Eastern Shore REPUBLICAN STAR OR General Advertiser.

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, Printer of the LAWS of the UNITED STATES.

[VOL. 9.....12.] TUESDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 25, 1810. [No. 17.....579.]

TERMS OF THE STAR—Are *Two Dollars* and *Fifty Cents* per annum, payable half yearly in advance: No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

ADVERTISEMENTS—Are inserted three weeks for *One Dollar*, and continued weekly, for *Twenty five Cents* per square.

PUBLIC SALE.

BY order of the orphan's court of Talbot county, will be sold on the 27th inst. at the late dwelling of *James Berry*, dec'd. his personal estate, consisting of horses, cattle, sheep and hogs; corn, wheat straw, and corn fodder; all the farming utensils—also, some household and kitchen furniture, on a credit of nine months on all sums over six dollars, the purchaser giving note with approved security, with interest from the day of sale—Sale to commence at ten o'clock, attendance given by

SARAH BERRY, adm'rx of James Berry, dec'd.

Talbot county, 12th mo. 18, 1810——2q

NOTICE.

Will be sold at public vendue, at the late dwelling of Mrs Mary Dawson, *dec'd. on Friday the 28th inst.*

ALL the personal estate of the said deceased, consisting of household and kitchen furniture, plantation utensils, horses, hogs, two head of cattle, a quantity of corn, corn tops, blades, hay, straw, &c. and the crop of wheat now seeded on the farm, supposed to be thirty-seven and three quarter bushels—also, a negro woman and her child, and two or three negro girls from ten to fifteen years of age—the whole of the above property will be sold on a credit of nine months for all sums over six dollars, the purchaser giving bond with approved security, with interest from the day of sale—and for all sums of or under six dollars, the cash must be paid. The sale to commence at ten o'clock, and attendance given by

JOHN HARWOOD, ex'or of Mary Dawson, dec'd.

Easton, December 18, 1810——2

ALL persons indebted to the estate of Mrs. Mary Dawson, deceased, are requested to make immediate payment, and all those who have claims against the said estate, are requested to bring them forward, properly authenticated, to

JOHN HARWOOD, ex'or of Mary Dawson, dec'd

December 18, 1810——3

PUBLIC SALE.

WILL be sold at public vendue, on *Friday*, the 28th inst at my farm in Tuckahoe, formerly the property of Mr. John Turner, some household and kitchen furniture, consisting of beds and furniture, farming utensils, cattle, two yoke of oxen, a quantity of corn and corn blades, and a number of other articles—six months credit will be given on all sums above six dollars, with note and good security.

All those who are indebted to the estate of *William B. Harrison*, late of Talbot county, deceased, are requested to make immediate payment; and those that have claims against the said estate, are once more requested to bring in their accounts, properly attested, to the subscriber.

JAMES NABB, adm'r of Wm. B. Harrison, late of Talbot county, deceased December 18, 1810——2

PUBLIC SALE.

BY order of the orphan's court of Talbot county, will be sold at public vendue, on 6th day the 28th inst. all the household and kitchen furniture of the late doctor *John Coats*, deceased, consisting of beds and bedding, a mahogany desk and book case, mahogany tables, chairs, &c.—also, a considerable collection of books, a silver watch, and many other articles. A credit of six months will be given on all sums over six dollars, (for that sum, and under, the cash will be required) the purchasers giving notes with approved security, with interest from the day of sale.

ROBT MOORE, ex'or of Doctor John Coats, dec'd.

Easton, 12th mo. 18, 1810——2

N. B. The sale to commence at ten o'clock, at his late dwelling.

HAT MANUFACTORY.

SHERWOOD AND JEFFERIS,

RESPECTFULLY inform their friends and the public, that they have commenced the above business in the house formerly occupied by Mr. *John Jefferis*, where they have on hand and intend keeping, a general assortment of fashionable and plain gentlemen and ladies' HATS, of the best quality, which they offer for sale at the most reduced prices for cash. From the knowledge they have of the business, added to their personal attention, they confidently hope to give general satisfaction to all who may favor them with their custom.

They also keep for sale, a general assortment of Hatter's Trimmings, and give the highest price in cash for all kind of furr

Easton, December 18, 1810——m

BOARDING.

SIX BOYS will be accommodated with *Boarding and Lodging* by the year, on good terms, (convenient to the Academy) by application to

MARY TRIPPE.

Easton, December 18, 1810——3

DOCUMENTS,

Accompanying the Presidents message,

(CONTINUED.)

Department of State, May 22, 1810.

Sir—Your despatch of the 27th of March, by the British packet, was received on the 17th of this month.

The President has read, with surprise and regret, the answer of Lord Wellesley to your letter of the 2d Jan. and also his reply to your note requiring explanations with respect to the blockade of France. The one indicates an apparent indifference as to the character of the diplomatic intercourse between the two countries, and the other evinces an inflexible determination to persevere in their system of blockade.

The provision made for the diplomatic agency, which is to succeed that of Mr. Jackson, manifests a dissatisfaction as the step necessarily taken here with regard to that minister, and at the same time a diminution of the respect heretofore attached to the diplomatic relations between the two countries. However persevering the President may be in the conciliatory disposition which has constantly governed him, he cannot be inattentive to such an apparent departure from it on the other side, nor to the duty imposed on him by the rules of equality and reciprocity applicable in such cases. It will be very agreeable to him to find that the provision in question is intended merely to afford time for a satisfactory choice of a plenipotentiary successor to Mr. Jackson, and that the mode of carrying it into effect may be equally unexceptionable. But whilst from the language of the marquis Wellesley with respect to the designation of a charge d'affaires, and from the silence as to any other successor to the recalled minister, it is left to be inferred that the former alone is in contemplation, it becomes proper to ascertain what are the real views of the British government on the occasion, and, should they be such as they are inferred to be, to meet them by a correspondent change in the diplomatic establishment of the United States at London. The President relies on your discretion for obtaining the requisite knowledge of this subject, in a manner that will do justice to the friendly policy which the United States wish to be reciprocal in every instance between the two nations. But in the event of its appearing that the substitution of a charge d'affaires for a minister plenipotentiary is to be of a continuance not required or explained by the occasion, and consequently justifying the inference drawn from the letter of Lord Wellesly, the respect which the United States owe to themselves will require that you return to the United States, according to the permission hereby given by the President, leaving charged with the business of the legation such person as you may deem most fit for the trust. With this view a commission, as required by a statute of the last session, is herewith enclosed, with a blank for a secretary of legation. But this step you will not consider yourself as instructed to take, in case you should have commenced, with a prospect of a satisfactory result, the negociation authorised by my letter of the 20th January.

In a letter of the 4th of this month, I transmitted to you a copy of the act of Congress at their last session concerning the commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain and France. You will herewith receive another copy of the same act. In the fourth section of this statute you will perceive a new modification of the policy of the United States and you will let it be understood by the British government, that this provision will be duly carried into effect on the part of the United States.

A satisfactory adjustment of the affair of the Chesapeake is very desirable. The views of the President upon this delicate subject, you may collect not only from the instructions heretofore given to you, but from the sentiments that had been manifested on the part of this government in the discussion with Mr. Rose, and from the terms and conditions contained in the arrangement made with Mr. Erskine. And conformably with these views, thus to be collected, you will consider yourself hereby instructed to negociate and conclude an arrangement with the British government in relation to the attack on the frigate Chesapeake.

I have the honor to be, &c.

R. SMITH.

Mr. Smith to Mr. Pinkney.

Department of State, July 2, 1810.

SIR,

Your several letters of the 8th and 9th of April and 2nd and 3d of May have been received.

Whilst it was not known, on the one hand, how far the French government would adhere to the apparent import of the condition, as first communicated, on which the Berlin decree would be revoked, and, on the other hand, what explanations would be given by the British government with respect to its blockades prior to that decree, the course deemed proper to be taken was that pointed out in my letter to you of the 11th of November, and in that to gen. Armstrong of the 1st of December. The precise and formal declaration since made by the French government, that the condition was limited to the blockades of France, or ports of France, of a date prior to the Berlin decree, and the acknowledgement of the British government of the existence of such blockades, particularly that of May, 1806, with a failure to revoke it, or even to admit the constructive extinguishment of it, held in your letter to the Marquis Wellesley, give to the subject a new aspect and a decided character.

As the British government had constantly alledged that the Berlin Decree was the original aggression on our neutral commerce; that her orders in council were but a retaliation on that decree, and had, moreover, on that ground, asserted an obligation on the U. States to take effectual measures against the decree, as a preliminary to a repeal of the orders, nothing could be more reasonable than to expect, that the condition, in the shape last presented, would be readily accepted.—The president is therefore equally disappointed and dissatisfied at the abortiveness of your correspondence with lord Wellesley on this important subject. He entirely approves the determination you took to resume it with a view to the special and immediate obligation lying on the British government to cancel the illegal blockades; and you are instructed in case the answer to your letter of the 30th of April, should not be satisfactory, to represent to the British government, in terms temperate but explicit, that the U. States consider themselves authorised by strict and unquestionable right, as well as supported by the principles heretofore applied by Great Britain to the case, in claiming and expecting a revocation of the illegal blockades of France, of a date prior to that of the Berlin decree, as preparatory to a further demand of the revocation of that decree.

It ought not to be presumed that the British government, in reply to such a representation, will contend that a blockade like that of May, 1806, from the Elbe to Brest, a coast of not less than one thousand miles, proclaimed four years since, without having been at any time attempted to be duly executed by the application of a naval force, is a blockade conformable to the law of nations, and consistent with the neutral rights. Such a pretext is completely barred, not only by the unanimous authorities, both of writers and treaties on this point, not excepting even British treaties; but by the rule of blockade communicated by that government to this, in the year 1804, in which it is laid down that orders had been given not to consider any blockade of those Islands (Martinique and Guadaloupe) as existing, unless in respect to particular ports which may be actually invested; and then not to capture vessels bound to such ports unless they shall have previously been warned, not to enter them, & that they (the lords of the admiralty) had also sent the necessary directions on the subject to the judges of the vice admiralty court in the West Indies and America.

In this communication it is expressly stated that the rule to the British courts & cruizers was furnished in consequence of the representations made by the government of the U. States against blockades not unlike that now in question, and with the expression of redressing the grievance complained of. Nor ought it to be presumed that the British government will formally resort to the plea that her naval force, although unapplied, is adequate to the enforcement of the blockade of May, 1806, and that this forms a legal distinction between that and the Berlin decree of Nov. following. Where it admitted that an adequate force existed, and was applicable to such a purpose, the absurdities of confounding the power to do a thing with the actually doing of it speaks for itself. In the present case the absurdity is peculiarly striking. A port blockaded by sea without a ship near it being a contradiction in terms, as well as a perversion of law and of common sense.

From the language of lord Wellesley's two letters, it is possible he may endeavor to evade the measure required, by subtle comments on the posture given to the blockade of May, 1806, by the succeeding orders of 1807. But even here he is met by the case of the blockade of Copenhagen and the other ports of Zealand in the year 1808—at a time when these, with all Danish ports, were embraced by these very orders of 1807—a proof that however the orders and blockades may be regarded as in some respects the same, they are regarded in others as having a distinct operation, and may consequently co-exist, without being absolutely merged in, or superseded, the one by the other.

In the difficulties which the British government must feel in finding a gloss for the extravagant principle of her paper blockades, it may perhaps wish to infer an acquiescence, on the part of this government, from the silence under which they have, in some instances, passed. Should a disposition to draw such an inference shew itself, you will be able to meet it by an appeal not only to the successful remonstrance in the letter to Mr.* Thornton, above cited, but to the answer given to Mr. Merry of June, 1806, as the notification of a blockade in the year 1806, as a precise and authentic record of the light in which such blockades and the notification of them were viewed by the United States.—Copies of the answer have been heretofore forwarded, and another is now enclosed, as an additional precaution against miscarriage.

Whatever may be the answer to the representation and requisition which you are instructed to make, you will transmit it without delay to this department. Should it be of a satisfactory nature, you will hasten to forward it also to the diplomatic functionary of the United States at Paris, who will be instructed to make a proper use of it, for obtaining a repeal of the French decree of Berlin, and to proceed, concurrently with you, in bringing about successive removals by the two governments of all their predatory edicts. I avail myself of this occasion to state to you, that it is deemed of great importance, that our ministers at foreign courts, and especially at Paris and London, should be kept, the one by the other, informed of the state of our affairs at each.

I have the honor to be, &c.

(Signed) R. SMITH.

William Pinkney, Esq. &c. &c. &c.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

* The following is the letter to Mr. Thornton.

Mr. Madison to Mr. Thornton, charge des affairs of his Britannic Majesty.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

SIR, *October* 27, 1803.

The letters of which copies are enclosed, were received last evening.—One of them is from the British consul general at New York; the other, a copy enclosed therein, of a letter to him from commodore Hood, commander in chief of his Britannic majesty's ships of war on a West India station.——The letter bears date to the 26th of July last, and requests that the American government and agents of neutral nations might be acquainted, that the islands of Martinique and Guadaloupe are and have been blockaded from the 16th of June, preceding, by detachments from the squadron under his command; in order that there may be no plea for attempting to enter the ports of these islands.

It will, without doubt, occur to you, sir, that such a communication would have been more properly made thro' another channel, than directly from the consulate at New York. The importance and urgency of the subject however superceded the consideration of forms, and I lose no time in communicating to you the observations which the President deems it to require.

It will not escape your attention, that commodore Hood's letter is dated no less than three months before it could have the effect of a notification, and that besides this remarkable delay, the alledged blockade is compelled from a date more than one month prior to that of the letter itself. But, these circumstances, however important it may be, do not constitute the main objection to the proceedings of the British commander. His letter instead of stating that a particular port or ports were blockaded, by a force actually before them, declares, generally, two entire and considerable islands to be in a state of blockade. It can never be admitted that the trade of a neutral nation in articles not contraband, can be legally obstructed to any place, not actually blockaded, or that any notification or proclamation can be of force, unless accompanied with an actual blockade. The law of nations is perhaps more clear on no other point than that of a siege or blockade, such as will justify a belligerent nation in restraining the trade of neutrals. Every term used, defining the case, imports the presence and position of a force, rendering access to the prohibited place manifestly difficult and dangerous.—Every jurist of reputation, who treats with precision this branch of the law of nations, refers to an actual and particular blockade. Not a single treaty can be found which undertakes to define a blockade, in which the definition does not exclude a general or nominal blockade, by limiting to the case of a sufficient force so disposed as to amount to an actual and particular blockade.—To a number of such treaties G. Britain is a party. Not to multiply references on the subject, I confine myself to the 4th article of the convention of June 1801, between Great Britain and Russia, which having been entered into for the avowed purpose "*of settling an invariable determination of their principles upon the rights of neutrality*," must necessarily be considered as a solemn recognition of an existing and general principle and right, not as a stipulation of any new principle or right, limited to the parties themselves. The article is in the words following. "That in order to determine what characterises a blockaded port, that denomination is given only to a port where there is, by the positions of the power which attacks it with ships stationary or sufficiently near, an evident danger of entering." It cannot be necessary to dwell on the inconsistency of the kind of blockade declared by commodore Hood, with the principle laid down concerning the rights of neutrality; or on the consequences of the principle on which a blockade of whole islands by a few ships is founded, to the commerce and interests of neutral nations. If the islands of Martinque and Guadaloupe, the latter not less than 240, and former nearly 150 miles in circumference, and each containing a variety of ports, can be blockaded by detachments from a commodore's squadron, it is evident that a very inconsiderable portion of the British fleet may blockade all the maritime countries with which she is at war. In a word, such a principle completely sacrifices the rights of neutral commerce to the pleasure or the policy of the parties at war. But it deserves to be particularly remarked, that a power to proclaim general blockades, or any blockade not formed by the real presence of sufficient force, to be exercised by officers at a distance from the control of their government, and deeply interested in enlarging the field of captures which they are to share, offers a temptation that must often aggravate the evils incident to the principle itself. You will infer, sir, from these observations the serious light in which the President regards the proceeding, which is the subject of them; and will perceive the grounds on which the injuries accruing from it to our commerce, will constitute just claims of indemnification from the British government. To diminish the extent of these injuries as much as possible, and to guard the good understanding and friendly relations of every sort, which are so desirable to both nations against the tendency of such measures,-will, I venture to assure myself, be sufficient motives with you to employ the interpositions with Commodore Hood, which you may think best adapted to the nature of the case.

I have the honor, &c. &c.

(Signed) JAMES MADISON.

Edward Thornton, Esq. &c. &c. &c.

Unexampled Receipt.—At the New York theatre, on Wednesday last, the representation of *Shylock*, in the Merchant of Venice, by *Cooke*, was calculated to make the manager "rich as a Jew." The receipt of the house, we understand, amounted to 2,-122 dollars. *N. Y. Columbian.*