ships bound from Britain, was eleven hundred and thirty eight—tons, one hundred and seventy five thousand five hundred and fifty six.

In 1801, the foreign ships bound to Britain, were five thousand four hundred and ninety seven—tons, seven hundred and eighty thousand, one hundred and fifty five. The number of foreign ships bound from Britain, was five thousand six hundred and twenty six—tons, eight hundred and four thousand eight hundred and eighty.

Notwithstanding the exclusion to and from Holland, France and Spain, the foreign ships, ministering as carriers for Britain, in a period of war, much more than doubled the foreign ships which ministered to our commerce, private and public wealth, in the most favorable periods of peace, before the departure from the rigor of the navigation system. The tonnage, it may be observed by the accurate examiner of these documents, was, in the latter of these two periods, much greater, in proportion to the number of ships, than in the former; so that the actual exports and imports, so *carried for the service of Britain,* were much greater than in proportion to the number of the carrying ships. Our own ships and tonnage, as we have seen, were also greater; therefore, we were commercial gainers by all this increase of foreign trade, whilst our own carriers were fully occupied. We were political gainers by the increase of revenue from this increase of our trade; and in the command of such numbers of our own sailors to defend our country.

From all these arguments and documents, it appears that our trade was extended considerably, very considerably, under the departure from the navigation system: but the extent to which it has been increased, will be still more manifest from documents referring to the actual commodities, and their proceeds at the custom house in the two periods above mentioned, of which the following is an abstract.

An account of the value of the trade of Great Britain, in the three years immediately preceding the late war, and in the last three years of war; with the amount of the duties collected on Imports and exports during the same periods.

IMPORTS IN 1790.

	Value.	Duty.
France	495 800	107 800
Holland	714 700	61 600
Spain	729 200	191 500
United States	1,192,000	825 600
British West Indies	3 854 200	1,290,100
Conq Colonies in do.		
Foreign West Indies	19 800	400
Other Parts	12,116 000	2 417 000
Total	19,130,800	4,400,000

DITTO IN 1791.

France	546,000	134 300
Holland	853 900	78 900
Spain	724 500	202 000
United States	1 194 200	318 600
British West Indies	3,651,600	1,461,300
Conq Colonies in do.		
Foreign West Indies	23 800	600
Other Parts	12,675 700	2,417,800
Total	19,669 700	4,613 500

DITTO IN 1792.

France	717 600	117,300
Holland	807,500	88,400
Spain	897,800	206 400
United States	1,038 700	307,000
British West Indies	4 128,000	1,613 400
Conq Colonies in do.		
Foreign West Indies	67,300	1 400
Other Parts	12 007 900	2,637 600
Total	19 659 300	5,021 500

DITTO IN 1799.

France	29,900	13 400
Holland	600,500	20 700
Spain	4 6,700	114 300
United States	1 818 500	870 300
British West Indies	5,154 500	2,190,200
Conq Colonies in do.	1,592,200	490 800
Foreign West Indies	602 600	2,800
Other Parts	17,045,400	4,194,600
Total	26 837 400	7,397 300

DITTO IN 1800.

France	110,400	39,000
Holland	972 600	62 000
Spain	635 600	122 000
United States	2 357,900	428 300
British West Indies	5 639 400	2,263 100
Conq Colonies in do.	2,724 300	417 600
Foreign West Indies	310,100	6 500
Other Parts	17,800 300	3 368 600
Total	30 570,600	6,708,800

DITTO IN 1801.

France	221 500	63 800
Holland	1,025 900	90,900
Spain	519 800	117 300
United States	2,706,500	382,900
British West Indies	6 453 100	2 942,600
Conq colonies in do.	4 309 000	839 500
Foreign West Indies	95 200	600
Other Parts	17 414 500	3 291 400
Total	32,796 500	7 732,000

EXPORTS IN 1790.

	Value.	Duty.
France	630,300	18 800
Holland	1,413,200	47 800
Spain	640,000	1 100
United States	3,431 600	3,400
British West Indies	1,877,100	2,500
Conq. colonies in do.	0	0
Foreign West Indies	2 200	0
Other Parts	13 639 500	98,800
Total	21,643,900	172,400

DITTO IN 1791.

France	1 131 300	18,000
Holland	1,365 800	49,000
Spain	654 900	2 600
United States	4,225 300	5 100
British West Indies,	2,530,000	3 100
Conq. colonies in do.	0	0
Foreign West Indies,	800	0
Other parts	12 823 800	88,100
Total,	22,731,900	166,200

DITTO IN 1792.

France	1 228,000	12 800
Holland	1 516 400	46 900
Spain	794,000	1,900
United States	4 271 300	4,200
British West Indies	2,784,200	3,300
Conq. colonies in do.	0	0
Foreign West Indies	22 000	0
Other parts	14 289 200	92 900
Total,	24,905,100	162,000

DITTO IN 1799.

	Value.	Duty.
France	8 900	0
Holland	17 600	0
Spain	0	0
United States	7 036 500	7,700
British West Indies	4 536 800	4 700
Conq. colonies in do.	1,757,700	800
Foreign West Indies,	160,400	0
Other parts	22,453 400	129 200
Total	35 991 300	144 400

DITTO IN 1800.

France	1,325,300	2 900
Holland	3,208 500	1 200
Spain	3,200	
United States	6,825,400	9 600
British West Indies,	2,956,400	3 700
Conq Colonies in do.	1,657,600	600
Foreign West Indies	20,100	
Other parts	27,695,500	150,000
Total	43,151,900	169000

DITTO IN 1801.

France	1 390 700	5,800
Holland	3 496 700	3 000
Spain	507 300	1,100
United States	7 517 400	11,000
British West Indies	3 212 630	4 900
Conq Colonies in do.	1,410,000	1,200
Foreign West Indies	12 600	
Other parts	24 754,300	134 800
Total	42,301,600	161,800

NOTE—The value of Imports and Exports as stated in this account, is not the *actual* value, but an *official* value fixed about a century ago; and ever since retained retained in the custom house books, for the purpose of shewing the comparative state of our trade. The *actual* value of the articles exported and imported is, of course greater by all the rise in price which has since taken place.

It is to be observed, that the great increase of imports in 1800 from France, and other hostile countries, beyond the imports of the preceding year, 1799, must have arisen from the increased employment of neutral bottoms. This increase is easily accounted for. In the year 1799 the acts dispensing with a part of the navigation system, were not arrived at full operation. In the year 1800, they were arrived at full operation, which operation was, that Britain was enabled, through these carriers, to possess a considerable part of the trade of the enemy from which by her navigation laws, she would have been entirely excluded. The exports also rose in a still greater proportion in general, and to hostile countries in particular. The value of exports in 1800, were about forty three millions, with a proportionate duty; of which, four millions and a half, and a proportionate duty, were to France, Holland and Spain.

(To be continued.)

NEW Store.

BY WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

The subscriber informs the public that he has commenced business in the house formerly occupied by MR. QUINN, F. street; And has on hand, a general assortment dry goods, Groceries, wines and spirituous liquors.

Porter,
Hardware and Cutlery,
Queensware, China and Glass,
Flour, Corn, and Corn-meal,
Oats, and Chopped rye,
Candles and Soap by the box,
Country whiskey by the barrel, and few casks of genuine old Irish whiskey

All of which he will sell low for cash or country produce.

The HIGHEST prices, given for country produce, CASH.

FRANCIS CLARK.

Aug. 29—wtf.

ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 11.

SPANISH WAR.

(Concluded.)

Mr. FOX. "After what has been said so well, so fully, and so ably, by my hon. friend (Mr. Grey) near me, and several other friends of mine, on the present question, I do not feel, Sir, that I can be expected to offer many arguments or reasonings of mine to induce the house to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend as cordially as I shall; yet if the details of argument and fact have been gone much into by my predecessors in this debate, some things have occurred, some principles have been avowed, in the course of it. to which I can by no means yield my assent, of which, indeed, I do most heartily and earnestly disapprove.—The right hon. gentleman who has just sat down, who has supported administration on this question, has, in fact, either renounced or disclaimed, or which am I to understand, that they have renounced, or that he has disclaimed, the doctrines in question? That learned gentleman has told us, that he does not acquiesce in the doctrine of keeping war in our pockets, to be taken out, and recourse had to its scourge, whenever convenience or an unprincipled policy might seem to recommend. This doctrine, I am glad, Sir, to find, that learned gentleman most ready to renounce or disclaim. But Sir, the monstrous principles announced last night by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Pitt) have called on me for observation and animadversion. Were ever doctrines more monstrous—more objectionable? I confess to you, Sir, they are such as I think will excite universal abhorrence and detestation. I remember a story in an ancient tragedy, in which a deceitful man is represented as praying to Jupiter for two voices, one for truth, and the other for deceit. The Supreme Governor of the World has made no such distinction. But, however, there was something like it; for if there are not two different voices for a deceitful man, there are two different languages to make use of; and if the dictionaries of those were to be found, the remarkable difference of the idiom might be seen, as for instance, "passing over in silence," means "not to acquiesce;" and to wave going to war," signifies to preserve ground for war whenever you choose to make it without notice." The hon. and learned gentleman who preceded me in this discussion has avoided laying any stress on what was so much dwelt upon in an earlier part of the debate, the difference between our engagement to suspend hostilities and a neutrality; language which I cannot help considering as the language of fraud; but when I saw it and read it at length in the letter of Lord Hawkesbury, I felt it to be a monstrous doctrine. The hon. and learned gentleman prefers taking a new footing. He divides the cause of the war into two parts. The remote cause, was the treaty of St. Ildefonso; the proximate cause was, first, the armaments carrying forward in the ports of Spain; secondly, the insufficiency, unsatisfactoriness of the answers given by the Spanish government to Mr. Frere. I think, Sir, with my friend, that an offensive and defensive treaty between our enemy and any other power, is a sufficient ground of war against that power; and I think that such a treaty as that of St. Ildefonso. I do not, however, exactly agree with all the hon. and learned gentleman has said respecting its being so much worse than that celebrated treaty called the family compact." Mr. Fox next adverted to the tardy and fluctuating measures pursued from the commencement of the negociation to the rupture, and argued that nothing like candid explanations had been offered on the part of ministers to the court of Madrid. It was usual, in speaking of the conduct of opposition at any one time, to attribute the same principles to the existing opposition. What the sentiments of the opposition to which the learned gentleman had alluded had been, he could not fully call to mind; but this he trusted, that when the present opposition should be no more, and the conduct of future oppositions might be animadverted upon, it would be said that they did not resemble the virtuous opposition of 1805. (The hon. gentleman here adverted particularly to the circumstances of that period to justify the opinion he then held.) He contended, that the influence which France had then over Spain, was only an influence of its government over the government of Spain, to induce it to do what it desired, but quite different from the influence which France at present possesses over Spain, for directing the whole of its power and resources to the promotion of its own objects. As to what had been observed with respect to Portugal, he would ask, whether it was not justifiable to connive at the subsidy extorted from that power. The smaller powers either attach themselves to the greater, or were obliged to do so, and where there was no evidence of the *malus animus,* their weakness should not be made the ground of resentment. Are any of those states so very anxious, at the call of France, to let

"Their little bark attendant sail
"Pursue the triumph, & partake the gale?"

He remembered when the young Arch Duke Charles of Austria was signalising his military talents in Germany, that many ministerial advocates in this country claimed a share in his triumphs, in virtue of two millions of money that had been sent out of the country without the consent of Parliament (*a loud laugh.*) When Spain commuted its contingent for a pecuniary subsidy, it was natural to suppose they would make that as light as possible, and it could not place them in a different situation from that in which they had stood by the treaty of St. Ildefonso. As to the quantum of the subsidy, he agreed with the learned member, that that was very little to the purpose. If the treaty of St. Ildefonso was a ground of war, he asked, whether the change of the stipulated contingent of that treaty altered that ground? Undoubtedly not. But he did not think it possible to wave the right of urging the right for a more convenient time. Mr. Frere, it appeared, had not been instructed to declare war, and yet he had done so. As to the use of the term convention appearing in the notes, which had been represented by the right hon. gentleman opposite, as a confusion of a supposed agreement between Spain and this country, with the convention of the 19th of October with France, he supposed the mistake might have arisen from the incorrect translation of the original note. As so much stress had been laid on this agreement, in the turn which the debates had taken, since the opening, in which it had been industriously placed in the back ground, he would put it to the learned member, whether, if considered with reference to the two notes of Mr. Frere, it could be taken in the comprehensive sense in which he had regarded it? The learned gentleman and another learned gentleman last night had talked of a conditional declaration of war.—There were many cases in which he could conceive the propriety of such a declaration, as at the end of a truce, or at a certain future period, in the event of a stated condition not being complied with previously, or under more complicated circumstances, such as if, for instance, a fleet were not to be removed within a certain time from one given port to another. In all these cases the declaration would be explicit and clear; but he contended that such a declaration ought not to be made in the case of negociations, which might lead to an amicable adjustment of the matter in dispute and that the declaration in the instance under discussion was far from being clear or explicit. The hon. gentleman further contended, that whoever fairly considered the situation of Spain, the difficulties and calamities of every sort with which she had a struggle, and afterwards seriously believed that she labored to equip armaments under such circumstances to annoy this country, such a person could not be exceeded in credulity by the simplest of dupes. Could sending three ships from the bason into the mole, and these three ships only half manned, be seriously looked upon as an indication of such hostile armament and intention? Nor was it so absurd as argued on the other side to send troops in such ships. If so, it was an absurdity of which we ourselves have frequently been guilty. As to the information received from Admiral Cochrane, he was sure that ministers did not believe the whole of it. What he asserted about Carthagena and Cadiz, most certainly they did believe. As to the subsidy granted in lieu of the contingent in troops, and the convention with France, the tendency of which was esteemed to be so noxious, why, if it was understood to be of that unfavorable nature to G. Britain, was no official inquiry made into it till October last!—It appears indeed that Mr. Frere had some conversation about this convention, but not a trace of such a conversation is to be found in the letters upon the table.—It consequently is not known whether any interview took place between him and the Spanish minister upon the subject; or whether any written demand was sent in respecting it. Soon after Mr. Frere's recall was determined upon, because his conduct was disagreeable to the Spanish court—and by whom was he replaced? By his brother, and the brother his Secretary, who consequently was privy to all his disputes with the Spanish ministry. Could any appointment be more absurd, especially while a gentleman was appointed as Ambassador to that Court in every respect qualified for the situation, and who might be ready to set out on the notice of a few days. But it was urgent to make the new demand respecting the convention. Mr. Frere was ordered to make it, and if an immediate answer was not given, his instructions were to quit Madrid immediately. But did not Mr. Frere know the subject at least of the convention? It certainly appears that he did, and even more than the substance, for he roundly asserts there is no article in it respecting Portugal but one. It is said the detention of the Spanish frigates was merely a measure of precaution, and not an act of war. Is the detention of merchantmen in our ports to be considered in the same light as the seizure of frigates in the open seas? Would it be thought so if the British flag was treated in the same manner? What is taken may be restored, but honor tarnished cannot be repaired. Can you restore the lives of so many persons, whose lot it did not seem to be to encounter such perils, who have been sacrificed to this measure of of precaution?—Surely all this proves the excellence of the old practice of a declaration of war. If such attacks are to be styled cautionary measures, all war is a measure of precaution. The war of the succession was such a measure—the seizure of the frigates could not be looked upon as merely a measure of precaution—it was a direct measure of war, and he defied all the learning and ingenuity opposite him, to prove the contrary. But it has been pretty generally objected, that those who hold such language, tend to asperse the character of the country. But if such conduct is not to be canvassed, for what purpose does this house meet? Is not the house now assembled to deliver an opinion on it? Does not the whole of the constitution depend upon the consequence and credit attached to the opinion of the two houses of Parliament? Are they to delude the people; or to rescue them from delusion? Are they to speak their own mind, or only such sentiments as may be acceptable to government? Before you convince the people of your sincerity, you must first prove you are sincere. For his part he could not afford a better proof of his sincere conviction, that ministers had acted rashly and unjustly in their conduct towards Spain, than by giving his cordial support to the amendment of his hon. friend.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* rose to reply at near half after four in the morning. From the lateness of the hour, he said, and from the impression which the speech of his right hon. and learned friend (the master of the Rolls) had made upon the house, he did not think it necessary that he should trouble the house much at length upon the question now submitted to the decision of the House. There was one point, however, on which his case appeared principally to rest, namely, that our forbearance from commencing hostilities after a just cause of war had arisen, was highly honorable to the feelings of his majesty's ministers, and the manly character of the nation; and that the repeated warnings which we had given to the Spanish government, displayed the most candid, fair and generous conduct towards their people. The other arguments which had been principally directed against the manner in which the negociation had been conducted, and the war commenced, he combated in succession with the utmost perspicuity and ability. He concluded with declaring that he waited with confidence the judgment of the house and of the country upon the subject.

Mr. Fox said a few words in explanation as to some parts of his speech, which had not been correctly quoted.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that he was fully satisfied with the explanation, and wished the argument there to rest between them. The house then divided,

For the original question	313
For the amendment	106
	207

Adjourned at 6 o'clock.

FOR SALE,

At the Navy Yard, nearly opposite Mr. Dobbins's Tavern, a two story BRICK HOUSE, at present occupied by Mr. Thomas Mattingly, Baker, for terms apply to the subscriber.

SAMUEL RUSS.

May 3—3t

Thirty Dollars Reward.

STRAYED or stolen from the commons of this city, on the night of the 24th ult. the well known grey MARE, late the property of captain WILEY, of Fairfax county Virginia. She is about 7 years old, near 15 hands high, low in flesh, gailed by the saddle, has a brand on the near shoulder; also a token which can be given in testimony, of which the thief or reward contriver may not be apprised. The subscriber will pay reasonable charges and 5 dollars, for the restoration of said mare; and (if stolen) 25 more on conviction of the thief.

SOLOMON MYER.

Washington, May 3—3t
Ind. U. S. 29th year.

NOTICE.

THIS is to give notice that the subscriber has obtained from the Orphans Court of Prince George's county in Maryland, letters of administration on the personal estate of Hyram Drane late of said county deceased; all persons having claims against the said deceased are hereby warned to exhibit them to the subscriber properly authenticated on or before the twentieth day of September next, they may otherwise by law be excluded from all benefit of said estate.

RICHARD W. BRASHERS, Adm'r

April 1—3w