

their support, as may enable them to discharge the duties of their function, and such as may express the just respect which is borne to their office and character. Our Lord himself with his retinue of Apostles and Disciples, was maintained by charitable contributions; for we read that many ministered unto him of their subsistence (a). When he sent forth his Apostles to preach, he gave them this instruction, Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in your purses, for the workman is worthy of his meat (b). Whence it is manifest, that our Lord accounted it the duty of those, to whom the Gospel was preached, to give a competent maintenance to them that preached it. When the apostle St. Paul puts the Thessalonians in mind that he had maintained himself, he at the same time asserts his right to require maintenance of them: Not (says he) because we have not power (c). And to the Corinthians he says, That as they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar, even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel (d). Whence it is plain that the Ministers of the Gospel have authority to require a competent maintenance from the people committed to their care; and as the privileges of the Gospel certainly are not less than those of the law; and the apostle has inferred that the Ministers of Christ ought to live of the Gospel, because the Jewish priests lived of the altar, we may reasonably conclude, that their maintenance must not be less in proportion, than that which the Jewish priests enjoyed.

IV. As it appears that the Church is a complete society, wherein some govern and others are governed, the next thing to be determined is, What obedience is due from the private members of this society to their governors? That all lay-Christians do owe some obedience to their spiritual rulers is evident from our Lord's command to hear the church (e), and the injunction of the Apostle, Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account (f). The Church which we are to hear is to be known from the foregoing description of it, and the rulers to whom we are to yield obedience, and submit ourselves, are they who derive their commission by an uninterrupted succession from Christ and his Apostles. Wherein this obedience to our rulers consists, and what are the limits of it, we may learn from the nature and extent of their power; for so far as they have a right to command, so far are we bound to obey. Now all things that are in the world may be divided into good, bad, and indifferent. The good oblige by their own nature, and the command of God; in these things the authority of our governors is of no force; for whatever is enjoined by the positive command of God, we are bound to do, whether they require it or not. The evil are by the same forbidden, and we are obliged not to obey our Governors, if they should command them. So that it is the indifferent only whereto their authority reaches, and the things which are indifferent in themselves are all those which relate to the outward peace and order of the Church; which are not enjoined by the express word of God, but yet are in no respect contrary to it, in no wise forbidden by it. This authority was exercised by the Governors of the Church from the beginning (as hath been shewn) and it undoubtedly belongs to them; for as they are evidently invested with some spiritual authority, and they can command in nothing at all, if not in indifferent things, in all such things as are indifferent, they certainly have a right to command. And as is their authority, such is to be our submission. So that the obedience we owe to our spiritual governors, consists in observing all their injunctions, that are contained within these bounds of their commission; in submitting to that discipline, which they shall inflict, either to recover us from a state of folly, or to preserve us from falling into it; in attending their public administrations at such time and places as they shall appoint, and upon such occasions as they shall judge proper, to increase our piety, and devotion; and in submitting to such regulations as they shall think conducive towards the edifying of the body of Christ. This is our duty; for things which are indifferent in their nature, when commanded by lawful authority, are no longer indifferent to us, but become

(a) Luke vii. 9. (b) Matt. x. 9, 10. (c) 1 Thess. iii. 8. (d) 1 Cor. ix. 6. (e) Matt. xviii. 17. (f) Heb. xiii. 17.

necessary in their use; and in disobeying them that have the rule over us, we disobey God, who has commanded us to be subject for conscience sake; and therefore all this we are to do, from a sense of that right which they have to command, intrusted to them by God our Saviour, and of that great penalty to which we are liable by our contempt; for he that despiseth them, despiseth Him that sent them.

## LONDON.

HOUSE OF LORDS—OCTOBER 3.  
THE QUEEN.

(Mr. Brougham's Speech concluded.)

On looking at the evidence of Barbara Krautz, some estimate could be formed both of her motives and of the consistency of her uncorroborated story. She swears she came over to England to be a witness by compulsion; and yet when you come to turn over the next page in her book, you find what? That she was to be paid: that is, to get a little compensation for loss of time. She had made no terms, given in no bill, she had made no express bargain, nor had she any reason to expect payment for the evidence she was expected to give. This was her story; but it soon came out that she had got a little payment, and the scale at which it was meted out to her was also observable; for it was wrung most reluctantly from her.—Look at her examination, page 93:

Were you ever examined before? Yes.

Where? I was once taken to Hanover.

What had you for going there? I dont recollect; it was little, so little that I dont recollect.

She it seemed did not, nor could not recollect this remuneration, because it was so little. But it subsequently turned out that it was not because the reward was so little, but because it was so great, she could not recollect. What if it was larger by five times, by ten times her ordinary wages at the inn? She was asked, what if doubled her whole year's salary, wages, perquisites, and all, at the inns at Frankfort? still she could not recollect it: When this payment doubled that annual sum, will any man, my Lords, of plain and common understanding, pretend to say he can believe this woman, when she states she does not recollect such a circumstance, when the amount paid for a six days' journey so far exceeded her annual profits? Was it possible after such a confession as this, to credit her belief? Could she be depended upon in her memory of facts, who did not recollect receiving for a trip that from beginning to end did not cost a fortnight's time, more money, by a great deal, than she could earn in a year, and did not recollect it, because the amount was so little, so very little? How can any man then, I say, place a reliance in a story coming from such a source?

Now, my Lords, we must again cross the Alps, in pursuing this strange history; and dismissing the testimony of the witness whose testimony I have just noticed, all the rest of the persons brought forward are but mere make-weights, persons who are liable to these general observations which I had yesterday the honour to submit to your Lordships. The facts to which they swear are such, that it is utterly inconceivable that they can have been seen by mortal eye. Can it then be supposed that such things would have been suffered to take place with such publicity, that they must be exposed to the observation of a number of persons in the lowest walks of life, of the humblest, and even degrading occupations, and whom after all the pains taken with them, it has been found impossible to clothe with even ordinary respectability. It is impossible that any person retaining ordinary sense and understanding, could allow such scenes as had been described to pass in the presence of eleven men. Why had not more of the crew who were on board the vessel been called? It is strange that the witnesses never mentioned what they had seen. One who had been on board, when asked if he had ever told of what he had witnessed, replied "yes once." When asked on what occasion it was that he so mentioned it, he replied "to the commission at Milan." The question was then put, "did you never mention it before?" and to this the reply was "never." And thus it is with them all. When Rastelli swore to scenes too disgusting to be detailed—when he swore to abominations having taken place in the face of day which could not be described, and that too in a situation so unsheltered that it was impossible for him to turn his head without seeing them, he like all the rest of the witnesses to these abominations, as if the relation between cause and effect of this singular case, was wholly suspended, had never opened his mouth on the subject; his lips had been hermetically sealed till he was called on by the commission at Milan. Through ten long months that witness was silent. Was he a hermit all this time? Was he living the life of a recluse? Was there no mortal ear in which he could mention it? Was there no man, woman, or child, to whom he could whisper it? To the latter, perhaps, he might not be expected to mention it; but had he no friend, no brother, no mistress, no common passenger to whom he could mention it?

I know that the boatmen on the Lake Como have been corrupted in many instances by the fondness of the passengers for gossip, and who, finding they got paid for their stories, have got into the way of entertaining them with tales, which have no foundation whatever in truth. Is it, I say, credible, that knowing what he had sworn to, that this man would have whispered to no one the strange sights which he had seen? How many are there of your Lordships, who, unaccustomed to the habits of official life; who, not being under those restraints imposed upon the lips, the tongue, and the minds of those connected with the courts of Law; how many are there of your Lordships, such as I have described, who, having seen these things, would not have mentioned them to some friend or acquaintance? He believed there were few gentlemen, who, having witnessed such scenes not being in any

way bound in silence—would not have spoken of them to some one. Yet here were these low persons, so different in their conduct from the upper ranks of society, so much more discreet, so much more on their guard, and living with persons of such purity that the mention of such facts would at once have crimsoned their cheeks with the glow of offended delicacy, that in no one case did they pretend to have revealed what they have sworn themselves to have witnessed, to any living being. Is this probable—is it that which can be credited? The Princess is described to have been seen kissing Bergami on the Lake of Como as often as the wind blew on it. She was seen riding in a carriage in a situation which cannot be mentioned without a blush. The facts witnessed were so striking, so unheard of, so frightful, so portentous—that if really seen, it was impossible for the beholder to remain silent a single day. But days, weeks, and months passed away, and nothing was said on the subject till the parties were called to the Milan Commission. It was then, for the first time, that the lips of those persons were unsealed. I do not believe that they concealed for days or hours what they had sworn to. I believe that they only concealed from the ears of their neighbours what they have now stated, from the time when, learning that others had been largely paid for their better slanders, they determined on imitating their conduct; from the time when it first crossed their imaginations to act this part, till they had passed over to Milan, and obtained the reward of perjury. My Lords, you will see that in this instance there is no variation in the conduct of the witnesses at all, but in other instances, there are other variations of importance. Do you recollect—but can any one ever forget, the waiter from Trieste, who appeared at your Lordships' bar? Does he not rise before you at this instant? Does not his aspect recal him to the memory of many of your Lordships who have forgotten his name? Do you remember those eyes, that nose, that lecherous mouth with which the wretch stood here to repeat the falsehoods to which he had previously sworn at Milan? Do you remember that pander from Trieste? Do you remember that lechery—lechery which seemed that of an inhabitant of the infernal regions? Do you remember the glowing mouth with which he told his falsehoods? But I can contradict him. He at least will not go unpunished. I can contradict by other witnesses the facts to which he has sworn. I can contradict, and I can bring to punishment other witnesses, but he shall not escape. I will shew you by undoubted, unquestionable, unimpeachable evidence—by evidence above all suspicion, that he has sworn falsely. I can prove by the room itself, and by the position of the door, that he is not to be believed. I will do more; I will prove from what he himself has stated, that his evidence cannot be true. I will shew that the Queen was at Trieste but one night in all her life. She went to the Opera, as he has stated, and that is the only instance in which this witness spoke truth, and the next day, I will prove, that she went away, and never afterwards crossed the threshold of the gate of Trieste. Of the filthy cargo brought over on this occasion, I think the samples which I have brought before your Lordships is pretty well enough. I know not whether this Iachimo be the legitimate descendant of the Iachimo of Shakespeare; but in mind your Lordships can hardly doubt that he is own brother to this and other witnesses who have belied the Lady Princess of this fair Isle, and they may say—

— "mine Italian brain

"Can in your duller Britain, to operate  
Most vilely; for my 'vantage, excellent;  
And, to be brief, my practice so prevailed,  
That I returned with similar proof enough  
To make the noble Leonatus mad,  
By wounding his belief in her renown  
With tokens thus, and thus; averring notes  
Of chamber hanging, pictures, this her bracelet,  
(O, cunning, how I got it!)"

I should not sufficiently discharge my duty if I did not now call your attention to the several heads or charges contained in the strange indictment brought before your Lordships in the form of a bill of Pains and Penalties. Your Lordships will recollect that the first scene is on Neapolitan ground. At Naples, the parties are described as first coming together, and there the adulterous intercourse is alleged to have taken place in the course of ten days or at the utmost a fortnight after they first met. Your Lordships will see that from the statement of these witnesses, it appears that the Princess of Wales acted the part described, having heretofore been a person of unimpeachable character and life—having been proved to be so by much stronger evidence than could have been adduced in her behalf, had she never been suspected. That her character was unblemished is proved, if there is any truth in evidence—if there is any benefit in acquittal—if there is justice in the world—it stood higher, than if she had never been accused, as she had two solemn acquittals after two solemn inquiries into her conduct. So much on those occasions had been proved in her favour, that when one set of Ministers had found her guiltless of the charges preferred against her, and recommended that she should be merely censured for some acts which were called levities, their successors in office not satisfied with this, had recommended that the censure for levities should be discharged, and that her King and father should receive her in his affections as the purest Princess that had ever adorned the walks of life.

This character, so supported, so vindicated—coming out of the trial purer than if it had never been called in question, as it seemed to the Ministers of that day, who were among those that now favoured the present charges, her Majesty, in so short a time had been represented to have thrown away, and to have demeaned herself in a manner that would have disgraced the most profligate of her sex. It seems that she hired a menial servant, and of him I shall have a few words to say hereafter. She then moved towards Naples, and in a few days—in less than a month—all restraint was laid aside, and the mistress of the servant was represented to have made herself the mistress of a menial lover. The whole of the case must fall to the ground if your Lordships should not believe that the alleged intimacy between them had commenced on the second night after the arrival of the Queen at Naples, as this necessarily results from what has been sworn to by the witnesses Majocchi and Dumont. It appears that little caution was thought necessary. But I would now call your attention to the bed in which the Queen and her lover are described to have slept, and prepared for their reception. One small iron bedstead, of dimensions hardly sufficient for one person on a voyage, is represented to have been placed in the bed-room of Bergami, and on this bed it should seem the parties had slept, though a larger

and more comfortable bed was in the chamber of her Royal Highness, and in every chamber of the house. The learned Gentleman then proceeded to comment on the inconsistencies which appeared in the evidence of the witness Dumont, as given at different times. Billy Austin, who had been stated to have been excluded from the room of her Royal Highness on the night referred to, he could prove had slept in another apartment for some time before, in a room adjoining that of her Royal Highness, to which he could have access at all hours. Yet this witness, with all her scold about her at the time my Friend was examining her, would not speak so positively to the bed being tumbled; but she swore positively to its bearing the appearance of two persons having slept in it. Is not that then more abundant than my Learned Friend could have wished? My Lords, another scene she would have you believe, took place at Naples: to which, however, she will not venture to apply a time. She was aware of the danger that would accrue, had she done so. She would not run the risk of being sited and exposed on that point. She would not run the risk of contradiction, because she well knew if she fixed it earlier or later in the week, so long as she did not specify a time, contradicted she certainly would be. Some night, however, during her Royal Highness's stay at Naples, she saw Bergami come out of his room naked, excepted to his shirt, without even stockings—without even a night gown, moving towards that part of the corridor into which the chamber of the Queen opened. She did not start back; she did not reticet; but moved on in a direction towards Bergami. And Bergami did not start back; he did not retire: but, seeing her, and without making any excuse, he continued his course towards the Queen's room. She continued going towards him, and then made her escape. He perceived she saw him, you are to believe; and still he makes no excuse, but moved on to the accomplishment of his dirty purpose, with a greater degree of alacrity, and a greater steadiness of step than a husband would adopt in going to the bed-chamber of his own wife.

But there was a most singular omission on the part of the Attorney-General. There were two maids slept in the next room. Both it seems heard the child cry, and must have heard any conversation that passed. Why not call these persons?—Why not ask whether they communicated any thing that had passed. Because they could not, it was all false. Next was Madame Dumont's testimony—what was her story? He prayed their Lordships to attend to this. Bergami, it seems, slept on the opposite side of the court, while well, but on being seized with a violent fever, he is brought from his usual apartments, and put in a room near the Princess. Is it not extraordinary, that the period selected for this operation was, while Bergami was ill, instead of being in perfect health; but this he said, was in perfect conformity with the whole of the conduct pursued by the Queen. For it would seem from the story that they tell, that all her efforts were directed to destroy her life, property, character, and honour. There was another witness, and he wished to know why they did not call her—he meant the sister of Dumont. She was then witness. They were on their defence. For this he said was a prosecution, and he thought that the Bill of Pains and Penalties ought to have stronger, or at least as strong proofs in support of it, as the removing of a life or a limb. The Queen was in a most peculiar and perplexing situation. But it must be the fate of her who was pursued by the Grimms, the Omptedas, the Ravens, and the Douglasses of her own country. Such is her unhappy fate, that she cannot tell, even at the present hour, whom she dare to trust. At this very hour she may be harbouring another viper in her bosom; for she has in her service at this moment, the sister of the witness Dumont. To that they would probably answer, "Then, why not call her sister?" He could, if he would reply to that argument of his learned friends, in the words of an ancient author, "That no ramparts or fortifications were so good a security against the wicked, as that mistrust which nature had generally implanted in us all." But such mistrust was hateful to an innocent woman; to the victim even of the Grimms, the Omptedas, the Sacchis, and the Dumonts.

He had no doubt that all who heard him would believe that he was not bound to call witnesses; and if he and his Learned Friends, who with him were of Counsel for her Majesty, had been called upon by their Illustrious Client to give an opinion on this subject, he should have felt no difficulty in deciding against the calling of witnesses; and he would not raise a suspicion in that breast which up to the present moment, from the commencement of the evidence to the end of it, had put suspicion at defiance. He should have felt no difficulty in leaving the case as it stood on the evidence against his Illustrious Client, but her Majesty who had seen no reason to part with a faithful servant altho' she was the sister of an ingrate, her Majesty had desired that sister to be examined. The sister of Dumont would be produced to their Lordships, and they would then have an opportunity of pronouncing upon the degree of credit which could be given to the sister first examined. He now came to the evidence of Secchi, which stood unsupported. And here he must observe, a remark which he had heard made in another place, contrary as it was to the usual penetration and discrimination of the individual who was the author of it. It was said if this were a plot, and the witnesses were all perjured, why should they have stopped short in their stories? Why should they not have gone those lengths that would convince all mankind? But the principal point of precaution in laying a plot was to avoid swearing too hard. Why at Naples, had they not called other witnesses? For the very reason that they most carefully avoid calling two persons to speak to the same thing, for fear that in cross-examination the story made up between them might be exploded. On one occasion her Majesty was described as being hissed out of the Theatre. This must have been known to more than one person. It could not be concealed. The concealment of a masquerade, like the fabrication of their case, could not withstand the light of the next morning. Why was no second witness brought to speak to the state of the beds—the state of the linen? What became of Ann—! He (Mr B.) could tell them—she was here! Why was she not called? He could answer that too, she was not an Italian.

If they believed the witnesses, the case of adultery was as clearly made out as ever was any one that procured a verdict in Westminster Hall. But if they did give a verdict on the testimony of such witnesses, they would be worse than the Jacobins of Paris, for Murdering Marie Antoinette. If a witness were proved to perjure himself in any, the most trifling particular, the grave parts of his story were