think it right that the queen of Scots ſhould yet have the liberty to defend herſelf in perſon. She confeſſed, indeed, that it was reaſonable that Mary ſhould be heard in her own cauſe; but ſhe affirmed, that ſhe was at a loſs at what time ſhe ſhould appear, in what place, and to whom ſhe ſhould addreſs herſelf. While ſhe let fall, however, the hope that Mary might obtain the permiſſion ſo repeatedly and ſo earneſtly requeſted, ſhe expreſſed her reſolution that the earl of Murray ſhould firſt be heard in ſupport of his charge, and that ſhe ſhould attend to the proofs which he affirmed himſelf in readineſs to produce. After this buſineſs ſhould be tranſacted, ſhe told the deputies of Mary that ſhe would again confer with them. It was to no purpoſe that they objected to a procedure ſo ſtrange and ſo im­proper. An accuſation, ſaid they, is given; the perſon accuſed is anxious to defend herſelf; this privilege is denied to her; and yet a demand is to be made for the vouchers of her guilt. What is this but an open violation of juſtice? It did not become them to diſpute her pleaſure in her own dominions: but they would not, they informed her, conſent to a meaſure which was ſo alarming to the intereſts of their queen; and if it was adopted, ſhe might expect that a proteſt againſt its validity would be lodged with her commiſſioners.

The Engliſh commiſſioners reſumed the conference, and were about to demand from the earl of Murray the proofs with which he could ſupport his accuſation. The biſhop of Roſs and his aſſociates being admitted to them, expreſſed themſelves in conformity to the converſation they had held with Elizabeth. They declared, that it was unnatural and prepoſterous in their ſovereign to think of receiving proofs of the guilt of the queen of Scots before ſhe was heard in her own de­fence; and they proteſted, that in the event of this proceeding, the negociation ſhould be diſſolved, and Elizabeth be diſarmed of all power to do any prejudice to her honour, perſon, crown, and eſtate. The com­miſſioners of the Engliſh queen were affected with this proteſtation, and felt more for the honour of their miſtreſs than for their own. They rcfuſed to receive it, becauſe there were engroſſed in it the words of the refuſal which Elizabeth had given to the petition for Mary. They did not chooſe to authenticate the terms of this refuſal by their ſubſcriptions; and were ſolicitous to ſuppreſs ſo palpable a memorial of her iniquity. They alleged, that the language of her refuſal had not been taken down with accuracy; and they preſſed Mary’s deputies to preſent a ſimpler form of proteſta­tion. The biſhop of Roſs and his colleagues yielded not, however, immediately to their inſidious importuni­ty; but, repeating anew their proteſtation as they had at firſt planned it, included the expreſs words of Eliza­beth; and, when compelled by the power of the com­miſſioners to expunge the language of the Engliſh queen, they ſtill infilled upon their proteſtation. An interruption was thus given to the validity of any future proceedings which might affect the reputation of the queen of Scots. The earls of Murray and Morton, with their friends, were very much diſapointed. For they had ſolaced themſelves with the hope of a triumph before there was a victory; and thought of obtaining a decree from Elizabeth, which, while it ſhould pronounce the queen of Scots to be an adultereſs and a murderer, would exalt them into the ſtation and character of virtuous men and honourable ſubjects.

Though the conference ought naturally to have ter­minated upon this proteſtation of the deputies pf Mary againſt the injuſtice of Elizabeth, yet it did not ſatisfy the latter princeſs that the accuſation only had been delivered to her commiſſioners: ſhe was ſeriouſly diſpoſed to operate a judicial production of its vouchers. The charge would thus have a more regular aſpect, and be a ſounder foundation upon which to build, not only the infamy of the Scottiſh queen, but her own juſtiſication for the part ſhe had acted. Her commiſ­ſioners accordingly, after the biſhop of Roſs and his colleagues had retired, diſregarding their proteſtation, called upon the earl of Murray and his aſſociates to make their appearance. The pretence, however, em­ployed for drawing from him his papers was ſufficiently artful, and bears the marks of that ſyſtematic dupli­city which ſo ſhamefully characterizes all the tranſactions of Elizabeth at this period. Sir Nicholas Bacon the lord keeper addreſſed himſelf to the earl of Mur­ray. He ſaid, that, in the opinion of the queen of England, it was a matter ſurpriſing and ſtrange, that he ſhould accuſe his ſovereign of a crime moſt horrible, odious to God and man, againſt law and nature; and which, if proved to be true, would render her infamous in all the kingdoms of the world. But though he had ſo widely forgot his duty, yet had not Elizabeth re­nounced her love of a good ſiſter, a good neighbour, and a good friend; and it was her will, that he and his company ſhould produce the papers by which they ima­gined they were able to maintain their accuſation. The earl of Murray, in his turn, was not wanting in diſſimulation. He expreſſed himſelf to be very ſorry for the high diſpleaſure he had given to Elizabeth by his charge againſt Mary, and for the obſtinacy of the Scottiſh queen and her deputies, which made it neceſſary for him to vindicate himſelf by diſcovering her diſhonour. Under the load of this double and affected ſorrow, he made an actual and formal exhibition of the vouchers by which he pretended to fix and eſtabliſh her criminality. A particular account and examination of theſe vouchers, the reader will find in our life of MAry, and in the works to which we have there referred.

To enumerate all the ſhifts to which Elizabeth and the adverlaries of Mary were put, in order to make the ſtrange evidence that was produced wear ſome degree of plauſibility, would far exceed our bounds. It is ſufficient to fay, that after having weaned themſelves with prevarication and falſehood; after having preſſed Mary to abdicate her crown, a requiſition with which ſhe never would comply; and after having finally refuſed to hear her in her own defence; Elizabeth, on the 10th of January 1569, gave leave to the earl of Murray and his accomplices to depart her dominions telling them, that ſince they came into England, nothing had been objected to them which could hurt their honour as men, or affect their allegiance as ſubjects. At the ſame time ſhe told them, that they had produced no infor­mation or evidence by which ſhe was entitled to con­ceive any bad opinion of the queen of Scots. It was therefore her pleaſure to allow the affairs of Scotland to continue preciſely in the condition in which they were ſituated at the beginning of the conference. Three