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, JANUARY 8, 1811. [No. 19.....581.]

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.

THE SUBSCRIBER

Offers for Sale his Valuable Farm,

LYING in Talbot county, & handsomely situated on Miles River, adjoining the town of St. Michaels. This farm has on it a small dwelling house, a new barn, and other out houses: on the premises are two thriving apple orchards, and other fruit trees in abundance: likewise a large quantity of oyster shells, sufficient to manure the farm. This property contains upwards of 200 acres of land, about one half of which is wood and the other half arable land. This property is so well known that it needs no further description. The terms of sale are, one third of the purchase money to be paid when possession is given, the remaining two thirds are to be paid in two different instalments, one at twelve months, and the other at eighteen months, from the day of sale, the purchaser or purchasers giving bond with approved security, bearing interest from the day of sale.

There will be a reserve made of the Wind Mill, now standing on the farm: also the Wheat in the ground.

Should this property not be sold before *Thursday*, the 31st of January, at Private Sale, it will on that day be offered at *Public Sale*, on the premises. For further particulars apply to the subscriber, living on the premises.

ROBERT R. RICHARDSON.

January 1, 1811.——5

LAND FOR SALE.

Will be sold at public sale, on the first Tuesday of February next,

THAT valuable farm known by the name of Galloway, the seat of the late Henry Nicols, jun. esq containing by estimation six hundred and ninety one acres and one fourth of an acre of land, situated in Talbot county, within two miles of the town of Easton. The above land is laid off into lots of various sizes, with a proportionable quantity of arable meadow and wood land attached to each lot, each kinds of which are of a superior quality and excellence.—The subscriber being anxious to dispose of the above property, to satisfy the claims existing against the estate of the late Mr H. Nicols, jun. will offer it free of all incumbrances.—The terms of sale are, that one third of the purchase money is to be paid down on the day thereof, one third in twelve months after, with interest, and the residue in two years, with interest also from the day of sale till paid. The just and properly liquidated & authenticated paper of Mr Nicols, will upon all those payments be received and discounted—A good and sufficient deed, upon the purchaser complying with the first payment, and giving bond with approved security for the payment of the residue of principle with interest, will immediately be given. This Land will be sold at Mr. Lowe's tavern, in the town of Easton, from a plot made out by the surveyor, designating the several quantities and qualities of land contained in each lot.

William Hayward, jun. my agent, is authorised to attend to the sale, and the premises may be seen by making application to Thomas C Nicols, Easton, or to Thos. Harwood, tenant upon the land.

ELIZABETH NICOLS.

December 18, 1810——m

ADVERTISEMENT.

ALL those who put mares to the Stud Horse FREDERICK kept by me last spring, will please to pay their respective accounts to Mr. John Kennard, as he is the proper person to receive the same

THOS. S. LOVEDAY.

January 1, 1811——3

NOTICE.

ALL persons having claims against the estate of *Thomas Bell*, late of Talbot county, deceased, are hereby noticed to appear in the court house of Talbot county, on *Wednesday*, the third day of July next, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, with their claims legally authenticated, in order to receive their proportionate dividends of the money received, and held in hand—otherwise they may be excluded from all benefit of said dividend by law

ROBERT BELL, Adm'r.

January 1, 1811.——3

IN CHANCERY, Dec. 29, 1810.

ORDERED, That the sale made by Littleton R. Purnell, trustee for the sale of the real estate of Doctor *John Purnell*, be ratified and confirmed, unless cause to the contrary be shewn on or before the 10th day of March, 1811, provided a copy of this order be inserted once in each of three successive weeks in the Star, printed at Easton, before the 10th day of February, 1811. The report states that all that part of the tract of land called Spaldon, Father's Care, No. 1, and Fraternity, sold for $2,212—a house and lot in Snow Hill, for £350—two small lots, being part of a tract called Snow Hill, for £78.

True copy. Test,

NICHS. BREWER, Reg. Cur. Can.

WILLIAM M. MAYNADIER,

Has just received his assortment of

GROCERIES,

And also Russia floor matts, patent and common lamps, spermaceti and common oil, glass and Queen's ware, castings, nails &c. All of which he will sell on the lowest terms for Cash.

Easton, January 1, 1811——3

LIST OF LETTERS

Remaining in the Post Office, Easton, Md January 1, 1811.

WILLIAM BRUFF; capt. Robt. B. Bennett; Rebecca E. Bartlett; Saml B. Beach; J. W. Bordley. C. Thos. Cooper; Dr. Jabez Caldwell; Eliza Colscott; John Council. D Harriot Downes; Rebecca Dixonel; Benj Denny; Sol Dickinson; Henry Dickinson; Sarah Dawson; John P Dormer. E. Miss Mary Emory; rev. T. A. Elliott. F Isaac Fisher; Jno. Ferguson; Miss Ann Fontleroy; Nancy Fountain. G. John Giffin; Nicholas Goldsborough: Jere. Garey. H. Thos. L Haddaway: Francis Hazard; William Hemsley; Philemon Hamilton; Michael W. Hopkins. J. Wm. Jenkins; Robt Jones. K. Ann Kinniss; David Kerr, jun. Cloudsberry Kirby. L. William Lowe; Thos. S. Loveday; Abraham Lower. M. Mary M'Clayland; William Meluy; Rachel Matthews; rev Avery Melvin; Mr. Matthews. N. Edward Needles (3) Bernard Nadel, Clerk of orphan's court. P. Mary Patterson; Marcus B. Parmlee; Sarah Pritchard; E Pamphilion; S Pamphilion; Thos. Parrt; Ths. Prince. R. Patty Rhodes; Nancy Roberts; rev. S Redman; John Redgrave; Isaac Robinson. S. John Singleton (2) Andrew Skinner; Sophus Steples; John R. Sherwood; Elizabeth Spencer; Miss D. Spencer; Jessey Scott (2) Lam W. Spencer; Mary Sail; Eliza Sherwood; John Seney (2) T. Lloyd Tilghman; Miss L. Tilton; Anna Thomas; rev Jas. Thomas. V. Jeremiah Valiant; Wm Valiant. W. Anthony Wheatley; Hugh Work; James Wilson, jun. Ann Wilson (3)

FOR SALE,

A NEGRO WOMAN and her two Children. Apply to the Editor.

Easton, December 25, 1810——m

LAMBERT W. SPENCER,

Has received from New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, his entire assortment of

DRY GOODS:

Together with

HARDWARE & GROCERIES.

Amongst the latter he has received a large quantity of SALT, and a few barrels of Pippin Apples.—All of which he is determined to sell low for Cash or Country Produce.

Easton, Nov. 27, 1810——m

JOHN JOHNSTON,

SADDLER AND HARNESS-MAKER,

Washington Street, Easton:

HAS the pleasure of informing his friends and the public, that he has lately returned from Baltimore with a new assortment, selected by himself, of the most fashionable GOODS, proper for his line of business. He is now ready to receive the orders of all who would favor him with their custom, and pledges himself that the workmanship of his saddles and bridles shall be neater and stronger than those imported.—He has received patterns of the most fashionable saddles, both for Ladies and Gentlemen, now in use in England, and requests his patrons and friends to call on him and view his assortment.

Those who favor him with their custom may depend on having their work executed with neatness and dispatch—and the liberal patronage of a generous public will be duly appreciated and acknowledged by integrity, attention and promptitude. ☞ Leather Trunks for travellers, and hair trunks of the newest patterns, made at the shortest notice

December 25, 1810——m

THOMAS G. ARMSTRONG,

No. 94, MARKET STREET, BALTIMORE

HAS on hand a large and general assortment of ladies' morocco and leather *SHOES*, men's fine and coarse do. children's morocco and leather do.—Also—a general assortment of *COMBS*: Ladies' head combs, of the latest patterns—tortoise and mock shells. Fine teeth Ivory combs, pocket combs, riding combs, horse combs, and rack combs,—Also, an extensive assortment of *CUTLERY*, including almost every article of that description. Cloth, hair, tooth, and comb brushes of all sizes—pocket books, breast pins, snuff boxes, and a variety of other fancy goods too tedious to mention,—which goods he will sell on reasonable terms for cash only.

September 11, 1810.——7p——&m

IN CHANCERY, Dec. 18, 1810.

ORDERED, That the sale made by George Gillaspie, trustee for the sale of the real estate of *Samuel Davis*, deceased, shall be ratified and confirmed, unless cause to the contrary be shewn before the 23d day of January, 1811, provided a copy of this order be inserted three successive weeks, in the Star, at Easton, before the said day. The report states the sale of 241 acres, 1 rod, 15 perches of land, was sold at 22 dollars per acre. True copy. Test.

NICHS. BREWER, Reg. Cur. Can.

DOCUMENTS,

Accompanying the Presidents message,

(CONTINUED.)

Extract of a letter from Mr. King, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at London, to Mr. Pickering, Secretary of State, dated London, July 15th, 1799.

"Seven or eight of our vessels, laden with valuable cargoes, have been lately captured, and are still detained for adjudication: these vessels were met in their voyages to and from the Dutch ports declared to be blockaded. Several notes* have passed between Lord Grenville and me upon this subject; with the view, on my part, of establishing a more limited and reasonable interpretation of the law of blockade, than is attempted to be enforced by the English government.—Nearly one hundred Dutish, Russian, and other neutral ships, have, within a few months, been in like manner, intercepted, going to and returning from the United Provinces. Many of them, as well as some of ours, arrived in the Texel, in the course of the last winter; the severity of which obliged the English fleet to return to their ports, leaving a few frigates only to make short cruizes off the Texel, as the season would allow.

My object has been to prove, that in this situation of the investing fleet, there can be no effective blockade; which, in my opinion, cannot be said to exist, without a competent force stationed and present at or near the entrance of a blockaded port."

Extract of a letter from Mr. King to Lord Grenville, dated Downing Street, London, May 23d, 1799.

"It seems scarcely necessary to observe, that the presence of a competent force is essential to constitute a blockade; and although it is usual for the belligerent to give notice to neutral nations, when he institutes a blockade, it is not customary to give any notice of its discontinuance; and that, consequently, the presence of the blockading force is the natural criterion, by which the neutral is enabled to ascertain the existence of the blockade; in like manner, as the actual investment of a besieged place is the only evidence by which we decide, whether the siege is continued or raised. A siege may be commenced, raised, re-commenced, and raised again; but its existence, at any precise time, must always depend upon the fact of the presence of an investing army. This interpretation of the law of blockade is of peculiar importance to nations situated at a great distance from each other, and between whom a considerable length of time is necessary to send and receive information."

Extract of a letter from Mr. Marshall, Secretary of State, to Mr. King, dated, September 20th, 1800.

"The right to confiscate vessels bound to a blockaded ports, has been unreasonably extended to cases not coming within the rule, as heretofore adopted.

On principle, it might well be questioned, whether this rule can be applied to a place, not completely invested by land as well as sea. If we examine the reasoning, on which is founded the right to intercept and confiscate supplies, designed for a blockaded town, it will be difficult to resist the conviction, that its extention to towns, invested by sea only, is an unjustifiable encroachment on the rights of neutrals. But it is not of this departure from principle, a departure which has received some sanction from practice, that we mean to complain: It is, that ports, not effectually blockaded by a force capable of completely investing them, have yet been declared in a state of blockade; and vessels, attempting to enter therein, have been seized, and, on that account, confiscated.

This is a vexation, proceeding directly from the government, and which may be carried, if not resisted, to a very injurious extent. Our merchants have greatly complained of it, with respect to Cadiz and the ports of Holland.

If the effectiveness of the blockade be dispensed with, then every port of all the belligerent powers may, at all times, be declared in that state; and the commerce of neutrals be, thereby, subjected to universal capture. But if this principle be strictly adhered to, the capacity to blockade will be limited by the naval force of the belligerent; and, of consequence, the mischief to neutral commerce cannot be very extensive. It is, therefore, of the last importance to neutrals, that this principle be maintained unimpaired.

I observe, that you have pressed this reasoning on the British minister, who replies, that an occasional absence of a fleet from a blockaded port, ought not to change the state of the place.

Whatever force this observation may be entitled to, where that occasional absence has been produced by accident, as a storm, which, for a moment, blows off the fleet, and forces it from its station, which station it immediately resumes, I am persuaded, that where a part of the fleet is applied, though only for a time, to other objects, or comes into port, the very principle, requiring an effective blockade, which is, that the mischief can then only be co-extensive with the naval force of the belligerent requires, that during such temporary absence, the commerce of neutrals to the place should be free."

Extract of a letter from Mr. Madison, to Mr. Charles Pinkney, dated Department of State, October 25th, 1801.

"The pretext of the seizure of our vessels seems at present to be, that Gibraltar has been proclaimed in a state of blockade; and that the vessels are bound to that port. Should the proceeding be avowed by the Spanish government, and defended on that ground, you will be able to reply—

"1st. That the proclamation was made as far back as the 15th of February, 1800, and has not since been renewed; that it was immediately protested against by the American and other neutral ministers at Madrid, and not warranted by the real state of Gibraltar; and that no violations of neutral commerce having followed the proclamation, it was reasonably concluded to have been rather a menace against the enemies of Spain, than a measure to be carried into execution against her friends.

"2d. That the state of Gibraltar is not, and never can be admitted by the United States, to be that of a real blockade. In this doctrine they are supported by the law of nations as laid down in the most approved commentators, by every treaty which has undertaken to define a blockade; particularly,* those of latest date among the maritime nations of Europe, and by the sanction of Spain herself, as a party to the armed neutrality in the year 1791. The spirit of articles XV. and XVI. of the treaty between the United States and Spain, may also be appealed to as favoring a liberal construction of the rights of the parties in such cases. In fact the idea of an investment, a siege or a blockade, as collected from the authorities referred to, necessarily results from the force of those terms; and though it has been sometimes grossly violated or evaded by powerful nations in pursuit of favorite objects, it has invariably kept its place in the code of public law, and cannot be shewn to have been expressly renounced in a single stipulation between particular nations.

"3d. That the situation of the naval force at Algesiras, in relation to Gibraltar, has not the shadow of likeness to a blockade as truly and legally defined. This force can neither be said to invest, besiege or blockade the garrison, nor to guard the entrance into the port.—On the contrary, the gun boats infesting our commerce have their stations in another harbor, separated from that of Gibraltar, by a considerable bay; and are so far from beleaguering their enemy at that place, and rendering the entrance into it dangerous to others, that they are, and ever since the proclamation of a blockade, have been, for the most part, kept at a distance by a superior naval force, which makes it dangerous to themselves to approach the spot.

"4th. That the principle on which the blockade of Gibraltar is asserted, is the more inadmissible, as it may be extended to every other place in passing to which vessels must sail within the view and reach of the armed boats belonging to Algesiras. If because a neutral vessel bound to Gibraltar can be annoyed and put in danger by waylaying cruisers, which neither occupy the entrance into the harbor nor dare approach it, and by reason of that danger is liable to capture, every part of the Mediterranean coasts and islands, to which neutral vessels must pass through the same danger, may with equal reason be proclaimed in a state of blockade, and the neutral vessels bound thereto made equally liable to capture: or if the armed vessels from Algesiras alone, should be insufficient to create this danger in passing into the Mediterranean, other Spanish vessels operating from other stations, might produce the effect, and thereby not only blockade any particular port, or the ports of any particular nation, but blockade at once a whole sea, surrounded by many nations. Like blockades might be proclaimed by any particular nation, enabled by its naval superiority to distribute its ships at the mouth of the same, or any similar sea, or across channels or arms of the sea, so as to make it dangerous for the commerce of other nations to pass to its destination. These monstrous consequences condemn the principle from which they flow, and ought to unite against it every nation, Spain among the rest, which has an interest in the rights of the sea. Of this Spain herself appears to have been sensible in the year 1780, when she yelded to Russia ample satisfaction for seizures of her vessels made under the pretext of a general blockade of the Mediterranean, and followed it with her accession to the definition of a blockade contained in the armed neutrality.

"5th. That the United States have the stronger ground for remonstrating against the annoyance of her vessels on their way to Gibraltar, inasmuch as, with very few exceptions, their object is not to trade there for the accommodation of the garrison, but merely to seek advice or convoy for their own accommodation in the ulterior objects of their voyage. In disturbing their course to Gibraltar, therefore, no real detriment results to the enemy of Spain, whilst a heavy one is committed on her friends. To this consideration it may be added, that the real object of a blockade is, to subject the enemy to privations, which may co-operate with external force in compelling them to surrender; an object which cannot be alledged in a case, where it is well known that Great Britain can and does at all times by her command of the sea, secure to the garrison of Gibraltar every supply which it wants.

"6th. It is observable that the blockade of Gibraltar is rested by the proclamation on two considerations, one that it is necessary to prevent illicit traffic by means of neutral vessels, between Spanish subjects and the garrison there; the other, that it is a just reprisal on Great Britain for the proceedings of her naval armaments against Cadiz and St. Lucar. The first can surely have no weight with neutrals, but on a supposition never to be allowed, that the resort to Gibraltar under actual circumstances is an indulgence from Spain, not a right of their own; the other consideration, without examining the analogy between the cases referred to, and that of Gibraltar, is equally without weight with the U. States, against whom no right can accrue to Spain from its complaints against G. Britain, unless it could be shewn that the United States were in an unlawful collusion with the latter; a charge which they well know that Spain is too just & too candid to insinuate. It cannot even be said that the United States have acquiesced in the depredations committed by G. Britain, under whatever pretexts, on their lawful commerce.—Had this indeed been the case, the acquiescence ought to be regarded as a sacrifice made by prudence to a love of peace, of which all nations furnish occasional examples, and as involving a question between the United States and Great Britain, of which no other nation could take advantage against the former. But it may be truly affirmed, that no such acquiescence has taken place. The United States have sought redress for injuries from Great Britain as well as from other nations. They have sought it by the means which appeared to themselves, the only rightful judges, to be best suited to their object; and it is equally certain that redress has in some measure been obtained, and that the pursuit of complete redress is by no means abandoned.

"7th. Were it admitted that the circumstances of Gibraltar in February, 1800, the date of the Spanish proclamation, amounted to a real blockade, and that the proclamation was therefore obligatory on neutrals; and were it also admitted that the present circumstances of that place amount to a real blockade, (neither of which can be admitted,) still the conduct of the Algesiras cruisers, is altogether illegal and unwarrantable. It is illegal and unwarrantable, because the force of the proclamation must have expired whenever the blockade was actually raised as must have been unquestionably the case, since the

---

* *See the note from Mr. King to Lord Grenville, immediately following.*

* The late treaties between Russia and Sweden, and between Russia and Great Britain.