

FOREIGN NEWS.

PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS, Monday, July 10.

The Earl of Liverpool called the attention of their Lordships to the bill framed on the report of the secret committee. The Queen's Counsel had applied that their Lordships should proceed forthwith with the inquiry. This call he thought their Lordships were bound to answer, as far as it was practicable for them to do; but he was convinced that their Lordships could not exercise their duty, if they proceeded in this measure without having the advantage of at least a portion of the Judges. Consistently, therefore, with the call made for immediate proceeding, he had inquired, and found that on the 17th of August their Lordships might have the attendance of four Judges; and he should, therefore, move, that the bill should be read a second time on the 17th of August.—Earl Grey observed, that, if there was any delay, it would be much better that it should take place before the proceedings commenced than during their progress. He thought that the attendance of the Judges might be obtained now; and, in that case, it would be better to go on than to begin at the 17th of August, with the probability of suspending the proceedings after that period. Certainly, a copy of the charges, and a list of the witnesses against her, ought to be communicated to her Majesty.—Lord Liverpool said, that he thought that the charges were already sufficiently known; and, as to the communication of the names of the witnesses, he was satisfied that no claim whatever could in justice be made to such a communication.—Lord Holland cited the standing order regulating proceeding of inquiry, declaring it to be imperative on their Lordships to grant her Majesty the substance of the charges against her. Every circumstance had proved this proceeding a very singular one. Surely there could be no reason why the names of the witnesses should not be disclosed to the accused party. Either a statement of the precise evidence should be allowed; or, if that were refused, a list of the witnesses should be forthcoming.—Lord Liverpool said that it would be better if the Noble Lord would make a distinct motion on the subject.—Lord Erskine thought a list of the witnesses ought to be laid before her Majesty; and that list ought to be given before any further step was taken.—Lord Liverpool then proceeded to follow up the motions he had already made with the following:

- "That the House should be called over on Thursday, the 17th of August, at ten of the clock in the morning."
" That the call be enforced by the authority of their Lordships."
" That no Peer shall be absent on that day, nor on any subsequent one, during the proceedings, without leave from their Lordships."
" That no Peer shall vote by proxy."
" That the Lord Chancellor do write letters to their Lordships, that their attendance is required in the manner above stated."

All these motions were successively agreed to. Lord Erskine afterwards moved to take the question for affording a list of the witnesses to Her Majesty into consideration on Friday, which was agreed to.

From Bell's Weekly Messenger, July 10. Bill of Divorce and Pains and Penalties against the Queen.

In another part of our paper will be found a literal copy of the Bill of Divorce, now pending before Parliament, for degrading and divorcing her Majesty the Queen, for an adulterous connection with one of her own servants. It is our purpose to offer a few observations upon this proceeding, and its present stage. In the first place, as this was the only possible mode of bringing the matter to trial, and as both the ministers and the friends of the Queen are bound to bring it to issue, we think it but candid to acknowledge, that we do not see any cause of blame to the ministry in adopting this course. It is much to be regretted that party and opposition feelings should interpose even in questions of this kind. The plain point is,—the King accuses; the Queen denies. From the technical forms of the law there is no mode of trial open but by a Bill of Divorce. Both King and Queen, therefore, must necessarily resort to this bill of divorce. Let any plain man suggest any possible objection to this measure. We confess we see none; for the bill is essentially a Bill of Divorce; though in its form, but not in its substance, it wears partially the air of a Bill of Pains and Penalties. But the criterion is this, that it admits of all the forms of trial usual in bills of divorce, and which, in practice at least, are not usual in bills of pains and penalties. Now if her Majesty will have a fair trial,—a trial at least as fair as it is possible to have under the forms of the law, what cause has she, as far as respects this head, of any complaint?—On the other hand, we will think that the examination by a select committee, and such committee so large, was justly objectionable; as tending to prejudice to considerable a portion of her future judges. A committee, perhaps, was necessary,—but why so numerous? and why not selected from men who are now retired from active duty in the House of Lords? All purposes of a committee might then have been answered, and all inconveniences

It is equally true, we think, that there are three parties in the present proceeding. The King, the Queen, and the State. So far as respects the King personally, we do not hesitate to say (because we regard it as a high moral question) that we should at once reject the proposed measure, unless his Majesty came under the same circumstances with others who seek relief in the same imputed misfortune,—in other words, unless his Majesty's conjugal conduct was as irreproachable as we wish to presume it. But when we take the interest of the State into the consideration,—when we consider the importance of example in high station, and the countenance which immorality gains by the example of an audacious contempt of it in personages of high rank, when we recollect what the morals of France were rendered by the two successive Courts of the Regent of Orleans and Louis XV, and when we add to these convictions the comparative state of morals in England and the Continent,—under all these considerations, we say, we recognize a clear and distinct public interest in prosecuting the present affair to its just conclusion,—and we would grant that to the State, which we would require further grounds before we would concede to the King. We are not amongst those who hold the King acquitted from the duty and conscience of observing the laws of the country; his person is certainly exempted from all responsibility, but he remains bound in duty and by virtue of his royal office and character, though placed above all penalties. But as the ground of the present proceeding is the interest of the State, and as this interest is sufficiently distinct and intelligible, we see no impediment in law to the present proceeding; and as a sufficient ground is thus laid for the measure, we see no occasion for travelling into matter wholly extraneous to the merits of the question as between the Queen and the country. We shall deprecate, therefore, as most indecent and disloyal, any personal attack upon the Sovereign, as foreign to the legitimate defence of her Majesty.

In all these observations we of course presume that her Majesty is innocent, and will establish her innocence, and we are satisfied that, as respects the main charge, she will acquit herself. We understand that she is possessed of conclusive evidence in answer to the alleged adulterous connection. We sincerely hope that the current report is not erroneous in this respect. It may be remembered by some of our readers, that about twenty years since, or perhaps somewhat more, the Chevalier d'Eon (at that time a kind of Envoy from France) was accused before a Police Magistrate of a criminal assault with an improper design on a female, and was put under bail for trial; upon the arrival of which trial, his Counsel suffered all the evidence to proceed, and when finally called upon for the defence, stated, that they had but one answer,—that the Chevalier was a woman! We trust that, that the answer of the Queen will be as conclusive, and by the present tone, both of her Majesty & her advocates, we almost anticipate that it will be so. We shall be happy to be enabled to add, in our next paper, Solvuntur risa tabulæ; her Majesty certainly presses on the inquiry as if with a certain conviction of the result, and her adversaries appear equally confident.

So much we think in candid to state,—that we shall give very little credit to a dozen, or even a score of such witnesses, as we know Italians, Sardians, Venetians, &c. to be unless the evidence rest upon something beyond their testimony,—unless, in other words, it be confirmed either extrinsically, or by its own coherence, as circumstantial evidence. Such is the present state of morals on the Continent, and such the little estimation of an oath, that no English Court of justice can give much weight to such witnesses.

CADIZ, JULY 15.—On the 12th when the happy news arrived, that our idolized Monarch had renewed his oath to the Constitution, the whole city was filled with joy—the squares and streets were thronged, the regular troops and militia united, and vast processions moved through the streets singing patriotic hymns, and shouting "Long live our Constitutional King!" "Long live the Constitution!" "Long live the People!" An immense procession moved with an effigy of his Majesty mounted on a triumphal Car, supported by officers of the Militia. The royal mantle was supported by two beautiful children, crowned with flowers. Above the effigy was a statue representing Spain, holding the Constitution, in one hand and a sceptre in the other. A band of Music led, with innumerable wax lights. The procession was escorted by gentlemen on horseback elegantly dressed in ancient Spanish costume.—The rear was brought up by a large detachment of militia.

All the edifices were most splendidly illuminated at night, and the whole population vied with each other in offering a spectacle to express their love for the best of Monarchs, and their enthusiasm for the Constitution, worthy of a free and illustrious People.

Te Deum was celebrated at the Cathedral, and a banquet was given to the Militia; after which the immortal Riego was conducted in triumph to his quarters by the people.

Letter from the American Consul in Cadiz, dated Cadiz, July the 15th 1820.

This town has been for the last six days a theatre of gaiety and rejoicing. On the 9th inst. an express arrived from Madrid, in 48 hours, stating that the Cortes of the Spanish nation had their first session on the 6th, that they had appointed Mr. Etpigo, one of the most enlightened and liberal

Deputies of the former Cortes, President. General Quiroga had been appointed Vice President, immediately after the nomination of the four Secretaries, a committee was appointed, of 44 members to inform the King, that the Cortes were actually and legally constituted. A letter was written to the Secretary of State, in order that he might ascertain when it would be agreeable to his Majesty to receive the committee from the Cortes, and the King answered, that he was willing to receive the same without loss of time—the committee called on his Majesty, who received them most graciously; and who fixed the 9th inst. at 10 o'clock, A. M. to appear before the Congress and make the solemn oath to the Constitution.

On the 12th at day-break, another express arrived from Madrid in 60 hours, which brought the Gazette with the official account of his Majesty's appearance in the Cortes, and his oath to the Constitution on the morning of the 9th before all the Princes of the blood the Diplomatic body, the Ministers of State, the Council of State, the Supreme Court of Justice, in fact all the authorities of the Town, an immense number of officers of the army and navy, and about 2,000 spectators, which is more than the galleries could conveniently hold. His Majesty read a speech in which he attributed all the evils which had happened for the last five years in Spain to the bad counsellors who surrounded him: that Providence had at last condescended to open his eyes and that he trusted that the Cortes would assist him in promoting the general welfare. His Majesty appeared to be full of satisfaction spoke with energy and without embarrassment. The President of the Cortes made a very sensible reply to the King, to which his Majesty answered that he thanked the Cortes for their expression of their feelings towards him, and that he flattered himself that a new era was about to reign in Spain from that moment. His Majesty then retired amidst the acclamations of the people, the tears of all the spectators.

There are various reports in the Paris papers respecting Ali Pacha: one rumor itates, that he had been assassinated, whilst, according to another story, he had found the means of raising an army of 120,000 men, with which he intended to carry the war into the interior of the Turkish Empire. According to other accounts, by the way of Venice, Ali had no more than from 18 to 20,000 men, on whom he could depend, and with these he had to meet his determined enemy the Pacla of Scutari, who had 25,000. It is, however, added, that should he succeed in defeating the latter, he may set at defiance all the troops sent against him from Constantinople.

Vienna, June 27.

The Austrian Observer says, according to direct accounts from Turkey, Ali Pacha's situation is by no means favorable; and persons who are well acquainted with it, are convinced, that far from being able to undertake offensive operations against the Porte, he will find no little difficulty to defend himself against the forces drawn together against him.

He appears, indeed quite disposed to submit, and the only question relates to the conditions upon which he shall be restored to favour!

From the London Courier of July 14. MEMOIRS OF THE QUEEN.

"With anecdotes of Bartolomeo Pergami, her Majesty's late Chamberlain." This very title is observable; her Majesty's late chamberlain. Is Pergami then dismissed from the Queen's service? and if so, why? If his office about her person was innocent and honorable, why is he dismissed at this moment?—Why has she not brought with her one single member of her Italian household?

"The undisguised manner in which the name of Bartolomeo Pergami is connected with that of her Majesty in the bill of pains or penalties, or rather the divorce bill, which has been introduced in the house of lords, renders every anecdote respecting that individual of peculiar interest.

"Our readers will probably recollect, that in The Observer of the 22d of May, we published a sketch of her Majesty's life, embracing all the circumstances of her first introduction into this country—the troubles into which she was subsequently precipitated through the perfidy and falsehood of supposed friends—the happy issue of the painful ordeal through which she passed, and her final departure in disgust from England in 1814. We now purpose to enter a little more at large into the occurrences which immediately preceded her Majesty's embarkation for the continent, and to follow them up by a sketch of the events of her life, during the five years she was absent from our shores.

"After the clear and universal recognition of her Majesty's innocence of the crimes alleged against her, both publicly and privately, in 1813, her Majesty was relieved from all those restraints under which she had been placed by the circulation of reports founded in the basest malignancy."

This is not quite true—the acquittal of her R. H. was only as we recollect, as to being the mother of William Austin; but there was no clear or universal recognition of the purity of her morals or conduct; on the contrary, the committee of the Privy Council aimed very strongly upon the impropriety of her conduct, and the late king, in a paternal letter, admonished her to a change of that conduct.

"She was restored to the confidence of the people, and, in proportion to the extent of her acknowledged injuries, their affection seemed to increase. Still, however, her Majesty had to encounter all the mortifying consequences of court influence—she was debarred from that elevated society which belonged to her rank, and, what was still more painful to her feelings, she was deprived of the consolation which she had been wont to derive from all her other wrongs, by frequent intercourse with her daughter."

The writer ought to have added, that the restraint upon her intercourse with her daughter, was imposed by the advice of the Privy Council, after an examination into the Queen's conduct, which they found was such as to render it, for the young Princess's sake, necessary that their intercourse should be under control and restraint.

"It was in this state of things that she determined by travel to divert her mind from the indignities to which she was hourly exposed; and on the 25th of July, 1814, she wrote a letter to Lord Liverpool, the contents of which she desired might be laid before the Prince Regent."

Here are proofs in abundance that the Queen herself speaks—or that the writer affects to be in her intimate confidence—Who else could tell the secret motives of her determination? Who else could tell her communications with Lord Liverpool? Who else could give copies of her letters? Who else could say what she was at the same time doing with Mr. Whitbread? All these little traits are important—they affix a degree of authenticity to this paper, which, as we shall see hereafter, gives out of her own mouth, or that of her advocate, ample reason to believe that the Queen is not innocent of what is laid to her charge.

"In this letter she stated, that 'accuated by the most urgent motive, that of restoring tranquillity to the Prince Regent, as well as to secure the peace of mind of which she had been for so many years deprived, she had, after the most mature reflection, determined to return to the continent.'" After particularising some of her just grounds of complaint, her Majesty declared her intention to quit England for a season, and to embark at Worthing; she added, that she would ever be ardently solicitous for the prosperity and glory of this generous nation.

We beg our readers to observe the fulsome jargon with which the writer endeavours to captivate vulgar popularity, and to identify the Queen with a people for whom, individually, as we shall see, she does not seem to care a fig.—This is the same tone which the Queen herself has used in her public answers.

"Her Majesty also communicated her intention to Mr. Whitbread, who, in his answer, stated that he had not been at all surprised at the resolution with which her Majesty had been pleased to acquaint him, and concluded by reiterating his sentiments of devotion and zeal for her re-establishment in all the rights of the empire over which she was one day to reign."

"The answer of Lord Liverpool announced the communication of her Majesty's letter to the Prince Regent, and His Royal Highness's acquiescence in her views, and assuring her that his Royal Highness would never throw any obstacle in the way of her present or future intentions as to the place where she might wish to reside."

"On the 9th of August, 1814, her Majesty embarked to Worthing, on board the Jason frigate, to return by way of Hamburg, to Brunswick. Lady Charlotte Lindsay, and Lady Elizabeth Forbes, were her maids of honor. Mr. St. Leger was her Chamberlain; Mr. Wm. Gell and Mr. Craven, were also her chamberlains; her equerry was Capt. Hess; her physician, Dr. Holland; her major domo, Mr. Sicard (still holding that situation); her messenger, Mr. Hieronimus, a German (still in her Majesty's service.)"

Let us here observe, that of the nine persons here mentioned, the only two who are still in her service, are foreigners. No wonder she and her partisans should object to the evidence of foreigners—it is objecting to evidence altogether; she had none others about her, and notwithstanding she affected regard for the English nation, she had not one English person in her family or society, or not more than one.

"To these were added a few domestics, which constituted the whole of her Majesty's suit. Mr. St. Leger, from ill health, did not accompany her Majesty farther than Brunswick. Lady Charlotte Lindsay repaired to the Spa to join her sister Lady Glenberrie; but rejoined her Majesty at Naples. Lady Elizabeth Forbes returned to England to see her sister. Mr. Craven went to Germany on family affairs and in order to meet his mother the Margravine of Anspach. Mr. Gell was attacked with the gout, and was obliged to resign his situation. Captain Hess joined his regiment, in consequence of the renewal of the war, and, in fine, from a variety of different causes, her Majesty was forsaken by the different English persons who composed her Court."

We shall say nothing of the cause assigned for the departure of all these ladies and gentlemen. We have had very different and very praiseworthy reasons assigned for their conduct. One thing we may say, that nearly all these excuses were either temporary, or might have been foreseen before the parties left England, and that therefore either they were not the true

if they were, then that the separation was intended from the beginning, and persons were chosen for form's sake, whom the Queen knew could not go on with her. Mr. Gell's gout, and Mr. St. Leger's illness do not fall under the latter of these classes; but when the gout of the former got better, as we are glad to believe it did very soon, why did he never rejoin her? and why was not Mr. St. Leger's place supplied at Brunswick, the Queen's native place, the chief residence of her family and her friends?

"She sought by every means in her power to replace them by others of the same country; but under different pretences she was unable to obtain any, save Lieut. Hannam, R. N. who became her private secretary."

This is an extraordinary admission. This Queen, so popular, so beloved, so innocent, could not find one man, one woman, and only one child out of "this generous nation," who would submit to live with her. Under "different pretences," she was rejected of every Briton-born, except Lieut. Hannam, of the royal navy, and Wm. Austin, who, though not mentioned in this defence, we know still accompanied her. What were these pretences? Upon that the defence is silent. People in general are fond enough of accepting honorable office, about the persons of princes and sovereigns—why had the whole British world an invincible disgust to accompany the princess of Wales? The incautious use of this word "pretences," explains a little of this matter. The writer knows, and by this word confesses, that the real motives of those refusals were such as the parties could not respectfully or decently avow, and they were therefore obliged to substitute pretences; a false excuse, when the true motive is unavowable. The writer, therefore, knows that these excuses were false; but does she or he not also know what the true motive was? But we have heard, and believe, that all these causes were not pretences, and that some English persons declined the princess's invitations plainly and honestly, alleging as their reason, that they would not submit to the society of Pergami.

"In this situation, she was of course obliged to form an Italian suite, among whom she found those who endeared themselves to her by their fidelity and attachment."

This goes on rather too fast, both in argument and in feeling; the head and the heart seem both too quick. Why should the extraordinary unanimity of the English nation (unanimous for the first time since the creation) in refusing to enter the princess's service, force her to form an Italian suite? She is not an Italian; she had no connexions nor friends in Italy; she never had been there in her life before; she is a German; her father and mother were, and her nephew is, sovereign of a German state. Why could she not have formed a German suite? The Germans are, generally speaking, a particularly moral, decorous, and trust-worthy people; and, next to Britons, would have been certainly the fittest persons to have composed the princess's suite. The argument of necessity is, therefore, not only not worth much, but it is false, and drives us to form surmises why English Irish, Scotch, Germans, Dutch, Danes, Prussians, &c. &c. were rejected, and her suite composed wholly and exclusively of Italians?

Now, as to the feeling. Is not the word "endeared," rather a strong expression? Observe, the whole suite did not become "endeared," but only some of them. We presume the names which follow are those of the persons so endeared. This endearment, if advisedly used, and with relation to such persons, speaks volumes! but as it is only a casual expression, we shall not dwell upon it.

"The Countess of Oldi, of Cremona, a lady respectable for her qualities and misfortunes, became her lady of honour."

We know too much of foreign titles to be the dupes of the nobility of the Countess Oldi. The Count Oldi may be just as respectable as Ferdinand Count Fathom, or Bartolomeo Pergami, for ought we know; but it appears by a subsequent passage in this defence, that the Countess Oldi is Bartolomeo Pergami's sister, and that this Bartolomeo Pergami entered the Queen's service in a menial station!!! And now we have an explanation of the strange incognito name under which the Princess of Wales astonished Africa, Asia, and Europe—the Countess Angela Oldi! It is well known that princes travelling incognito assume inferior titles; but they are generally their own, or those of the family. Here then we have the daughter of the Duke of Brunswick, the wife of the sovereign of England, borrowing a name from the sister of her living servant, and adopting herself, if we may use the expression, into the family of Pergami. That her personal vanity might have fixed on the very inappropriate name of Angela, is ludicrous and pardonable enough; but that she should have chosen a surname which tended to represent her as the sister of her menial servant, is an indecency and degradation of which we had no conception, till we read this defence. Suppose it were proved in an ordinary criminal trial that a lady had turned her footman into her constant and most intimate companion, and that she passed abroad under the name of that footman's sister, what would a jury say?

"Respectable for her qualities and misfortunes." This seems to imply that this Countess had, through her misfortunes, fallen into a low rank in life, and this cant of "respectable for her misfortunes," is an attempt to slur over the gross indecorum of raising the servant's sister from a mean situation to be lady of honour to a sovereign. If this woman had really been and defended to a respectable