Eastern Shore General Advertiser.

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

[VOL. 5....8.] TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 4, 1806. [NO. 10 .....373]

THE TERMS
OF THE
REPUBLICAN 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.

For Sale,

A FARM, containing upwards of three hundred acres of Land, eleven miles below Easton, and near the road from thence to *Saunders'* (formerly *Akers'*) Ferry. About one half of this Farm is arrable land, the residue in wood. A stream runs through the whole, which is equal, if not superior to any below Easton for a Mill Seat; and a considerable quantity of meadow may be made at a small expence. A further description is deemed unnecessary, as it is presumed any person wishing to purchase would view the premises. Application may be made to *John Ardrey*, who resides on the Farm; or to the subscriber, who will shew the same. For terms apply to Dr. *T. Thomas*, Easton, or to

WM. THOMAS.

N. B. If the above land is not disposed of by the 5th of November, it will on that day be offered at PUBLIC SALE, on the premises, at 12 o'clock, if fair, if not, the next fair day. W. T.

sept. 23, 1806. 6

Public Sale Postponed.

I WILL sell on Thursday the 6th day of November next, if fair, if not the next fair day, at Peach Blossom, some valuable stock, consisting of excellent young milch cows, steers in fine order, and a beautiful young Bull of the Bakewell breed; some valuable young horses, and a number of sheep and hogs—also a quantity of good hay and corn blades well cured, and excellent cyder and apple brandy in hogsheads and barrels; a large still in complete order, and a good cyder mill, trough, &c. with several other articles. A credit of nine months will be given on all sums exceeding ten dollars, the purchaser giving bond bearing interest, with approved security previous to the removal of the property; the cash will be required on all sums under ten dollars. The sale will commence at ten o'clock.

R. CHAMBERLAINE.

N. B. I will sell the horses at private sale, if any person wishes them for immediate use. R. C.

Peach Blossom, Sept. 30, 1806. 4

Public sale.

ON Friday the 7th of November next, if fair, if not, on Saturday, at the farm occupied by the subscriber, near Easton, on the Miles river road, will be sold,

Horses, Cattle, Hogs & Farming Utensils—Household and Kitchen Furniture. The terms of sale will be a credit of three months on all sums over three dollars, with note and approved security—cash will be required for all sums under three dollars. Sale will commence at 10 o'clock, A. M.

JOSEPH HUZZA.

Talbot county, oct. 21, 1806. 3

Public Sale.

WILL be sold on Saturday the 8th day of November next, at public auction, on the premises, in the town of Oxford; on a credit of nine months, note with approved security, bearing interest from the day of sale. A FRAME HOUSE and LOT, that will suit either for a Store or Dwelling; it is nearly new, and in good repair. Should the above property not be sold on the above day, the same will be for rent; and possession given on the first of January next.

THOMAS WATTS.

oxford, oct. 28, 1806. 2

Sale of Lots.

ON Tuesday the 11th day of November next, will be disposed of at public sale on the premises, several valuable LOTS adjoining the North end of the town of Easton, lately the property of Colonel *John Hughes*—a credit of one, two and three years will be given, the purchaser giving bond and security with interest from the day of sale.

JAMES EARLE, junr.

N. B. A second hand *COACH*, at the Coach House of Samuel Hopkins, immediately after the above sale. J. E.

September 23, 1806. 3

To be Rented,

AND possession given the first of January next, the house and Lot at present occupied by Mr. *John Bruscup*, on Harrison-street—For further particulars apply to

MARY TRIPPE.

Easton, September 30, 1806. 3

From the National Intelligencer.

THOUGHTS on the subject of NAVAL POWER *in the* UNITED STATES *of* AMERICA; *and on certain means of encouraging and protecting their Commerce and Manufactures.*

No. III.

The inconveniences, which the commerce of the U. S. sustains are considered here as very numerous, and the injuries are deemed neither few nor small. We are excluded, for example, from the largest part of the dominions of a forign power, whom we do not shut out of any of our ports. We are subject, in their colonies, to an alien tax, in effect,* for selling our own produce, though of prime necessity to the foreign country; while merchants of the same country can freely dispose of all its natural productions & manufactured commodities and all other goods, not only in our old states, but even in our purchased territories and colonial settlements; tho' at the same time, we are excluded from the equal carriage of our own produce, and from the regular participation in the transportation of their produce and manufactures from their acquired territories and colonial settlements. If short occasional relaxations are produced by extreme necessity, they are subject to great inconveniences by their unexpected occurrence and transitory existence, while our foreign competitors are liberally allowed a constant enjoyment of all the branches of our foreign trade. Far more favor is extended by us to the produce of their fisheries, than is shown by them to the produce of ours. They exclude all our manufactures and much of our produce, yet we allow the importation of every thing they grow or make. They prevent our employment of foreign seamen, beyond a certain extent, in our voyages to all their ports, apparently to check our ship-building and navigation, while we impose no such unwarrantable restraint upon their vessels or crews.—They obtain a footing on the decks of our vessels by "the right of search" for enemies' property and military enemies, and pervert it to impress the seamen necessary for the voyage, though they are lawfully engaged under written contracts, expressly prescribed by our national legislature. A similar conduct in our officers would render them liable to exemplary punishment and heavy damages. They subject our detained vessels, produce, and supplies to unjust and exorbitant charges and ruinous delays, in their ports and in their courts of admiralty, which we cannot nor will reciprocate. They have set up, for many years, principles of blockade totally unknown to the law of nations, destructive of our commerce, deeply injurious to the sales of our crops and exports, and inconsistent with our neutral rights, and national independence, the reciprocation of which would subject our officers to damages and punishment. They attempt to prescribe laws for us upon the free ocean, *the highway of nations*, at the express pleasure of their own executive authority, destroying *at will* our whole commerce with enemies' home dominions, and neutral ports, rivers, and states, though they violate these laws in their own conduct, proclamations and treaties touching the same or like places, in the time of war. For these evils, and for several others of a like nature, war—demoralizing, impious, frantic, and expensive war—is said to be the regular cure. But it is far worse than the disease, and the U. S. are happily aware, that besides war, there is another and a better remedy—the cultivation of the arts of peace, under the direction of the national legislature. Sincerely disclaiming all enmity to the belligerent powers of Europe, we are firmly bent on fair neutrality and honorable peace. It is our earnest desire that our situation and views should be thoroughly understood and well considered at this most awful and unprecedented crisis. Those who apprehend from the U. S. intentional *injustice to themselves* will, we trust, be agreeably disappointed; and those who expect from us an acquiescence in real *injustice from any foreign country to ourselves*, will certainly be mistaken. Our policy, though uncommon in Europe, is clear and sound, as we believe. If our situation should compel the reluctant expenditure of twelve precious extra millions, for example, let them not be unwisely lavished in the prosecution of a naval war, by which we may not gain, but let that immense sum be levied, by the calm operation of statute law, on the *produce and manufactures of our spoliators*, and applied, under the direction of our government, *to the indemnification of our mercantile and marine sufferers*, and to *the cordial support of our manufacturing industry*. Even in our unwilling but necessary resort to such measures, we shall not be at all influenced by the desire of doing to the foreign nation any harm, but by a fair and right disposition to do good to ourselves. We refrain from hostilities; and, as already mentioned, we restrict, prohibit, and duty their navigation and trade much less than they restrict and duty ours. We of course observe the most amicable conduct. Immediately before Divine Providence ordained the separation between Great Britain and America, the laws and system of the empire were the common property of both countries. The U. States did not incline, at the beginning, to maintain "*the navigation act*" and the commercial and manufacturing regulations with that strict adherence to their monopolizing spirit, which seemed most advisable to the British kingdoms. Yet we did not consider even their peculiar and unaltered rigor as a war by them upon us, nor can reasonable and just men now perceive the semblance of war against G. Britain in our later and calm recurrence to the commercial regimen of our ancient and common empire. We adopt the system as the precedented means of prosperity, and as a peaceful measure of subsistence and defence. It is possible, that we may not even now approve of all the regulations to encourage our navigation, manufactures, & commerce which existed in our joint Anglo American system before 1776, but if we adopt the whole, and thus return to them even all the regulations and prohibitions they have long meted to us, we should not thereby act with any hostility to them, nor even more partially to our interests than they have constantly acted favorably to their own. Let them remove their restrictions, and obey reason, under the law of nations, and we will remove our restrictions with cordial satisfaction. We earnestly desire peace and good will with all nations, and with none more sincerely than with them; but they ought to remember, and we shall doubtless consider, that we are not commanded to love even our worthiest neighbors better than ourselves.

Though it was intended, in this publication, merely to treat of the dangers, obstacles, and expences of great naval power, and to show that there are safer and cheaper means of protecting commerce, yet it may be proper and useful briefly to notice some connected subjects. It is a matter of just and great astonishment, that an ardent English pamphleteer against our commercial rights† has ventured to justify all the measures against neutral trade, which England has taken, and almost all she may yet adopt, by the sweeping and unwarranted assertion, that the neutral states having *first* submissively allowed *the enemies of Britain* to encroach on their commercial rights, Britain has, by natural reason, and the law of nations, a claim to exercise similar encroachments! We are sorry to remark, that English aggressions upon neutral rights has been so long and variously continued, that her friends have forgotten the commencement, and the most important incidents. We shall therefore endeavor to assist their recollections.

It will be found, by recurrence to the British state papers and annual registers, that in the year 1792, while England was at peace with all the world, she began this injurious work by detaining neutrals, as well at sea as in her own ports, laden for France with provisions, with her own bale goods, and with neutral produce and manufactures; and that as this *monstrous* act was against the law of nations, numerous treaties, and her own municipal laws, the British ministry of that day were obliged to shelter themselves under an act of indemnity. They continued this lawless and injurious conduct till the French declaration of war in Feb. 1793, setting, in time of peace, an evil and unprecedented example to all nations, and to future times. After the war with France had taken place, the British government formed separate and successive conventions with Russia, Spain, Prussia, and Austria, "to stop and compel ‡ *all neutral* ships bound to or freighted for France, either to sail back or enter some neutral port." It will be observed, therefore, that before the present allies of France violated, in 1805 and 6 the neutral rights in conjunction with her in the rage of war, England had led them into such deliberate violations in the calm of peace in 1792, and in war in 1793, in conjunction with herself. If Prussia is in these bad practices now England, it seems, taught them to her many years ago, and took pains to draw Denmark and Holland into the same illegitimate conduct. Neutral vessels were unlawfully detained and taken, in numerous instances, by Great Britain and her friends, avowedly to injure the general trade, and disturb the interior peace of France by the awful miseries of famine. We might observe, incidentally, that the dismemberment of France, and *even dictating a form of government to her* were explicit objects of the treaties of Pinlintz § and Pavia; & of the British manifesto of October, 1793. These are the very outrages of which England now complains against France. We leave to themselves the settlement of those mutual complaints, which they however ought to adjust before we embark in a war on the side of either. It is not remembered, that the English government thought it proper to wage war with Russia, Austria, or Prussia for their partition of Poland, or for their late repartition of the German empire, under the name of "*indemnities*," in which operation all those powers partook. Nor did the elector of Hanover ever depart from a "submissive" neutrality. Why, then, should America plunge into the abyss of an awful and unprecedented war, which she abhors, for reasons which have not heretofore moved the elector and king to war, in Hanover or England?

But to return to neutral rights. In January, 1793, the Prussians, then acting with England, drove from the hanse towns all the French agents, who were buying provisions for France, as they now drive away *the dealers in English goods*. In this England supported Prussia, by stopping ships bound from the Hanse towns to France. In the month of June, 1793, England issued her famous *executive* order for destroying all the *neutral* trade with France, without even pretending to act on the principle of blockade, or to be forced by necessity. The language of the treaty with Russia, &c. on which lord Grenville avowed to Mr. T. Pinkney, that those June orders were founded, was this: "To unite all the efforts of *England* any Russia to prevent all other powers not implicated in this war (neutrals) from giving, directly or *indirectly* and protection whatever, in consequence of their *neutrality*, to the commerce of France, upon the seas or in their ports."

In the same year, 1793, it was declared, by Prussia and Austria, then allies of England, that the ordinary benefits of *neutral* intercourse with France was not to be allowed; and the British minister at Genoa proclaimed, that to be *neuter* (to preserve *the peace of our own nation*) was to be an accomplice with France. In the case of Tuscany, things were carried so far by Great Britain, that her minister, lord Hervey, made known by letter to the Tuscan prime minister that the continuance of his royal master's *neurality* (his country's peace) would depend upon the opinions of the powers combined with England against France; including Prussia, of whom the English writers now bitterly complain for violating the neutrality of the Hanseatic towns. Lord Hervey addressed a public letter to the minister of Russia in Tuscany, declaring that the neutrality of Tuscany was incompatible with the designs and interest of Europe, *and would be guided by them* in a manner more suitable to their war plans.

On the 6th of November, 1793, the English government made a *secret* order of the king and council, and sent it (*without notice* to any neutral minister) to all their ships of war, ordering the seizure of all neutral vessels having on board the produce of the French colonies, or provisions, dry goods, or other supplies for those colonies. A cargo of American fish, Indian corn, lumber, French produce and manufactures, and other articles could always be carried from our ports to the French colonies, and molasses, rum, &c. could always in peace be brought back. Here our own neutral produce, our own neutral property, in our own neutral ships, in an established *peace* trade under the well known arret of Aug. 1784, procured by President Jefferson, was cut up without the least ceremony or notice, by *a palpable usurpation of the legislation of the ocean*, at the pleasure of the British crown. Yet England, after this unfortunate precedent, thinks we should make war on France and Prussia, for shutting her goods out of Hamburg.

Though Mr. Jay was sent to Great Britain, in 1794, to effectuate a treaty which should maintain harmony, the British order of council of June, 1793, was renewed in 1795, as soon as it was supposed, in England, that the treaty was ratified; so little decorum, so little justice, was observed towards this great neutral customer of England!

In April, 1797, to punish Spain merely for being at war with England, or rather to aggravate her misfortune in not being able, with England, and Germany, and Russia, and Italy, and Portugal on her side, to defend herself against France, a proclamation, *in palpable violation of the law of nations*, was published by admiral Nelson, in which all *neutral* commerce with Spain was forbidden. The plea of necessity was not set up. It was thought sufficient to announce that England had "*found it right that Spain should no longer have any trade.*" Our neutral *manufactures* and our neutral *crops* were thus unlawfully shut out of Spain by the *friendly* navy of England. Yet we are to fight the whole continent of Europe for refusing British goods.

With these and many other evidences of *early*, and unremitted, and excessive English violations of neutral rights and commerce, and *even of English laws* before our eyes, it is impossible for the government or people of the U. S. to assent to the pretension, that our alledged sufferance of latter and lesser wrongs from the enemies of England, entitle her to claim of our neutrality an indulgence in the numerous and excessive injuries of the current season‖. With a calm and reasonable firmness, therefore, we recur to the recommendation of a continuance on the peaceable and legitimate protections and indemnifications for our property, commerce, and sufferings, which the legislative power in Nicholson's law, has begun to administer, and of such of these which are respectfully suggested for consideration in this publication. There is yet another and a far better course which the present British government hold at their own command—*the infusion of American moderation into the old Anglo-American system of commercial monopoly, and frank justice under the law of nations.* It cannot be doubted by any reflecting man, that the recited injuries to our neutral rights give us large claims upon the magnanimity of England, and justify temporary distinctions against her. They have touched American sensibility to the quick, and deeply affected our interests. The perversions of the principles of search and of blockade, the violation of mariners' and passengers' contracts, and the legalized extortions in the admiralty business, with *the palpable assumption of the right to bind us on the ocean, in all cases whatsoever, by executive orders*, have laid a foreign axe to the

* Our merchants, supercargoes and trading captains are forbid to sell at all, but they do the business in the name of a British colonial merchant, paying a commission, WHICH IS THE TAX.

† The writer of War in Disguise, 2d part, of May, 1806; called observations on Mr. Randolph's Speech, p. 14.

‡ See convention of March 25, 1793, with Russia, and the Russian explanation to Sweden, July, 1793, Debrett's State Papers, &c.

§ This treaty is referred to as real by lord Holland's pamphlet, or that of his son.

‖ The following article of intelligence proves that Great Britain still continues her monstrous attempts *to force* independent *neutral* states into *fatal wars* and treaties by her naval power:

"*Constantinople, May 8, 1806.*

"Mr. Arbuthnot, the English ambassador, has had *a fresh* conference with the Reis Essendi (or Turkish secretary of state,) at which he *emphatically* declared, that if the Porte (or Turkish government) did not, *within a few days*, come to a determination to renew its treaties with England, an English squadron would certainly make its appearance in the Levant, as any further refusal must be considered as a rupture between the two powers." The Turkish government simply replied, that it was resolved to maintain the neutrality which it had hitherto observed. These excessive measure of a naval power are calculated to work an abrogation of those precious rules in the law of nations, which have hitherto secured industrious, peaceful, and honest communities from the expences, miseries, and crimes of war.