

London, Feb. 26.
The following is the protest in the House of Lords, against the Bill suspending the Habeas Corpus.
"Seeing that it does not appear to us from the report of the Secret Committee, that a state of imminent and pressing danger has been sufficiently established; so great as that the powers of the executive government, under the existing laws, are inadequate to meet it, and such as to require the suspension of rights most important to the safety and liberty of the country.—We protest.
Signed, Augustus Frederick. (Duke of Sussex.) Bedford, Albemarle, Foley, Tunbridge, Alvenley, Monfort, Essex, Lauderdale, Grey, Wellesley, Thonet, Grosvenor, Auchland, St. John, Say and Seale, Rosayn, Holland.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Feb. 25.
A message was received from the House of Lords, transmitting to this House, the Bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus.
Lord Castlereagh moved for a first reading. (Loud cries of no, no, no.)
Lord Castlereagh said, it was desirable that the second reading should take place to-morrow, but if the House prefer it, I consent that the two readings take place on the day following. So determined.
Sir Francis Burdett, presented a petition, carried on the same day, from a meeting of the inhabitants of Westminster, against the suspension of the Habeas Corpus.

Feb. 27.
A petition to the same effect has been passed by the Common Council of the city of London.

Feb. 26.
Lord Castlereagh asked for the first reading of the bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus.

Mr. Bennet.—I am surprised that the Noble Lord asks, as for a very common business, and without a single remark, for the reading of a Bill, whose object it is to deprive the people not only of the trial by jury, but of all trial.—If he had proved that the safety of the Constitution depended on this measure, I would be the first to approve it. But what proof is found in the report of the Secret Committee? A single witness has been examined, (the Lord Advocate of Scotland) and has required that the paper which he has produced to the Committee should not be made public. They complain of seditious libels in the report; but, where is the Attorney General? Where are the laws? Why not prosecute the Authors? They speak in it of a conspiracy to surprise the Soldiers, to seize the Tower, to cut down the Bridges. Who are the Conspirators? Six men mounted in a chariot, carrying in a stocking their munitions of war. They set forth a manufactory of pikes; and a person has offered to prove that these pretended pikes were intended to form a railing round a garden. They speak of funds which are at the disposal of the Traitors; and they find a sum of ten pounds; and it is after allegations, so contemptible that they propose such a bill! If a similar power was demanded in favour of people who had never soiled their hands with the blood of their fellow-citizens, I would never consent to grant it to them; but it is asked for those who have already acted criminally in making use of the same power.

Lord Castlereagh.—I beg the honourable member to name the minister of his majesty, whom he accuses of having acted criminally, & to justify this accusation.
Mr. Bennet.—The noble Lord would have comprehended me, if he had suffered me to finish my remark. My accusation respects those members of the administration, who were in office at the time when the same powers were confided to them, and the proof that they acted criminally, lies in their having accepted an act of indemnity.

Lord Castlereagh.—I ask permission to observe to the honourable member, that I have never acted criminally, that I have never dipped my hands in the blood of my countrymen, and that if he asserts that, he asserts what is absolutely false.
Lord Milton.—The hon. member (Mr. Bennet) has not asserted that the noble lord has dipped his hands in the blood of his countrymen; but that he had acted criminally in the eyes of the law, and that he had obtained a bill of indemnity, to place himself out of the reach of the consequences of this crime. These two propositions are very distinct.

Lord Castlereagh.—I have understood that there was imputed to me, a kind of criminality, on account of which I might have been prosecuted, if it had not been for an act of indemnity. I say, that if such a criminality is imputed to me, it is a falsehood; and if it is said, that as a member of the secret committee I have acted otherwise, than as was authorised by the circumstances, it is equally a falsehood.

Mr. York.—If the hon. member (Mr. Bennet) persists in accusing the noble lord of criminality, the house ought to oblige him to name a day, not far off, to support his accusation, and to establish it if he can; if he simply intended to say, that the noble lord had acted so illegally as to make an act of indemnity necessary, this allegation, might have been passed by, as having escaped him in the heat of debate.

The Speaker.—I conceive that the point of order depends on this question: Did the hon. member intend to accuse the government of his majesty, collectively, of criminal acts, or a member of this house individually? The two accusations are—1st, That one or more persons have dipped their hands in the blood of their countrymen; and 2d, That they have abused powers which were confided to them. Now, according to the idea which I have of the rules of this house, the imputation of an act of criminality to the government in general, is not an infraction of the rules; but if it is advanced against an individual, it is a direct breach of those rules. The hon. member will declare to the house in which sense he made use of the expressions which are complained of.

Mr. Bennet.—I should be the last man to retract what I had an intention to utter, but I do not hesitate to declare, as a man of honor, that I intended to speak generally. I did not designate any member of this house, but I spoke of the persons who formed part of the administration, under the deplorable reign of which there took place in Ireland; scenes which I shall never cease to deplore. I spoke of those who, during the continuance of a similar act to the one in question, committed illegal acts. I am sorry that I did not use the word *illegal*, instead of that of *criminal*.

Lord C.—This explanation is sufficient. I, however, ask permission to say, although I have the right to complain, personally, of an accusation advanced against the administration in general, if it was accused of cruelty, as a member of this administration, I will contradict this charge as positively as the hon. member has contradicted the report of the Secret Committee.

Mr. Bennet.—I have never heard any cruelties spoken of, but those committed in the court of the palace at Dublin.

Lord C.—Is it just to introduce in a like discussion, that which passed in Ireland at another period.

Mr. Bennet.—My only object is to justify myself in the eyes of the house. I repeat, truly, that I disapprove the proposed bill.

The Lord Advocate of Scotland spoke of some seditious pamphlets spread through that part of Great Britain; of the efforts made there to render the workmen who were without employ the instruments of factious projects; of inflammatory petitions and discourses, prepared in anticipation, which were sent there. He added, that a secret conspiracy was organized at Glasgow; that it held correspondence with England, and that its members were bound by an oath in the following terms:—
"In the presence of God, I voluntarily swear, that I will persevere in my efforts to form a fraternity of affection among all the English worthy of confidence; to obtain for every Englishman, not tainted with crime, or madness, the right of election at the age of 21 years, with a free and equal representation, and annual parliaments; that I will support this system with all my power, by moral or physical force, as the case may require"—(Loud cries of hear! hear!)—"I swear, that neither fears, nor hopes, nor rewards nor punishments, shall induce me to give testimony against any of our members, collectively or individually in relation to any act done or expression pronounced, in this society, or any like it, or out of its bosom by one of its members, under pain of death, to be inflicted upon me by any member of such a society. Thus may God aid me and inspire me with confidence!" (Hear! hear! from both sides of the house.)

Some thousands of individuals, continues the advocate of Scotland, have taken this oath in Glasgow and its environs. The result is that many persons have been arrested—(hear, hear from the opposition)—but it is necessary that all the guilty should be. The conspiracy is not confined to Glasgow, it extends through all Scotland, and the adoption of the present bill, is the only means of preventing the shedding of blood in that country.

Sir Sam. Romilly did not deny that there existed many abuses, but he contended that the existing laws were adequate to their suppression, without lifting their hands against the liberties of their country, and stated the rigorous manner in which the authors of seditious libels had been prosecuted in 1794.

The Solicitor General, on the contrary contended that the existing laws were insufficient. If it was true that the lowest class of the people alone were engaged in this conspiracy, their number ought to prevent them from being considered as objects of contempt. This circumstance served to render it the more dangerous, because more ferocity was to be expected from it.

Sir Francis Burdett, attempted to throw ridicule on the idea of the danger with which England was represented as being menaced. He said that he saw no conspiracy but that of ministers to create a false alarm, to calumniate the innocent, and to prevent the adoption of the only measure which could save the country.—The report of the committee is couched in terms so general that it is impossible to answer its allegations.

Lord Castlereagh having said that the speech of the last speaker was not addressed to the House, but to those who were strangers to it; was interrupted with loud cries of *Order, order*.

Lord Stanley said, that every one ought to be called to order, who would attribute to an hon. member the design of addressing his remarks in the house, to any other persons than those of whom it was composed.

Lord Castlereagh said, that he did not impute to the speaker the design of inflaming the minds of the people; but that his speech was not made to convince the house, but to produce effects elsewhere.

The Speaker.—I think it is in order to consider every discourse pronounced in the house as addressed only to it.

Lord Castlereagh.—I submit to the decision of the Speaker. In an eloquent and animated speech, he proved the existence of danger, and asked, if on the eve of an insurrection in the capital, and in the provinces, the House wished to see the Executive power, compelled to stand with folded arms, without making any efforts to correct it before the explosion should overturn the government, was it proper to wait till blood should flow, or to prevent its effusion? The safety of the state imperiously demands this measure, and without it there exists no means of saving this country from a bloody and terrible catastrophe.

Lord Castlereagh sat down amid numerous and prolonged applause.
Mr. Ponsonby, in admitting the existence of the danger, of which he was convinced as a member of the Secret Committee, contended that the present laws were sufficient to suppress it. As a proof of it, he stated that they had been adequate to arrest the conspirators at Glasgow, as the house had been informed. The distress of the times has produced a discontent, which leads to insurrection, but that is not a sufficient motive to suspend the Habeas Corpus, the grand bulwark of British Liberties. It is a conspiracy of famine stirred up by malevolence.

Lord Cochrane thought that the country ought to demand the dismissal of the present ministers, as the sole means of saving it from degradation.
The votes were at last taken, 273 against, 98 were in favor of the first reading of the bill. The house adjourned at 3 o'clock in the morning.

February 28.
The third reading of the bill to suspend the Habeas Corpus was ordered by a majority of 265 against 103.
Sir Francis Burdett proposed an amendment, that no person should be imprisoned in a damp or unhealthy dungeon; that they should have the benefit of air, fire, and exercise; that they should not be loaded with irons, that they should

have liberty to address petitions to the king and two houses, and to see their wives and children.

Mr. Ponsonby moved that the suspension should only continue to the 1st of May, instead of the 1st of July.

Another member moved, the suppression of the clause which permitted the transfer of a prisoner from one prison to another.

The Attorney General opposed by observing that it might be used to remove a prisoner from those who might hold intelligence with him.—All these amendments were successively rejected and the bill adopted.

London, March 1.

At Glasgow, on the occasion of the arrest of two weavers, father and son, for being engaged in seditious plots, so great a crowd assembled, that the officers did not think it prudent to proceed until the arrival of a squadron of the 42d Regiment; when they set out on their way to prison, they were assailed by a shower of stones. An attempt was made to rescue the prisoners, and the troop was obliged to fire.—One young man was wounded.—Three of the assailants were arrested and conducted to Glasgow.

March 3.

Amongst the amendments proposed to the Habeas Corpus bill, and which the papers stated were rejected, there is one which has been adopted. The bill was on Saturday sent back to the House of Lords for their concurrence to the amendment which is to be debated this day. It relates to Scotland. From the clause of the bill as it originally stood it was necessary, in order for the arrest of any person, by virtue of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, that it be signed by one of his majesty's Ministers, or by six Members of the Privy Council in England; but in Scotland, an order signed by a single magistrate will be sufficient.

The amendment requires that the signatures for an arrest in Scotland be the same as in England.

The Usher of the Black Rod of the House of Lords was despatched to the mansion house to require the attendance of the Lord Mayor and Alderman Goodbehare at the bar of the House of Lords, to explain the nature and object of a Society of which they are members, and which was alluded to in the report of the secret committee to the House. What gave rise to this proceeding was, that the Lord Mayor, at a meeting of the livery of London held on Friday last, observed, that he was convinced there was no conspiracy against the government; that having himself furnished three fourths of the documents submitted to the secret committee, he was surprised that he had not been called upon to attend their meetings; that he could have satisfied the committee that there was no necessity for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; and that as a member of the union club, he had written to the Duke of Sussex, offering to prove at the bar of the house that the charges against the Society of which he was a member were unfounded.

Orders have been sent to Canada to make all possible retrenchment in the military and naval departments in that colony.
The funds yesterday advanced 1 per cent. The ministerial prints state that this was owing to the passing of the Habeas Corpus bill, which had dissipated the fears of government.

March 5.

Yesterday the House of Commons received an extraordinary number of petitions for Parliamentary reform, they contained nearly a million of signatures. The chief part of the petitions were presented by Sir Francis Burdett.
The society for moderate reform (Broughton, &c.) met for the first time at the Free Masons Tavern on Saturday. This meeting declared itself against universal suffrage and annual parliaments. Sir Francis Burdett is one of its members.

A Paris paper of the 2d March states, that an American Frigate remained before Palermo, to attend as was believed to the ratification of the arrangements concluded between the Court of Naples and the United States.

A letter from Cadiz of the 11th February, states, that the expedition of 15,000 men, destined for South America, was ready to sail, with an escort of a ship of the line and several frigates.

Paris, Feb. 26.
Mr. Pinkney, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Court of St. Petersburg, had, on the 12th of Jan., an audience of the Emperor of Russia. His excellency was presented to their Majesties the Emperors.

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

Annapolis, Thursday, May 1.

DIED.
At her residence, Pleasant Place on the North Side of Severn, on the 20th of April, at the advanced age of 66 years, Mrs. ELIZABETH GRAMMER, consort of Mr. Erick Grammer. A lingering and protracted illness had afforded the deceased an opportunity of preparing for the awful event, which she embraced, to obey the summons of her Redeemer Lord Jesus Christ, which it has become the painful duty of a friend to announce, but a few weeks since, her bereaved consort and herself were doomed to mourn the untimely death of a beloved Son.—This additional afflictive dispensation of a righteous Providence, which is now recorded, has fallen upon him with peculiar severity. Among the consolations which he was accustomed to mitigate his recent sorrows, he had hoped that she, who had been through so long a course of years the sharer of his joys, and the partner of his toils, would have been long permitted to soothe his declining years, and cheer the evening of his life. But it has pleased a wise Providence to order it otherwise; and it becomes the afflicted mourner not to "suppose as men without hope," but to submit to his dispensations with lowly humility and resignation to Christian.

From the Albany Daily Advertiser.

WILKINSON'S MEMOIRS.
We have just laid our hands on this work which has so long been talked of. In glancing over the first volume, our attention was attracted by the particular account the general has given of the Battle of Queenston Heights, in which Col. Solomon Van Rensselaer, bore a distinguished part. In the course of the history of the campaign, General Stephen Van Rensselaer speaks in the following terms of Col. S. V. R. "He, (Major General Stephen Van Rensselaer) received orders from General Dearborn, and commenced his march for the frontier, accompanied by Col. Solomon Van Rensselaer, adjutant general of the state of New York, of whom I must be permitted to say a few words. This high minded citizen soldier, and a noble man, made his novelties arms under my orders, as a comrade of dangers, more than twenty years before, and at that tender age was distinguished for his coolness and intrepidity in action. He had then served as a lieutenant-colonel in the revolutionary war, fought and bled for his country in the affair near Fort Ann, against the 9th British regiment of infantry, in 1777; he had transfused his spirit and patriotism into his nephew who in my presence, during the campaign of 1794, fought with valor, and bled with complacency. Rising by regular promotion to a troop, he was particularly distinguished by General Washington, and raised to the command of a squadron; he was among the disbanded officers at the reduction of 1800. On reaching Utica, General Van Rensselaer was called to the movements of the enemy in the quarter, and from thence, after a short halt, he proceeded to Oswego, where Colonel Van Rensselaer projected a handsome enterprise which failed through the want of a few regular troops; an armed vessel of the enemy lay along the wharf adjoining the British magazines at Prescott, on the opposite shore. Colonel Van Rensselaer proposed, with 120 men to take the St. Lawrence four or five miles after night, across the river, down on the Canada shore, taking possession of the buildings and the vessel, boarding her by the water at the same time. The lunters from the militia pursued for the enterprise at evening call; but at midnight they had engaged their minds, and as they believed there existed no competent