able to testify to you sufficiently how grateful I am for all the proofs of your zeal, and for the kindness of the person who has procured me so interesting an acquaintance. With sentiments of the most perfect esteem, I have the honour to be, Sir, your very humble and obedient Servant,

D'OMPTEDA.

Addressed to Monsieur la Chevalier Bischl, Director-General of the Police of Pesaro.

QUEEN'S PLATE.

Copy of a letter from Lord Milton to Alderman Wood, Treasurer of the Plate Committee:—

"SIR—The investigation into her Majesty's conduct before the House of Lords has now been brought to such a point as has satisfied me of the groundlessness of the opinion which I had, in common with many other persons, formed of her behaviour, and which deterred me, upon her arrival in England, from paying her those marks of respect which were naturally due to her exalted station. I have now, therefore, to request that you will take charge of the inclosed Subscription from Lady M. and myself, to the Service of Plate intended to be presented to her Majesty.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, &c.

(Signed) "MILTON.

"[illegible], *Oct. 22,* 1820."

THE QUEEN'S TRIAL.

HOUSE OF LORDS—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2.

The LORD CHANCELLOR took his seat on the Woolsack a few minutes before ten o'clock.—Prayers were read by the Bishop of Bristol, after which the list was called over.

Lord GAGE moved that the standing order of the House, relative to the method of voting, should be read. This being done,

Lord HOLLAND said, the regular mode of proceeding was for the names to be called over at the table, when each Peer rises and answers to his name, and declares his vote, Content or Non Content, standing up and uncovered; the Lord Chancellor then declares how he conceives the question has been decided, and if any Peer is dissatisfied, the House may then be divided.

The Order of the Day was then moved.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—"My Lords, the question now about to be discussed by your Lordships, notwithstanding all that has been said on the subject, is, whether this Bill shall or shall not be read a second time? I conceive, according to the ordinary practice of the House, this is the only point for your Lordships' consideration. In the ordinary course of proceeding on Bills somewhat resembling this—I mean Bills of Divorce—proof of the allegation contained in the Bill is first made, and if the individual occupying the woolsack is of opinion that the facts have been proved, and other Lords are of a contrary opinion, then a debate arises upon it. Upon looking into the precedents of your Lordships' House, you may be assured, beyond all doubt, that although the preamble of the Bill be proved before the second reading, it is competent for the House to amend the preamble, and that has been done in many, very many cases. The House, if it deems it expedient, may even introduce a new preamble; but it is my opinion, that no alteration of the preamble, or the allegations, can be made, unless for the purpose of mitigating them. In addressing your Lordships on this subject, I can assure you, with the utmost sincerity, that nothing whatever would induce me to trouble you, did I not feel that I could not at all avoid it, without a dereliction of my public duty. I would not have taken any part in this inquiry, did not a sense of duty impel me; and I declare to GOD, I do it with the utmost pain and reluctance. I say no man can vote for this Bill unless he thinks the substantial parts of the preamble proved; and unless I think the adulterous intercourse has been proved, I cannot, conscientiously, give my vote for it. In giving my opinion, I shall not deem it necessary to examine the evidence much in detail. My duty is not to sum up, but only to state my opinion. We are all Judges, all Jurors, and do not proceed on the principle of summing up the evidence, but for communicating to each other our opinions, and discussing the same.—Much has been said on the subject of a Bill of Pains and Penalties, and it has been often repeated, that they can only be justified when the safety of the Country requires that they should be resorted to. But not to go further back than the Revolution, there have been since that period several Bills of Pains and Penalties, where no such necessity existed. I have stated more than once, in the course of these proceedings, that a Bill of Pains and Penalties, if properly conducted, is more favourable—(I do not make any observation on its constitutional or unconstitutional character)—is more favourable to the accused. I mean if it is proceeded in according to the rules of law and evidence. In proceeding by Impeachment, the House of Commons decides on *ex-parte* evidence, and one single vote can decide whether an Impeachment shall take place or not; and if the House so decide, it has no remedy in itself. In a Bill of Pains and Penalties, examinations take place on both sides of the question, and in both Houses, so that an error committed one day, may be rectified the next. But it has been said, we are submitting the judgment of this House to that of the House of Commons; this is the case in all Bills of Divorce. It had been made another cause of complaint, that her Majesty had not been furnished with a specification of the charges, and a list of the witnesses; but how could the charges, or a list of the witnesses, be more effectually furnished, than by producing them at the bar, and then postponing the Defence till such period as the Defendant herself chose? He admitted, as he had before, in the case of Rastelli, admitted, that great advantages are to be gained by an immediate cross-examination of witnesses; but these were far more than counterbalanced by the immensity of advantage given to the Defendant by such postponement of the Defence. The House were also bound to keep in mind that important principle of British jurisprudence, that, in every case of accusation, that accusation was no proof of guilt; that the party may be innocent, and ought to be held to be innocent, until clearly proved to be guilty. Their Lordships would, therefore, dismiss every prepossession from their minds, and judge of the case solely from the evidence before them. He admitted that there might have been—that their Lordships might take it as his opinion that there had been—a much greater facility in the production of witnesses for the Prosecution than in support of the Defence. Of that circumstance the accused party ought, of course, to have the benefit. He admitted also, that there might have been corrupt endeavours to procure evidence, and that was another circumstance of which the accused ought doubtless to have the benefit, not only as regarded the witnesses who were the objects of that corruption, but as regarded others, on whom it might throw a reasonable suspicion.—He had, in forming his own opinion, given all these considerations their full weight. The way in which their Lordships should look at the question was this:—Whether, laying aside all testimony that could be suspected, and taking together the evidence which was unsuspected on the part of the Prosecution, and the testimony in answer, with the negative evidence, or want of evidence, which might have been produced—does it or does it not support the allegation of an adulterous intercourse having existed between her Majesty & Bergami? He had so put the case to himself, and it did appear to him—he was sorry to say it, but he could draw no other conclusion—that *there had been an adulterous intercourse between her Majesty and Bergami.* (Strong marks of sensation throughout the House.) His Lordship did not care although the whole evidence of Majocchi and De Mont were discarded; he would only ask their Lordships to accompany him while he took a short survey of the circumstances attending her Majesty's voyage to the Holy Land. Who went on board the Polacca with her Majesty? Schiavini, Hownam, Flynn, Austin, Countess of Oldi, &c. If the simple issue which their Lordships had to try was, whether her Majesty and Bergami had slept under the same awning or tent, could any man have a doubt as to the result of the evidence? In the first place, their Lordships had the evidence of Garguilo, the captain, and Paturzo, the mate of the vessel. No other observation had been made on the evidence of these persons, except that they had been paid a large sum of money as a compensation for coming here. In his opinion that was a matter of little or no consequence. There was no compulsory process to bring them to this country; and it was well known that foreign witnesses were never to be procured unless liberally paid. Now, supposing the fact of the sleeping under the tent to be proved by these witnesses, could their Lordships possibly believe, that, if any of the numerous persons who slept below could have proved the reverse, that they would not have been produced? Could their Lordships believe, that, if Bergami had slept below during the period when it was alleged he slept under the tent with her Majesty, it would not have been incontrovertibly established? The fact, however, of sleeping under the tent was one thing, and the existence of an adulterous intercourse another. In coming to a conclusion on this point, their Lordships would look to other circumstances—to the fact of the contiguity of the beds at almost every place where her Majesty sojourned—to the extraordinary circumstance of the elevation of Bergami, and all his family—and particularly to the introduction of Bergami's sister, the Countess of Oldi, as her sole Lady of Honour. They were always to keep in mind, that ocular evidence of the adulterous connection was not to be looked for; it was enough that there were such circumstances as led, in every reasonable mind, to the inference of guilt. The Noble and Learned Lord proceeded to animadvert with acuteness on the evidence of Lieuts. Flynn and Hownam, as contrasted with the evidence for the Prosecution, as to the circumstances on board the polacca. Why had not Schiavini been called? He it was who gave the orders to Garguilo and Paturzo; and if they could be contradicted, he was the man to do it. Could there be found in the evidence the slightest trace of necessity? But, supposing there had at any time existed a necessity, what was the meaning of having the tent shut up at different periods of the day, and when the weather was calm—when there was not a breeze? Where was the necessity of having the tent closed then, with the Queen and Bergami inside? Now, let their Lordships look to those who had been called to contradict this part of the evidence, and form a fair and rational comparison. Let their Lordships look to the communication between the awning on the deck and the place—to the uncontradicted evidence of the Captain upon that point—as to whether it was open or shut. Why had not the persons who had slept directly below the place been called to deny that fact? In cases of this nature, where the act had not been seen, an inference must be drawn from a combination of the circumstances. Now, if their Lordships would look to the case at Aum, making what allowance they pleased for the necessity on board the polacca, what necessity existed for the regulation at Aum? What could be the necessity for the introduction of a person into the tent, inclosed by another tent, in the latter of which Majocchi and another servant slept at each side? There was no *wind* there that rendered the presence of Bergami necessary, there was no *heeling*, no *tossing* of the ship up and down, to command his attendance upon his mistress. Let their Lordships only look to the management as to the contiguity of the sleeping apartments, from the time of the arrival at Naples to the return from the long voyage, and say what the meaning of that management was. Why had not the persons who might, if contradiction could be given, have contradicted that very powerful fact? Then the promotion of Bergami! Great indeed was the difference between promotion of a faithful servant, after a long life of service, and the sudden promotion of a man who had not distinguished himself by any. It was one of the greatest blessings of this glorious Constitution, that a man could arrive at the greatest honours by the performance of signal benefits; but here was a person who had not only been elevated himself for nothing, but whose family had been elevated through his means for *services* of the same value. M. Sicard, who had given his evidence with great propriety, knew that Bergami had been in the employment, but he knew nothing more. Mr. Craven hoped that he would be promoted, and Sir William Gell said he was to be gradually advanced. Gradually advanced! Now, let the gradual advancement be looked at. Was there ever so rapid an elevation? Not only Bergami himself, but every one of his family, had been raised to an extraordinary height. All, with indeed *one* exception—his wife! Now, by combining this circumstance with the unimpeached testimony of eight or nine witnesses, as to the indecent familiarities, and adding to those the possession of time, place, and opportunity, which certainly existed, their Lordships would be led to a conclusion, which, to him, appeared inevitable. Why had not Bergami himself been produced? There were cases in which the person charged with having been concerned was produced. Major Hook was called; but here there was an absence of a person, who was under such obligations as never man before was under. As to the evidence of what took place at Senegaglia, he considered that irreconcileable with truth in many parts, and therefore he dismissed it altogether from his memory. So also with respect to Trieste. When he heard of the distribution of the transactions there into six days, and found that the Queen had not been there half the time, he altogether dismissed that case from his mind. But then there was Barbara Kress, who had spoken to circumstances to which there had been no contradiction; except the evidence of Vassali was considered such—and that evidence was rather strange, for he had not said a word in opposition, until the Counsel for the Queen had helped him to fill up the vacancy. Vassali's evidence be looked to with great jealousy. Now, as to Catania: taking all the witnesses together, and coupling all that passed at Aum, in the polacca, and at Carlsruhe, with what occurred at Catania, no inference could be drawn from such a chain but that an adulterous intercourse had taken place. One word more and he should have done. As to what had passed out of doors, he should take no notice of that, for he must be supposed to know nothing of it. But whatever he might think of what was said, he should conscientiously do his duty. He had heard from that bar what it had given him great sorrow to hear—something like a *threat* to their Lordships. (*Hear!*) Whatever might be the opinion out of doors, he would take upon him to say, that the conduct he alluded to was never consistent with the duty of an Advocate, and the threat ought to have no effect upon the decision of their Lordships.—(*Hear, hear!*) They stood there to protect the liberty, the character, and the lives of their fellow-subjects, and he would not hesitate to say to them, "Be just and fear not." They would do their duty, and leave the rest to the wisdom and justice of GOD!

Lord ERSKINE agreed with the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack, that their Lordships ought to come to the discussion with temper and firmness; that they should not suffer themselves to be influenced by any extraneous causes, but that they should be just, and fear not! He would go still farther, and say, that their Lordships should be prepared to do justice at any hazard, and to adopt, as the rule of their conduct, *fiat justitia ruat cœlum!* He (Lord Erskine) did not know how to discharge his duty better to their Lordships than by laying his breast open to them, and stating his opinion on those proceedings. Before the commencement of this business, and on the death of his late Majesty, he was at some distance from town, and heard with surprise, that the first step that was taken was to strike the name of her Majesty out of the Liturgy, and thus deprive her of the Prayers of the Church! And yet the Learned Lord on the Woolsack, who had just sat down, had declared, that no person should be presumed guilty before trial, and that the scales of Justice should be held even! However much he might condemn such a proceeding, he certainly then thought that the Ministers must have had so strong a case against her Majesty as to render her guilt evident beyond the possibility of a doubt. When he came to the House, he found laying on their Lordships' table the informations on which this inquiry had been founded; and a determination to proceed by a Bill of Pains and Penalties, because, as was stated by a Noble Earl opposite, the crime of adultery was not treason, when

ships. On the arrival of her Majesty at Naples, I showed to your Lordships that an adulterous intercourse took place between her Majesty and Bergami, and that William Austin was removed for the purpose of its being done without observation. How has the fact of W. Austin's removal been met? My Learned Friends said that William Austin was removed before her arrival at Naples, and where is the proof? Mr. Craven was called; he was her Majesty's Equerry, and I may say, also, admonitor;—he says, that he admonished her Majesty to remove W. Austin out of her apartment, as it was indelicate, the boy being thirteen or fourteen years of age; and he gave prospective advice to her Majesty, viz.—That Austin should not sleep in her room when she arrived in Italy. And Mr. Craven says, he believes that on one occasion, in Germany, Austin slept in another room. Carrington is next called, of whose evidence I shall say something hereafter, and he says, that twice in Germany Austin slept in a room near to her Majesty's apartment. Sicard is then called, and what says he, my Lords? He contradicts the other two witnesses. He knew nothing of the alteration of the sleeping of Austin. He believes that Austin slept in her Majesty's room at Naples. He adds (page 603), that after her Majesty's arrival at Naples, her Majesty, for the first time, mentioned to him the propriety of Austin sleeping in another apartment, and she observed, that—"he is too old now." De Mont says, that her Majesty made the same observation to her before her arrival at Naples. Now, my Lords, this part of De Mont's evidence is not at all shaken by the evidence for the defence, but was confirmed and corroborated. The defence proved, that on the second night of her Majesty being at Naples, an alteration took place—Bergami was removed near to her Majesty's room, and Sicard says that it was done by his entire direction, for that he thought it was proper to have some person to sleep in the cabinet, which was close to the garden, to protect her Majesty. But why, my Lords, was the communication open between the garden and her Majesty's apartment? If this had been closed, there would have been no suspicion of Bergami, and no apprehension would have been entertained from persons attacking her Majesty. When your Lordships consider the general circumstances, I can have no doubt you will agree, that the reason of placing Bergami in the room near her Royal Highness was for the purpose of facilitating the intercourse between them. (The Attorney-General here referred to the evidence of De Mont, to shew that there was no contradiction in her evidence, as she had not sworn that her Royal Highness returned early, but that she believed it.) The arrangements of the rooms does not depend upon the evidence of De Mont and Majocchi, but it is confirmed by the evidence of Sicard, who acknowledges that there was an uninterrupted communication between the rooms of Bergami and her Royal Highness. (The Learned Gentleman here went over the evidence of De Mont, as to the lateness of the Queen's rising on one particular occasion, and then proceeded to speak of the state of the bed. Mr. Williams had stated that he would call a servant who saw the Queen upon the bed, in her travelling dress; but he had not done so, doubtless, afraid of a cross-examination.) If her Majesty has not called evidence to contradict these facts, after stating that she could do so, I say, that the inference is, that the facts could not be contradicted; and I contend, that the whole of this part of the charge is fully established by De Mont, whose testimony is confirmed and corroborated. There are ample grounds for inferring from this testimony, that the adulterous intercourse did take place at Naples. The next case stated by De Mont is that which she saw Bergami coming to her Majesty's room, and afterwards heard them lock the door, for the purpose of excluding all observation; if this fact remains uncontradicted, there can be no doubt of the adulterous intercourse having taken place also on that occasion. The Attorney-General then proceeded to the case of the masked ball, where Bergami was said to have retired with the Queen to her dressing-room, where he remained for three-quarters of an hour, when she returned with him in the dress of the Genius of History, which, notwithstanding the oath of Sir William Gell, their Lordships would know was most indecent, and that the arms were completely bare.—Sir William Gell acknowledged that a great delay did take place in the appearance of her Majesty; and, according to the evidence of De Mont, that delay took place when her Majesty retired to change her dress, and that Bergami accompanied her upon that occasion. The Attorney-General proceeded to comment very severely upon what he considered, the contradictions in Sir William Gell's evidence, particularly as to that part, in which he swears that he could see the under dress of her Majesty. He concluded that part of the case, by contending, that the evidence of De Mont was fully confirmed. I come next, my Lords, to the masquerade, and here I will observe that I am not averse to the pleasures of a masquerade, nor am I ignorant that people do not always go to masquerades in their carriages, and that they go in disguise; but I notice the Queen's going to the masquerade with Bergami and De Mont, instead of going with her suite. De Mont has sworn to the dress worn by the Queen, and Dr. Holland confesses that he did not know with whom the Queen went to the masquerade, but that she was there, and that he did not know of it until the following morning. It is quite clear that she went with De Mont and Bergami, the courier, who at that time had been only three or four months in her service. This circumstance, coupled with the subsequent elevation of Bergami, leads us to a natural inference of the adultery. (The Attorney-General then adverted to the evidence of the Queen's walking arm in arm with Bergami, and mentioned the circumstance of Mr. Craven's cautioning her Royal Highness against the inference which might be drawn from the situation in which he saw her and Bergami, and contended, that as there was nothing improper in the circumstance itself, it betrayed a suspicion in the mind of Mr. Craven, as to some improper familiarity between Bergami and her Royal Highness on other occasions.) Another fact has been sworn to at Naples by Majocchi, where he says, that Bergami having met with an accident from a horse, which confined him to his room, that he (Majocchi) was appointed to attend upon him. He swears that her Majesty passed twice through his room to that of Bergami, where upon one occasion she staid for fifteen minutes. It has been said by the Counsel on the other side, that it was unreasonable she should have passed through Majocchi's room when there was another passage. But what is the fact? The other passage was a public passage, leading to various rooms, and it was more probable that she should, of two dangers, choose the least, and prefer passing through the room of Majocchi, who might be asleep, to passing through the public passage. I do not care whether any act of adultery was committed on that occasion, but I will say, that no woman of delicacy would, at the dead of the night, go to the room of a man, unless she previously had some illicit intercourse with him. (The Attorney-General then referred to the testimony of Dr. Holland as to his pretended contradictions of Majocchi, and said the Queen might have been in the room without being seen by Dr. Holland. This testimony, connected with the rest of the case, is most important, for if the rest of the case is proved, there is nothing improbable in the Queen's going to the bed-room of Bergami at the dead of the night, if she had previously given herself up so completely to an illicit passion. Dr. Lushington said yesterday, that all the facts of improper familiarity between the Queen and Bergami were satisfactorily disproved; but he forgot what Lady Charlotte Lindsay, in page 515 of cross-examination, stated. She there states, that Bergami dined with the Queen, and walked out with her at Naples, and was upon all occasions selected as her favourite. In the journey from Naples to Rome, pages 519, 520, Lady C. Lindsay does not deny the familiar expressions *Boirre*, used by Bergami to the Queen, and his having provisions given him on that occasion by her Majesty. (The Attorney-General here spoke of the *Non mi Ricordos*, and the tender recollection of Lady Lindsay.) Is this no familiarity upon the part of a courier? Did Carlo Forti or Sacchi ever venture it? No. But Bergami did; and why? Because he had an improper intercourse with his mistress. This fact alone, established in cross-examination, proves more than any thing on our part. Lady Lindsay is the only female prop of her Majesty's propriety, and she is called to witness for twenty-four days, and she is obliged to admit that she was induced to withdraw on account of rumours which had reached her. My Learned Friends have said that there was nothing more natural than that Bergami, having the confidence of the Queen, should introduce his relations; but is it not a fact, that his mother, and child, and sister, and brother, were introduced at Genoa, whilst he was still in the situation of a courier, not after he had distinguished himself by his merit, and by that attack upon the house at Genoa, where they would have it inferred that he had played so meritorious a part? whereas it was that much-slandered witness, Majocchi, who was the principal friend to her Royal Highness upon that occasion. Dumont swears, that at Genoa the bed of the Princess was frequently not slept in, and she and Majocchi both prove, that at Genoa Bergami breakfasted frequently with her Royal Highness in a small cabinet. Have my Learned Friends endeavoured to contradict this? Majocchi states, that upon those occasions Camera and Louis Bergami waited upon them. I establish, out of their evidence, that the facts to which they depose might have been contradicted by Camera and Louis Bergami. (Here the Attorney-General entered into a long argument to show, that it was the duty of the accused to call these witnesses, and that their not having been called was a satisfactory proof that the facts had taken place, as the witnesses for the prosecution had stated.) At Milan, Bergami is still a courier; all the English ladies of her suite have left her Royal Highness; and two days after the departure of Lady Charlotte Campbell, who makes her appearance? The Countess Oldi; who is she—who recommends her? Nothing is said on that subject; but she is the sister of Bergami. If there was nothing mysterious or improper in the introduction of this lady, why was it concealed from Doctor Holland and the household, that the Countess Oldi was the sister of Bergami? The Queen might have said—"She is the sister of a courier; I feel the difficulty of my situation; I have been deserted by the ladies of my suite, and I want a female attendant." Doctor Holland goes with the Queen to Venice, where he remains only seven or eight days, and when he is asked as to the Countess Oldi, he cannot reply satisfactorily that she is a woman of education.—The Queen felt the disgrace of acknowledging that the Countess Oldi was the sister of her courier; and even when she had raised Bergami to the rank of a Chamberlain, she conceals the fact of her being his sister. Why was the Countess Oldi chosen? Because an improper intercourse had taken place between the Queen and Bergami, and as he had been raised by the kindness of her Majesty, the Countess Oldi was less likely to view their connexion with a scrutinizing eye than any other lady. Before I quit this part of the case, I must call your Lordships' attention to the witness Bianchi, whose testimony has not been attempted to be impeached by my Learned Friends. He might have been contradicted by a whole host of witnesses, if what he had stated had not been true. He states that the Queen bought a gold chain, and put it round the neck of Bergami, whilst the company were there. Doctor Holland was there, Hownam was there, but not a question was asked as to whether the chain had been purchased. (Here the Attorney-General entered into a long philippic against the public press devoted to the Queen's cause, as to their shameful observations upon the evidence; but we could not collect the way in which he connected the conduct of the press with his case. He alluded to one paper particularly, but did not name it.) The Attorney-General then proceeded to the evidence of Lieutenant Hownam, where he admits that Bergami dined with her Royal Highness in his courier's dress. He was asked if he had dined with her more than once, and he said never after in the dress of a courier; but he subsequently admits that he might have dined with her Royal Highness again in the dress of a courier; and Bergami alone (said the Attorney-General) was the only servant ever admitted to the table of her Royal Highness, and that too whilst he was a menial servant. It had been intimated, that the dress of Bergami was superior to that of a common courier. Did the dress cause the degradation? No; the fact was, that Bergami was a menial servant, and that Bergami alone, of all the menial servants, dined with her Royal Highness. It was stated, that Bergami was the maitre d'hotel, but this was not true, for Mr. Hownam proves that Hieronymus was the maitre d'hotel, and not Bergami; and yet Bergami dined with her Royal Highness when he was courier, whilst Hieronymus, who was the maitre d'hotel, was not admitted to that honour. It has been stated, that Mr. Burrell joined in the amusements at the Villa d'Este, but I can hardly think that he ever did so. These amusements, which have been attributed to the condescension, and affability, and kindness of her R. Highness, did not take place until all her English suite had left her. It was said that the English witnesses would drive the Bill out of the House; but all that the witnesses called by her Majesty's Counsel proved was, that with their own eyes they saw no acts of indecency. And this is the sum of their proof. What, my Lords, did one of the Members of your Lordships' House prove? I mean, Lord Guildford: he visited her Majesty and found Bergami, her servant, waiting at table, and in a few months after, on his way to her Majesty's Villa, he finds her Majesty and Bergami alone in a canoe on the Lake of Como, and on the same day he saw the same man, this Bergami, who was waiting behind her chair a few months before, sitting by the side of her Majesty at table. What must that Noble Lord have thought when he witnessed this? Had he no suspicion that all was not right? Had he no doubt of guilt? Why did he recommend his sister, Lady Charlotte Lindsay, to leave her Majesty? Was it not in consequence of the indelicacy and impropriety of what he had been the witness of? It has been said that private confidence has been violated; I say no, I say it was necessary to examine that Lady (and I should not have done my duty if I had not) as to the impressions upon her mind, and I admit that she might not, as she says, have witnessed indecent conduct between her Majesty and her courier. Can there be now any doubts how reports injurious to her Majesty were circulated, when her conduct was as I have described? And what kind of evidence have some of the English witnesses given before your Lordships? If I were to read the answers of some of the witnesses, I could find as many "*non mi ricordos*" as there were in the evidence of Majocchi and Rastelli. (*Hear, hear!*) Much had been said about Baron Ompteda, but my Lords, not one jot of proof has been offered.

A Peer now proposed that the Attorney-General should withdraw for a time to refresh himself.

[Here an application was made by the Queen's Counsel respecting the letters of Baron Ompteda, the proceedings on which subject were fully stated in the *Chronicle* of Thursday.]

At twenty minutes before two o'clock the Attorney-General again appeared at the bar.

He renewed his address by commenting upon the extraordinary application of Mr. Brougham. He then adverted to the arrangements of her Majesty's suite on board the *Leviathan*, and read the evidence of Captain Briggs (page 116), by which it appeared that some alteration took place of the arrangement of her Majesty's suite on board that ship, by which Bergami, the equerry, occupied the room adjoining to the cabin of her Majesty. He then proceeded as follows:—My Lords, these alterations took place by the directions of her Majesty, and it appears, my Lords, by Captain Briggs's evidence, that there was an easy access from one room to the other, which was a part of the system and habit of her Majesty and her courier, for the better carrying on an adulterous intercourse. My Lords, I now call your serious attention to what occurred at Catania, and if what Demont has sworn be true, it is sufficient to prove the charges against her Majesty. Demont swore, that she saw her Majesty coming out of Bergami's room with the pillows on which she usually slept. If this is true, what doubt can there be of the imputed guilt of her Majesty? We have had long dissertations on the amount of credit that ought to be given to discarded servants. My Learned Friends, although they produced the letters of Demont, have not destroyed her evidence; they know that, with their four elaborate addresses, their long arguments, to show that Demont's evidence was unworthy of belief, that they had not shaken it. There is one sentence in one of Demont's letters which must convince any one I am convinced, however, that when Demont complimented her Majesty, that she was not sincere; she knew that the Baron and her Royal Highness would see the letters; she knew that she had a sister dependent for support on her Royal Highness's family, and if she said any thing against them, her sister would be discharged, so she wrote to please rather than to offend [illegible]. But [illegible] she wrote shows, my Lords, that Bergami was the master of the house, the master and mistress, the man and woman; and see, my Lords, how she couples them together in one sentence. In the letter De Mont wrote at Rome, she says, "I have to acknowledge the great kindness of her Royal Highness and the Baron towards me, and to thank them for sending the servant with me to protect me to Rimini," &c. See, my Lords, how the Baron and the Princess are coupled together. At Catania, my Lords, De Mont swore, that during one night the child Victorine, who slept with her Majesty, was crying, "Mamma;" she was crying for her foster mother, and the Countess Oldi was endeavouring to console her; and her Majesty at the time was, there could be no doubt, in Bergami's room. Why, my Lords, was not the Countess of Oldi called? she has not been called; and if she had, she must have confirmed the testimony of De Mont. How was it that Bergami had orders and titles conferred upon him? He entered her Majesty's service with a salary of about 40 or 50 louis a-year. It is trifling to say, that her Majesty did not procure these honours and titles. From what other source did Bergami get the money to purchase them? It is also proved in evidence, that her Majesty had Bergami's portrait, and Bergami had the portrait of her Royal Highness—and does not this prove the guilt of the parties? For why should a Princess confer such favours on her menial servant. (The Attorney-General commented upon the conduct of her Majesty in introducing Bergami to her table on board the *Leviathan*, and on the conduct of Captain Pechell in refusing to degrade himself by dining with Bergami. He then proceeded to comment upon the arrangements on board the polacca for sleeping.) My Lords, it is proved that Bergami's bed was at first in the dining cabin, and that her Royal Highness's bed was in a cabin which led out of it, and the bed of her Royal Highness could be seen by Bergami as he lay in bed. Such, my Lords, were the arrangements of sleeping on all occasions, that the parties might gratify their criminal intercourse without interruption or observation. This is not all, my Lords, for there were two entrances into the dining cabin, but to enable them to carry on their guilty practices without any discovery, one of the doors was fastened up. My Learned Friend, Dr. Lushington, says, "I admit there were opportunities to commit the offences imputed, but because there were opportunities you must not infer guilt." My Lords, where such arrangements have been systematic, can there be any doubt upon the guilt of the parties, can you infer any thing else, or I mean can you come to any other conclusion? (The Attorney-General then commented upon the dining of her Royal Highness at Savona, and the sleeping at the Dey's Palace; De Mont had sworn that she slept at a public house, and the Attorney-General contended that there was no contradiction in this; he then returned to the polacca.) My Lords, it appears that under the tent, which was on the deck of the polacca, Bergami reposed in the day time.—Why should he repose there in the day time? Her Majesty could not want his protection then. Will it be said that a female could sleep night after night with a menial servant, and yet that there could be no guilt, because the parties were not undressed. Your Lordships must revoke all the divorce judgments which you have passed against other females, if you refuse a divorce against this Princess.—[Here the Attorney-General read part of the travels of Dr. Holland, to shew that it was not the custom of ladies in Turkey to undress at night, but to repose upon sofas, and therefore he contended that the circumstance of the Queen's being dressed was not an argument against the inference of adultery. He here entered into the evidence for the Prosecution, to prove that Bergami slept under the tent with the Princess, at a time when no occasion existed for such an arrangement.] My Learned Friends admit that these cases, if you are to believe the evidence, would justify a verdict in Westminster-Hall; and if you refuse to convict here, you will do an injustice to all other parties. How are we to prove adultery? If these facts are not sufficient, no case of adultery can ever be proved by evidence. Is it to be said that a female can sleep constantly in the same room with a man, and there is to be no adultery? I say, my Lords, that the charge of adultery is completely proved. A tent was erected on board the polacca—my Learned Friends say it was not worthy of the name of a tent; that it was open; that it was a mere awning to the ship; but Gargiulo and Paturso swear that it was fastened down to the ring-bolts; and not a shadow of imputation can be cast upon their evidence; and the only observation which can be cast upon them is as to the subject of remuneration. (Here the Attorney-Gen. said, that foreign witnesses must be well paid; and observed that the Queen's witnesses also demanded a large remuneration.) Are you to believe, my Lords, that these witnesses came here prepared to perjure themselves? But, my Lords, what do these witnesses say? They say that the tent was closed by order of Schiavini. Where is Schiavini? He is here, living with the Queen, at Brandenburgh House, but my Learned Friends refuse to call him on account of the terms of a cross-examination. Are these witnesses perjured? Are they come here to swear falsely? Schiavini is the person who these witnesses say ordered the tent to be let down, and yet Schiavini, who is at Brandenburgh House, is not called upon to contradict the statement. (The Attorney-General here entered into an ingenious and an able argument to show that Bergami and the Queen must have committed adultery under the tent, as no female of delicacy would have slept for five weeks under a tent with a man unless she had previously prostituted herself. He also argued to refute the opinion of Lieut. H., who supposed it was necessary that Bergami should sleep there; and the Attorney-General asked why, if her Majesty wanted protection, she did not order a hammock to be slung on deck, instead of having Bergami in a bed by her side.)—Five witnesses depose to the fact, and although Mr. Hownam's belief is not part of our case, it is a confirmation of our testimony. Mr. Hownam having failed, and Mr. Flynn having failed also, then my Learned Friends call Rastelli and Baron d'Ende to their aid, and think no more of calling Schiavini, or any other of their witnesses. This charge stands unshaken, and it is a confirmation of the whole case; for if they could sleep for five weeks under this tent, in a state of adultery, it will readily be inferred that all the other charges may be well founded. The Learned Counsel on the other side have been unable to grapple with this fact, and it would be absurd in me to dwell longer on the subject. (The Attorney-General here adverted to the evidence of the bathing on board the polacca, and went on to prove that the evidence for the Prosecution had been full and unequivocal, although the Learned Counsel had endeavoured to establish a contradiction. He then entered into a severe dissection of the evidence of Lieut. Flynn, which he contended was entirely unworthy of credit, as that unfortunate officer had sworn three different ways as to the paper which was written by Schiavini. He then proceeded to comment with great severity on the evidence of Captain Flynn, and said that his account of the binnacle was evidently untrue, for the light could not reflect into the tent, and his contradictions as to the log were plain and evident.) I shall now recur to the bathing of her Majesty. It is clear that she did bathe; and whether it was in the tent or in the cabin, it does not matter a straw; the important question is, was Bergami with her at the time she was bathing? It was sworn to by Majocchi; it was corroborated by De Mont; and the only evidence to contradict their testimony is the opinion of Lieutenant Hownam, and the belief of Lieutenant Flynn? If Bergami was present, and can there now, after it has been so decidedly sworn to, I say, if Bergami was present when she bathed, what doubt can remain that the crime of adultery had been committed? If she would do that before man, which no female of delicacy did unless she had granted him the last favour, what exception is to be taken in favour of her Majesty. My Lords, I am surprised that any one should say that Majocchi and De Mont are not to be credited. It is said that Majocchi is not to be credited, because he used the words *non mi ricordo*. Mr. Brougham said, and very triumphantly, this *non mi ricordo* has destroyed his credibility, and he cannot be believed by your Lordships. I, my Lords, dissent from this, and if Mr. Brougham does not do so now, he must admit that many of his witnesses are unworthy of belief on the same grounds. It has been complained, that the witnesses for the defence were treated with severity, and were cross-examined to an unheard-of extent. How, my Lords, has Majocchi been examined and cross-examined? He was first examined in chief for a day and a half; his cross-examination lasted the same time; and he has been called up three times since by Mr. Brougham, to ask him to facts which no witness has been called to disprove, though there was so much doubt and suspicion attempted to be thrown upon his evidence. How was it that Bisette, the laquais de place, who escorted Majocchi about London, was not called? How was it that Mrs. Hughes was not called? Why was not Mr. Johnson, who travelled in a coach with Majocchi, called to prove that he had not spoken the truth? And last of all, why were not the whole of the female part of the family of the Manners called, when Majocchi wished to marry? Why were they not called to contradict him? (*Laughter.*) I wish, my Lords, that Majocchi's evidence should be tried by the test of truth, and I am sure that he is deserving of credit. Where is the inconsistency in his evidence? There is but one witness called to contradict him, and on that witness I shall make a few observations, and I shall show, I have no doubt, that Majocchi's evidence is more to be believed than his, I mean the witness Carrington. If any person will point out any contradiction in the evidence of Majocchi, except the facts as to Baron Ompteda, sworn to by Carrington, and which I will show is a contradiction on the part of Carrington, I will yield Majocchi to his fate. Carrington speaks, my Lords, of a speech made by Majocchi in the kitchen at Ruffinelli, and also the next day in the court-yard, and Carrington said that Francesco —— was present. Why was not this Francesco called to confirm his evidence, for I have found that he is in England? Here, my Lords, is another contradiction. Carrington says that Ruffinelli is four miles from Rome, and up hill, and that Roscatti is nearer Rome than Ruffinelli; Carlo Forti says that Ruffinelli is 12 miles from Rome, and up hill, and that Roscatti is further up the hill, and more distant from Rome; which of the two is to be believed? If Carlo Forti has spoken truth, Carrington is here contradicted. (The Attorney-General compared the evidence of Carrington with that of Sir John Beresford, page 591 of the evidence, and endeavoured to shew that Carrington had sworn what was false, when he said he had not served on board of any other of his Majesty's ships, except the *Porters*; and that the explanation Carrington afterwards gave, that he understood the question related only to his serving under Sir J. Beresford, was an evasion, and that he had some motive in denying at first that he had not served on board any other ship.) The Attorney-General then proceeded.—My Lords, there is direct contradiction in the evidence of Carrington, and I must say, my Lords, that it is a thing unusual, and which no Counsel is permitted to do, I mean for one evidence to be called to support the doubtful testimony of another. My Lords, Sir John Beresford was called on the other side to support the evidence of Carrington.

Earl GREY here rose and said, that it was he who suggested to the House the propriety of calling Sir John Beresford. But, my Lords, it was not to support the evidence of Carrington; it was done merely for the purpose of eliciting the truth. I appeal to the justice of your Lordships, whether I could have any other motive, but to elicit truth (*Hear, hear!*) And I must contradict the aspersions that are attempted to be thrown upon me by the Attorney-General.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—My Lords, I was stating that it was unusual to call one witness to support another, and I admit that he was called to elicit the truth, and I rejoice that he has been called, for he has elicited the truth, and contradicted the witness Carrington in several instances; and what I said was not intended to reflect upon any one. (The Attorney-General then read the evidence of Carrington, and pointed out what he said were apparent contradictions, and then asked if the evidence of this witness was to be credited, and if Majocchi was not more worthy of belief? In Majocchi's evidence he said there were no contradictions; Carrington's was full. Carrington swore that Majocchi told him about Baron Ompteda, and that he threatened to kill him; Majocchi swore he knew nothing of the Baron. After the inconsistency and contradiction in Carrington's evidence, I ask your Lordships if he is to be believed in preference to Majocchi?)

The Attorney-General was asked by a Peer, if he had nearly concluded, and upon his replying that he should take some time longer to finish his address, the Lord Chancellor moved an adjournment till ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28.

The LORD CHANCELLOR took his seat on the Woolsack a few minutes before ten o'clock, when prayers were read by the Bishop of Bristol, and the list called over. The number of absent Peers was unusually great.

At twenty minutes past ten, Counsel were called on, when

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thus resumed:—"My Lords—when I closed my Address to your Lordships last evening, I had brought the examination of the evidence down nearly to the long voyage undertaken by her Royal Highness. In the course of that journey, her Royal Highness, when at Jerusalem, conferred on some of her suite titles of an Order of her own instituting. My Learned Friends opposite have stated, that this forms a substantive charge in the preamble of the Bill. This, my Lords, is not the case; but it is one of those collateral and corroborating circumstances which tend to prove the substantive charge. My Learned Friends have treated this subject facetiously; but, my Lords, it is matter of grave and serious import. It is not the institution of the Order, but the fact that Bergami, the favoured Bergami, is a Member of that Order.—It has been said that the Order was instituted to reward those of her suite who accompanied her Majesty in her pilgrimage. I object not to her Royal Highness's creating an Order of Knighthood; but I deny that it was from any religious feeling. Demont has deposed, that, in the whole journey, a Princess of Wales, on the eve of being Queen of England, omitted that which ought never to be omitted in any establishment—the Divine Service of the Protestant Church, for herself and the Protestant part of her suite. No, my Lords, her Royal Highness's passion for this favoured man led her to accompany him to the religious services of that religion which he professed, and to neglect those religious duties which ought never to be neglected. But to speak more closely as to this Order of St. Caroline. The office of Grand Master is conferred on one whom she called Colonel Bergami, although he had never had higher rank in the army than that of Quartermaster. Colonel Bergami, Count Francini, Knight of Malta and of the Holy Sepulchre, is made Grand Master, and is to hold the office for himself and his heirs for ever. The Diploma of Lieutenant Hownam is signed by the Princess of Wales, and by Colonel Bergami, as Grand Master, who has not omitted inserting the whole of his titles. This fact, my Lords, more than any other, proves the familiarity of the parties. Why was Bergami thus distinguished? What had he done more than the rest of her Royal Highness's suite? Oh, yes, he was her protector during the whole of the voyage! This was the reason he was thus dignified—thus honoured! The fact I leave to your Lordships' consideration. I might call the attention of your Lordships to the journey to Terracina, where a different kind of salutation took place with Bergami from the rest of the suite. After the voyage to Jerusalem, her Royal Highness returned to the Villa d'Este, where an alteration was made in the sleeping apartments. When Mr. Williams opened the Defence of her Majesty, he stated that he would prove that this change of the bed-rooms was made in consequence of her Royal Highness's bed-room smoking, and that an old floor was opened between the rooms; but the Counsel for the Defence, who have had the architect and other witnesses that could have proved that fact, have not examined them. What are we to infer from this, but that the witnesses did not come up to the mark, and, therefore, they did not dare to attempt to contradict it? The change of the rooms was proved by Majocchi and Demont, and remained uncontradicted. Another circumstance occurred in the long voyage, which had not been attempted to be contradicted, and which might have been refuted by a host of witnesses, if the fact was not true. At Terracina, the witness Galli swears that her R. H. was very familiar with Bergami; that they took delicate morsels together; and that when the company retired, he saw Bergami go up to her R. H. and give her a kiss. Were not this true, there were several persons belonging to her Royal Highness's suite who could have contradicted it; but the character of the witness had not been attempted to be impeached. I beg to observe, my Lords, that not a single witness for the Bill have my Learned Friends attempted to impeach, either as to their previous character or conduct, notwithstanding the invectives and imputations that have been heaped upon them. Strange and singular it is, that not one person from Como, or any of the places mentioned, has dared to say a word against the witnesses for the Bill. One single fact at this shews what must be the result. The Learned Counsel opposite, in speaking of Gargiulo and another witness, who had deposed to seeing the Princess and Bergami sitting on a gun on deck, with their arms round each other's neck, had said, that this circumstance, if true, would prove every thing except the last act, and from which it might be inferred. I am now come to what has been called the tour of Germany. On the arrival of her Royal Highness at Charnitz, a difficulty arose upon the subject of getting passports; and here I must call your Lordships' attention more particularly to the evidence. De Mont says, that, upon Bergami's return from Inspruck, he went to her Royal Highness's room, and that, upon his entrance, her Royal Highness ordered her to retire, and Bergami remained in the bed-room. Now, what did Mr. Brougham say?—"That he should satisfactorily shew, that, within an hour and a half after the return of Bergami with the passports, her Royal Highness was on her journey to Venice, and that the period between his arrival and the departure of the suite had been occupied in making the necessary preparations for the journey." Now, what had Hownam and Vassali said to substantiate that statement? I must also mention, that Mr. Williams said he had three witnesses to produce, with the view of proving this fact, and that not more than two were produced (the Countess of Oldi, no doubt, the other person, having been kept back, for reasons best known to the Learned Counsel for the Queen, and easily guessed at by every body else. But what were the preparations, according to the account of Mr. Hownam and Vassali? Why, Vassali admitted that the luggage had not been unpacked, and, therefore, there could be no necessity for making preparations for packing it; and all the preparations that were made had been undertaken merely for the purpose of removing the snow. He also says, upon being asked whether her Majesty was dressed, that she was covered with shawls, but not a word as to her being dressed. Now, De Mont says, that part of her Royal Highness's dress was taken off, and here, of course, there was no contradiction to that witness's statement. But is it upon attempts to contradict trifles of this kind that a defence against so serious a charge is to be grounded? Is this the way to prove that a servant was not with his mistress in her bed-chamber alone for hours? Now, as to the time of delay—Was it actually an hour and a half, according to the assertion of Mr. Brougham? Why, Hownam and Vassali had both admitted that the suite did not set out till broad day-light. Does not this correspond with the evidence of De Mont? Look, too, to the answer of Vassali, when questioned upon the subject of what he had observed; he had travelled day and night, and yet he did not feel fatigued, or think it necessary to retire to bed, although he was not required to assist in making those nightly preparations. He stays up, and employs himself in walking up and down from the stairs of her Royal Highness's bed-room; and upon being asked what he had been doing, he replied that a person was in eternal movement when waiting upon people of rank!! Now, if this be a triumph over contradiction, the defence has to boast of a triumph such as had never before been obtained. Whatever the Counsel against the Bill may think of it, I pronounce the evidence of Vassali and Hownam to be a confirmation of De Mont's evidence. The Learned Counsel said, he had next to advert to the important evidence with respect to Carlsruhe, which was as firm, now that the defence was closed, as it had been when that for the Bill had been terminated. Barbara Kress stated, that, one evening at the inn, she had occasion, as chamber maid, to carry water to Bergami's bed-room, between which and her Majesty's there was a dining-room. Now, the disposition of the rooms had not been attempted to be denied, and of course the House was bound to believe what had been stated on that subject. Upon entering the room, she saw Bergami in bed, and her Royal Highness sitting on the bed——

Mr. DENMAN—"The evidence was, 'she *had* sat on the bed.'"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, it was ridiculous to use any verbal criticism upon the subject. It was evident that her Royal Highness was sitting on the bed when she went into the room. Their arms were entwined, his arm was round her neck, but, upon seeing Kress, her Royal Highness let fall her arm and started up, and Kress, astonished at the circumstance, instantly left the room. Now, how was this met? By Mr. Hownam's account of the frequent visits of the Queen to the Grand Duke and Margravine; but that witness had acknowledged that his recollection failed him as to the question, whether her Royal Highness returned home from the Grand Duke's between dinner and supper. His recollection was a general one, and left a blank upon the most material point. Indeed, there was no attempt to fill up the blank by calling Vassali, whose memory was of the most extraordinary and useful kind.—This man remembered every tittle of the occurrences at Carlsruhe, but forgot every thing that took place either before or after that. Here the Learned Counsel read part of Vassali's evidence, and contended that the cross-examination completely overturned the examination in chief. Neither Vassali nor Hownam had proved that it was either impossible or improbable that her Royal Highness might have returned home on some of the evenings while she was at Carlsruhe, between the time of dinner and supper. The positive testimony of Kress was not to be shaken by the loose recollections of these gentlemen, and the still looser inferences from them. Holding, then, that the fact was as Barbara Kress swore—that the Princess and Bergami were sitting on a bed, he with his arm round her neck—this was a proof indisputable, according to Mr. Brougham's own concession, that an adulterous intercourse must have existed between them. Barbara Kress had deposed to another fact—namely, that she had found in the bed of Bergami a cloak, which she afterwards saw on her Royal Highness. (The Learned Gentleman here read that part of Kress's evidence.) Had her Royal Highness such a cloak or not? If she had not, why was not Madame Oldi, or some other of her Majesty's female attendants, produced to prove so? He was entitled to assume that the fact could not be contradicted. How, then, he would ask, was the circumstance of that cloak being in Bergami's bed to be accounted for? In no way but one; on no other supposition than that an adulterous connexion had taken place. The same witness, Barbara Kress, had stated a third fact—the marks she saw on the bed. He would not, however, dwell on this part of the evidence; their Lordships would weigh the force of it in their own minds. Such, then, was the important evidence of this witness. Mr. Denman had animadverted severely on the manner in which she had given her testimony, but, in his (the Attorney-General's) opinion, most unjustly. He had never seen any testimony given with a greater air of truth. The cross-examination had conveyed many vile insinuations against the character of this woman, but, as usual, not a single witness had been produced to throw the slightest spot or stain upon her.—And here again he could not help complaining of the gross calumnies which had been circulated through the public Press, both against this individual, and against every one who had been produced as a witness for the prosecution.—Aspersions had been cast upon her which were most false; there never was a witness who stood more clear and unimpeached than this individual. The Learned Gentleman next adverted to the absence of Baron d'Ende, by whom, as her Majesty's Counsel pretended, so much might have been done to shake the testimony of Barbara Kress. Why had this person not come over? What was there to prevent him? He could scarcely believe that his Learned Friends were serious in their desire for his attendance.—What did they want to prove by him? Could he have a better memory than Vassali? Could he testify more pointedly than that person had endeavoured to do, as to every day, hour, and minute, of her Royal Highness's stay at Carlsruhe? The name of Grimm had been introduced, but most wantonly; the Queen's Counsel had said that the Counsel for the Bill ought even to have produced this individual as a witness, although he had no connection whatever with the proceeding. The Learned Gentleman trusted that he had now completely satisfied their Lordships on that part of the case which rested on the evidence of Barbara Kress. This witness was of a character unimpeached; the facts which she swore to were within her own knowledge; they were of such a nature, too, that, if false, they might have been contradicted; but no attempt to contradict them had been made. The inference he would leave to every reasonable and unprejudiced mind. At Forio [illegible], a fact had occurred which his Learned Friends had thought proper to pass over unnoticed. The witness is Petollo, whose credibility was unimpeached.

The Learned Gentleman here read the evidence of this witness, in which he mentions having discovered Bergami in a situation that clearly indicated an adulterous intercourse. This witness also might be contradicted, but no attempt of the kind was made. In the course of her journey, her Royal Highness came to Trieste. Here his Learned Friends thought that they had secured a great triumph—but how? The fact which had been sworn to, they did not attempt to refute; they only endeavoured to produce a contradiction as to the time her Royal Highness stopped at Trieste. First, there was the evidence of Mr. Hownam, who stated, that her Royal Highness arrived on one day and went away on the next; and to corroborate himself on this point, Mr. Hownam had produced a letter, dated on the 18th of April. But did it follow that, because this letter was dated on the 18th, it was written on the 18th, and on no other day? Vassali, too, swears, that her Royal Highness remained only a day and a half—Vassali, of whose excellent memory the affair at Carlsruhe affords such memorable proof! Then, to prop up the case, one of the Counsel for her Majesty, (Mr. Brougham), with that adroitness for which he had been so remarkable throughout the whole proceedings, had produced a foreign newspaper, and, before he knew whether it could be received in evidence or not—nay, knowing well that it could not be received—had read an extract from it, which went to confirm the statement of Lieutenant Hownam and Vassali. Was it necessary, observed the Learned Counsel, to offer any comment upon such a piece of no-evidence as this? Why had his Learned Friend had recourse to it, if he had relied so very firmly as he pretended on the excellent statement of Vassali & Lieut. Hownam? But why, instead of taking any pains at all about a matter of such comparative unimportance as the length of time her Royal Highness stopped at Trieste—why had they not rather produced witnesses to contradict Cuchi, if he could be contradicted, as to the situation of the rooms in the inn, the doors, and the hangings? The Queen had doubtless had her emissaries at Trieste, as we [illegible] elsewhere; and if the facts that Cuchi deposed to were not true, there could have been no difficulty in procuring witnesses to refute them—When, therefore, not a single witness had been produced to show that Cuchi was mistaken in the main facts of his statement, was he not entitled to hold that that statement was fully established? His Learned Friend, Mr. Brougham, had left this part of the case with a threat, that his witness, Cuchi, should be brought to justice. Such threats were easily thrown out [illegible] the object of them could not be mistaken. Perhaps there were other persons whose testimony had been of a nature which exposed them quite as much as Cuchi to the chance of such future reckoning. The Learned Gentleman came now to another part of the case—the journey from Rome to Senegaglia. He confessed he was much surprised at the sarcasm which his Learned Friend, Mr. Brougham, had thrown out on the Counsel for the prosecution, with respect to the estimation in which they held the evidence of Sacchi, as if they had represented to their Lordships that he was a man deserving of no credit, because he had served in the army of Napoleon Bonaparte. Some persons, in dealing out general observations, often hid themselves. He could not suppose that her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, who had been wedded to a husband whose glory it was to have been at the head of an alliance which had crushed the tyrant to the dust—he could not suppose it possible that she would prefer, above all others, individuals who had been the followers of that upstart despot: but, so it was, that Bergami, the favoured Bergami, had been a soldier in Napoleon's army; that Vassali her Majesty's Equerry, had, for a time, served under the same Chief; that Colonel Olivieira, her Joint-Chamberlain, had also been a military adventurer, raised into consequence by the wars of the Revolution; and, in addition to these facts, that her Royal Highness had thought it becoming in her, as a British Princess, to personate, at a masked ball, the Genius of History, in order to crown with laurel the man who was one of the chief of that revolutionary band, in opposing whom the best blood of her own nearest relatives had been shed, and so much of the resources of that Country, of which she was so soon about to be Queen, had been expended! What became (said the Learned Counsel), after such facts as these, of the sarcasm of his Learned Friend? It could not be said that Sacchi was undeserving of credit, while his testimony remained uncontradicted. His Learned Friend, Mr. Brougham, had dwelt much on Sacchi changing his name, which, he said, was in consequence of the riot at Dover, although it was found that he had changed it twelve months before. But it would appear from the evidence, that he did not allude to the Dover riot when he gave the answer to the first question as to changing his name. He said he took a new name, in consequence of the tumults and dangers he should incur. The fact was, he came over as Milani, and changed his name afterwards, in consequence of the riot which happened at Dover. But now for the evidence itself. Sacchi states that he was a courier to her Royal Highness, and travelled in that capacity from Rome to Senegaglia. He is hardly cross-examined on that point, although he was cross-examined at great length as to his former situation, as to his change of name, and other unimportant circumstances. With regard to the journey from Rome to Senegaglia, Sacchi is left without a single question. If such questions had been put, the Counsel would then have supposed that there was some intention to contradict him; but this not being the case, no one expected it would be attempted to refute his evidence. His Learned Friend, in the opening of the Defence, had said, that he would negative the assertion of the witness Sacchi, by a person who was in the carriage with the Princess at the time. He (the Attorney-General) wished such a witness had been produced; it would have been worth ten such as Carlo Forti, unsupported as he was by other testimony. Now, as to this Carlo Forti, if he was found to be contradicted by evidence on the same side, and not supported by it, their Lordships would see how far his evidence was entitled to credit in contradiction to the testimony of Sacchi. Carlo Forti stated that he was courier to her Royal Highness when at Milan, and that he applied to her in consequence of being out of service at the time. Vassali says, that Carlo Forti entered her Royal Highness's service at Rome, but provisionally at Loretto; that he was sent to Rome with despatches, in consequence of his being a native. That he, Vassali, accompanied the Princess from Loretto to Rome, but Carlo Forti set out as a private individual.

Mr. DENMAN complained that the Attorney-General did not read the whole of the answers from the Minutes, but garbled extracts.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thanked his Learned Friend for the hint, and then read the evidence relating to this subject at some length. Carlo Forti swears that he was hired at Milan, and that he went from Milan in the service of her Royal Highness—Vassali says, he was not then in her service. Here, then, Carlo Forti was contradicted at the very outset of his evidence. Now, as to the proof that Sacchi did not travel from Rome to Senegaglia, Carlo Forti states that Sacchi went in a caratella, and that he, Forti accompanied her R. H. as a courier. The reason stated why Sacchi did not travel as courier, was an accident he had met two months before.—Could that, he would ask, be a reason why he did not ride on horseback? It was incredible that a man should labour under that accident two months, before he was able to resume what was his occupation, riding on horseback. Now as to the carriage. Carlo Forti states it was a landaulet with curtains, which drew aside. He says there were only three carriages, and that Sacchi set out before the Princess. Now for the evidence of Hownam and Vassali. Hownam will not venture to swear that Sacchi did not travel as courier on that journey. He says, the Princess travelled in a landaulet. It was hot weather, and they travelled by night; that the Countess Oldi and Bergami travelled in the same carriage with the Princess—although it was hot weather, and they travelled by night. "You would have thought," said the Learned Gentleman, "that in hot weather, it would have been desirable that the carriage should have been less crowded; and that, although it could not be expected that she should part with Bergami, yet her Royal Highness might have sent the Countess Oldi into another carriage, where there was a vacant place, since there could be no impropriety in being alone with Bergami, when they had slept five weeks together under the same tent." The Learned Gent. inferred from this, and from the fact of Countess Oldi not being called, that the evidence of Sacchi was entitled to the fullest credit. The Learned Counsel begged to know why the letters of De Mont, of which so much had been said, were not produced? Why the supposed challenge from Mr. Hownam to Ompteda had not been offered to their Lordships? But it seemed that there was something of a powerful nature indeed in her Royal Highness's favour, which rendered it unnecessary to attend to little circumstances of this description. Rastelli was called! Oh, most fortunate for the Queen! Her Counsel were to produce, in that witness, a recompense for all the losses to which she had been subject in the course of this investigation. After having gone on with the wind with the English witnesses, until the evidence of Lieut. Flynn was blown to atoms, and until the admissions of Mr. Hownam, which, after all, were ten times more ruinous to the defence than the miserable exhibition of Flynn, had taken place, Rastelli became a subject of observation, and the Counsel for the Defence went back to him with some great design. It had been said that Rastelli's absence was an irreparable disadvantage to the Queen! In his conscience he believed that she had been benefited by his absence beyond all calculation. At the very moment they were sinking in their evidence, they turned about, and commenced an attack on Rastelli. Then came the account of the conspiracy; and Mr. Denman, in alluding to that subject, took the opportunity to attack Mr. Powell. With confidence he appealed to their Lordships to acquit Mr. Powell of any improper view, however convinced they were that he had committed an error in judgment. Could their Lordships, for a moment, suppose, that his object was to remove Rastelli from further examination, and that that witness had been, as was insinuated, *spirited* away? If Rastelli had been here at the time, did their Lordships suppose, that her Majesty's Counsel would have been so rash as to call him? No; no. What had they done with respect to Sacchi? Was not the refusal to examine that witness, after having threatened to call him back, a commentary upon the conduct they meant to have adopted towards Rastelli? The absence of that man was, he would repeat, one of the most fortunate circumstances for the Queen that could have taken place. A clamour was excited; and if he had been kept in the country, not one word would have been said about him. Here the Learned Counsel took the opportunity to defend the Milan Commission. The most powerful necessity existed for the inquiry, and those persons who were most admirably qualified, by their talents, their integrity, and industry, were selected for the occasion. Mr. Cooke was celebrated for his legal knowledge, and his skill in detecting falsehood—Colonel Brown was a person of equally respectable character—and Mr. Powell, whose character qualified him also for the situation, co-operated with those Gentlemen—and could it be said, that, because Mr. Powell had been joined in the Commission, he should not have examined witnesses? His right to do so was as indisputable as that of Mr. Vizard. But this had been said for the purpose of affecting the character of Mr. Powell, who had, it was evident to their Lordships, acted from no sinister view. It would be recollected, that Rastelli had been asked, for the purpose of shaking his testimony, whether he had not had a conversation with Vassali upon the subject of his discharge from her Royal Highness's service? This Rastelli denied.—Now, why, when Vassali was under examination, was he not asked a question about this conversation? Because no such thing had ever taken place. The Learned Counsel then adverted to the evidence respecting the scene at the grotto at Villa d'Este, and contended, that the persons produced to contradict the testimony of the scandalous exhibition of the statues had completely failed. He then called the attention of their Lordships to the dance of Mahomet, which, he said, was one of the most indecent spectacles that had ever appeared. Mr. Hownam had said it was a dance in ridicule of the Doctor. And it was from thence inferred that it could not have been indecent. It seemed that he had been present once with her Royal Highness when it had been performed; and Vassali had also seen Mahomet's dance. But what signified it whether they had seen this dance once or not? Mr. Granville Sharpe had been called upon by the Learned Counsel, who saw the charge was indeed a desperate one; but what had that Gentleman stated? That he had seen the dance at Calcutta! It was, to be sure, a very excellent inference to draw, from the circumstance of having seen a dance at Calcutta, that it must have been the same in Italy. (*A laugh.*) But what had the enlightened Sir William Gell, who was so deeply versed in all curious knowledge, said? That it was not more indecent than the Spanish bolero! Why he (the Attorney-General) had heard and read of this Spanish bolero, that it was sometimes so indelicate that no decent female could be present, for a moment, at such an exhibition. Mr. Denman had, indeed, endeavoured to relieve the general disgust excited by the evidence, by assuring their Lordships that Drury-lane Theatre would treat the Public with the dance; and thus ingeniously endeavoured to destroy the effect of a charge which could never be contradicted by evidence. The balls at the Barona were also defended by the Counsel for her Majesty. Where had those balls been given? At the Villa Bergami—not at the house of her Royal Highness, as it had been said, to amuse her domestics, but at