

of the Quarter for Ireland, about 190,000l. The charge for the corresponding Quarter last year, was 9,434,565l. leaving a surplus in that Quarter of 347,034l.; but in this Quarter there is a surplus of above 1,000,000l. to which is to be added the account for Ireland, which will make the whole surplus above 1,200,000l.

October 9.

The evidence of Lady Charlotte Lindsay is to be opposed to the collective evidence of the Italian witnesses—that the Queen and Bergami lived in a state of the most disgusting familiarity, and to a degree totally unwarrantable even by the habits and manners of Italy. Her Ladyship, on this head, deposes, that up to the period of her quitting Her Majesty, she saw nothing of this kind. That it is, indeed, within the habits of Italians to be familiar with their domestics, to a degree which would be deemed inconsistent with English manners. That she saw nothing in the conduct of Her Majesty exceeding this degree. That unpleasant reports, which she did not believe, but which still affected her own reception and quiet, had reached her (Lady Charlotte Lindsay) with respect to the Queen, in Italy, and that, in consequence, she resigned; but that she herself saw nothing beyond the usual latitude of foreign manners, and that more relaxed absence of ceremony and distance, which the necessities, inconveniencies, and urgencies of travelling occasion.

This is the substance, and we think most fairly stated, of the deposition of Lady C. Lindsay, and it certainly goes to negative that portion of the Italian evidence which alleges a general and disgusting intimacy in the daily intercourse of life between the mistress and servant. It almost clears her Majesty of any alleged gross familiarity in this early part of her intercourse with Bergami, and upon the occasions to which Lady C. Lindsay is speaking. It is fair, however, to add, that as respects the prosecution, it does not decidedly contradict this part of the Italian evidence, as they may not depose to the same time and circumstances. Her Majesty might assume one conduct before her ladies, and another before the domestics of whom she was less in awe. This at least would be the observation of a Judge in commenting upon this evidence in his summary. The same Judge, would, however, add, that this deposition was still to be taken into consideration as establishing that kind of general conduct, at that period, which ought to be carried to her Majesty's credit in weighing the depositions against her at nearly the same period. If it appear that the English lady and the Italian witnesses depose to the same period, and to the same circumstances, there can be no doubt but that they are contradictory, and that the Italian evidence is false. But if they depose to different times, and to different circumstances, both may be true, one as speaking of one time, and one of another,—one as speaking of her Majesty's conduct before her Ladies, the

other before her domestics, and in the absence of her higher ladies. This deposition, in short, is evidence of character,—not directly contradicting the deposition of the former witnesses, but forming a circumstance which, in any doubt, is to be thrown into her Majesty's scale.

The next evidence is that of Lord Llandaff, who was at Naples at the same time with the Queen, and at the period in which her adulterous connection with Bergami is said to have commenced. His evidence is of the same effect, and of the same character, as that of Lady C. Lindsay. He saw nothing (at that period,) improper in the conduct of the Queen. He and his lady were in the daily habit of visiting the Queen. There was nothing indecorous with reference to foreign manners, in Her Majesty's being waited upon by Bergami in her bed-chamber. It was the common practice in the intercourse of daily life in Naples. He himself, his brother, &c. had visited Italian ladies of fashion and character in the same manner, in their bed-chambers, and the ladies in bed. Bergami was at that period with the Queen, but his Lordship saw nothing that struck him as even remarkable. This is likewise (a Judge would state in his summary,) evidence of general character; and therefore, does not decidedly contradict any part of the evidence, though it is entitled to its own weight. Taken in connection with that of the preceding witness it certainly explains many of the circumstances of intimacy and intercourse, which are deposed to by the former witnesses; and which, without this explanation, would of themselves be circumstances of strong presumption against her Majesty. The proper effect and the proper use of this evidence, is, that the Jury should bear in their minds, whenever any of those circumstances are alleged; and should then consider whether what is therein deposed, belongs to these foreign usages of people of character, and as such, does not amount in itself to any argument of guilt; or whether it exceeds these habits, and therefore justifies such a presumption. It is not (the same Judge would continue,) a contradiction of any fact alleged by the former witnesses; but it is an explanation into an innocent tendency of certain facts, which, without this explanation, would be, undoubtedly, strong presumptive evidence of guilt; but when taken with this explanation, they cease to constitute such presumptions.

The next evidence is that of the Hon. Keppel Craven, another English gentleman in the suite of her Majesty, and whose evidence certainly comes much more directly to some of the material points of the accusation. He deposes in substance, that he was with the Queen at Naples, at the period alleged to be that of her adulterous connection with Bergami.—That he saw nothing of any improper familiarity. That Bergami had much the manners of a gentleman.—That he advised her Majesty to remove William Austin from

the bed-chamber. In answer to a question by a Peer, he added, that this advice did proceed from himself at the suggestion of her Majesty.—He proceeded to depose, that the dress was not indecent—that it did not strike him as so, and must have struck him if really so.—That the masque might have been worn over the former dress.—That on one occasion he saw Bergami walking on the terrace with the Queen.—That he believes there were others in the garden, and that (though he mentioned it to the Queen because he knew there were spies upon her conduct) he himself saw nothing improper in it.

This evidence is chiefly important on two points, the first as to the part of his having recommended the removal of William Austin, and the second, that of the contradiction of the witnesses,—or rather a different statement, with respect to the masque scene. As respects William Austin, the Attorney General mentioned it as one of the circumstances presumptive of the guilt of the Queen at Naples, that William Austin, the former constant sharer of the Queen's chamber, was removed on the night of the masque scene. To this, this witness deposes, that he himself advised this removal in Germany, and that it was carried into effect in Italy. This part of the evidence is therefore an answer to that allegation and does it away, so far as it before went in presumption of a guilty purpose. The witness Majocchi deposed to the indecency of the masque dress—Madame Dumont said it was ugly. This witness saw no indecency in it. This is not indeed a direct contradiction of a determinate fact between Majocchi and Mr. Craven: indecency of dress being one of those things of circumstances about which two spectators might differ in opinion;—but it is certainly the opinion of a better and more unexceptionable witness than Majocchi, and therefore this deposition must be taken as establishing two conclusions:—the first, that the masque dress was not indecent—-and the second that there is much malice and exaggeration in Majocchi's testimony. The result of these three depositions certainly much weakens the first important fact in proof,—the commencement of the adulterous connection at Naples, and after the masked opera. They do not decidedly oppose, contradictory evidence; but they explain away the fact of the removal of Wm. Austin to make way for the introduction of Bergami,—the undressing of the Queen by Bergami, to invest her in the masque, and the alleged indecency of the masque. If the deposition of Mr. Craven be believed, these facts are removed, and the alleged adultery in this instance, instead of being corroborated by any facts of this kind, is certainly much weakened by the explanation of these circumstances which were alleged in proof of it.

Such is the present aspect of the defence; and so far as it is gone, it has certainly affected the case of the prosecution, in the proportion of the characters for credit and respectability of Ma-