



To the Freemen of Halifax, Northampton, Bertie and Martin Counties.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,
Permit me to inform you that I am a candidate to represent you in the fourteenth Congress of the United States. I was born, raised and educated among you. I am personally known to many of you. My qualification for the post I now solicit, is submitted to your unbiased judgment and candid consideration: let your decision be as it may, it shall receive my cheerful acquiescence—ever believing that the uninfluenced voice of a majority of the people is always correct.—My political tenets are taken from the Republican School—they were early imbibed, and I have not as yet seen any cause to change them. As the war, and the causes of the war are the principal subjects of political controversy at the present moment, I hope I shall be pardoned for briefly assigning those reasons which have operated upon my mind in pronouncing its declaration just and necessary.

I will, in the first place, advert to the concessions which our infantile and debilitated state induced us to make to a nation, that never was known to possess one particle of generosity.

In the second place, I will enumerate the unprovoked insults and injuries which we have received from the British nation—Injuries which in my opinion, left this nation no alternative but war or disgrace.

The only commercial Treaty we made with the British nation was that which was generally denominated Jay's Treaty, or the Treaty of London.

This treaty was made a few years after the States had adopted the Federal constitution. The American people had established a government which had no parallel either in ancient or modern history—it was viewed by the statesmen of Europe as theoretical and Utopian, rather than as ever likely to be successfully carried into practice—this reason and this only induced this government to ratify that treaty.—General Washington and the Congress were anxious to preserve peace with all nations, at a time, the new constitution was taking deep root in the minds of the people; a constitution, the effects of which were to astonish an oppressed and benighted world. England catching at this circumstance, demanded and obtained concessions from us, which have been considered by many as the precursor to an illiad of woes—under Jay's treaty, we permitted those persons who joined the ranks of the enemy during the Revolution, who did all they could to enslave us, to recover those debts which should have been confiscated according to the laws of war—we permitted British subjects to hold or dispose of those lands they were possessed of at the ratification of the treaty, which ought to have been confiscated. We agreed to trade with her West-India Colonies in vessels not to exceed seventy tons burthen, and that the return cargoes should not be nationalized by entering our ports and paying the duties. We permitted her to swell the list of contraband with articles never before known under the denomination of contraband, viz. "Timber for ship-building, Tar or Rosin, Copper in Sheets, Sails, Hemp and Cordage"—not one of those articles are included in the list of contraband with any of the many nations with whom we have made treaties; but with several, (France for instance,) they are expressly excluded. No raw materials have ever been considered contraband by any nation, excepting the solitary article of Saltpetre—such articles only, as can be immediately used in war, have ever been considered as coming under the denomination of contraband. We agreed, that in case of war their stock in our moored institutions, either public or private, and their

debts here should not be confiscated.

We agreed to permit her merchants and agents to remain here with their goods and effects in time of war, if they behaved themselves, and if not, they were to have twelve months notice to depart—this article expired twelve years after the ratification, and I hope never to see it revived again—shall these English merchants and agents be permitted to remain here, pouring forth their abuse against our government and political institutions? shall they be permitted to speak and write the foulest and basest slanders, and publish them in the prints of this country with impunity? I would cartel them in the *Anaoston* or *Robert Burns*, or some other vessel, and consign them to *Castlereagh* or the *Prince Regent*.

It would appear to a disinterested observer, that Great Britain ought always to be friendly with this country, as long as we were willing to concede so many important points which she was unable to obtain from the other independent powers of the world—but no nation ever received more injuries and insults from another, than this has from G. Britain—a strong case to prove that one nation is disposed to demand and insult in proportion as another nation grants and submits. If we resist oppression, we may preserve our Independence and live free: if submission is resorted to, recolonization and slavery are the inevitable results. Britain hates us, because we are free—she hates us, because she once expected to make us slaves and failed—she hates us because we are Republicans, and will not have a king to rule over us.

I will now advert to some of those many injuries which the British Government has done these U. States; many of which she hath refused and still doth refuse to make any reparation for.

Immediately after the Treaty of 1783, Britain began to act towards this country in such a way, as plainly exhibited an innate hostility, a secret enmity that was not easily to be removed.—She held the western posts a long time after it was stipulated that they should be given up to us—these posts which gave them so fair a chance of monopolising the whole Indian trade, or exciting the Indians to commit enormities on our frontier; and that they did stir up the North-Western Indians to declare war against the United States in the year 1794, a war which cost us much blood and treasure, is not denied by any party in this country. So early as the year 1792, we find Gen. Washington loudly complaining of their impressing the crews of American vessels on the Ocean, the great highway of nations, telling the British government, that it could not be borne by a free people, and that war would be the consequence, if the practice was persisted in—we have remonstrated for twenty years, all to no effect, and as Washington said in 1792, war has been the result. I am astonished to hear, after this length of time, that the tearing from their families and homes of a large class of American citizens, and reducing them to a state of slavery worse than Egyptian bondage, was no cause for war, but barely a subject of complaint.—I have always understood, that a just cause, of complaint would be a just cause of war, if the injuring nation refused or delayed to make reparation for that which was the just cause of complaint. If then twenty years of complaint and remonstrance is not long enough to ripen into war, should be glad to know what time the opponents to the war would suffer & complain, before they would have declared war. I frankly declare that I think we delayed the declaration of war too long. England began to think we could not be "kicked into a war," and treated us accordingly.—On the 11th of July 1792, General Washington directs the then Secretary of State to write to Mr. Thomas Pinckney our Ambassador at London, to protest

against the practice of impressing any of the crews of our vessels on the high seas. He says, "we entirely reject the mode, that our seamen should always carry about them certificates of their citizenship; this is a condition never yet submitted to by any nation—the simplest rule will be, that the vessel being American, will be evidence that the seamen on board of her are such." We have another letter from the same to the same, dated 12th October, 1792, in which are these words—"No law forbids the seamen of any country to engage, in time of peace, on board a foreign vessel; no law authorises such seamen to break their contract, nor the armed vessels of their nation to interpose force for their rescue." The assertion that they have the right to impress their men out of neutral ships is not supported by any law, either public or municipal. By the municipal regulations of England, they are in the habit of impressing their own men out of their own merchant vessels to man their ships of war. This municipal usage cannot have any force beyond the limits of their "Territorial Sea"—viz. one league, or the distance of a cannon shot from the shore—beyond that distance, the law of nations is the only law to govern; and impressment is unknown to it.

I have heard it said, that the question was honorably settled by "Monroe's Treaty." I assert, that not a syllable was incorporated in that treaty upon the subject. A note was tacked to the Treaty, from Auckland and Holland to our Ambassadors, promising that instructions should be given to the commanders of their ships of war, to be careful not to take Americans in their practice of impressment. The ministry which succeeded the one with whom the Treaty was made, directed Mr. Canning to inform our Ambassadors, 12 months afterwards, "that no engagements were entered into on the part of his Majesty, as connected with the treaty, except such as appear upon the face of it." Thus the note of Lords Auckland and Holland became a dead letter.

England pretends she does not want our seamen—that they are taken by mistake, in the attempt to obtain their own. I would ask why they do not release them, when the mistake is discovered? Why did they not meet us upon the principles contained in an act of Congress, commonly called the "Seaman's Bill?" By this act we pledge ourselves not to employ her seamen, if she will not employ ours; nay, severe penalties are directed to be imposed on any Captain of a public or private vessel, who shall ship a foreigner—this act has been passed for some time, and the British government has not deigned to notice it—the truth is, she did, until a few months past, want her own seamen & oafs too—her ships of war were not easily manned, & they have been willing to run the risk of war, to effect so desirable an object, even at the expence of neutrals—she has frequently replenished the crews of her ships of war, on the West-India station, at the expence of American merchantmen. Thus saving the immense trouble and expence of returning to England to recruit the crew.

England by her celebrated Navigation Act, required that the master and three fourths of the crew should be subjects of the king—but feeling it inconvenient in time of war, the government of that country, from motives of obvious policy, have passed temporary acts, allowing the employment of three fourths foreign seamen. And all the privileges of British subjects are conferred on foreign seamen after two years service, in time of war, on board of a ship of war or merchant vessel. Thus we see they do the very act, for which they pretend to carry on the war against us. If impressment was tolerated by our laws, (which I hope will never be) and the commander of one of our armed ships was to impress men from a British merchant vessel in

time of peace, war would be the immediate consequence. Shall England do that to others, which she would not permit others to do to her? And shall she find apologists in this country for such conduct? Mortifying as the confession is, I am compelled to say she has, and men who were born and educated here, and who pretend to possess anti-monarchical principles.

I wish the following advice of *Bynkershook* was more attended to—when hostilities are to be waged against another nation, no one can expect that we shall compliment ourselves and wish them well. The grave majesty of the Roman people displayed itself in the conduct of *Caius Popilius*, who, although he was saluted by king Antiochus, then his enemy, refused to return the salutation, while the war continued." Demosthenes refused to declaim in the Athenian Assembly, although he was bribed by the king of Persia—he would not speak against his country.

Britain refused the United States not only the right of carrying the products of the colonies of her enemy, purchased by our citizens, to the mother country, but condemned the vessel and cargo of such as were brought into the ports of the United States, the duties paid, the goods warehoused, and the ship changed on the re-exportation. The first article of the armed neutrality of the north is in the following words, "That all neutral vessels should be allowed to navigate freely from one port to another along the coasts of the nations at war."—This principle was admitted by England. She had previously admitted by her admiralty cases, that a trade forced through neutral ports, to and from the colonies of her enemies with all the world, was legal. She has violated these principles and millions of American property have been illegally condemned. England declared all the ports from the Elbe to Brest in a state of blockade, without a *strict investiture* with armed ships—instead of her force being stationed there, it was stationed off the neutral harbors of New-York and the Chesapeake. Under this illegal blockade an immense quantity of American property was condemned.

England passed her Orders in Council—a submission to which would have made us her colonies again. She required that every American vessel should touch at one of her ports, pay a transit duty and obtain a licence before we could go to the ports of any of her enemies or their dependencies—under this order millions worth of our property has been condemned. This order should have been immediately followed by an order of reprisal on the part of the Republic. Much talk, much blood, treasure and national honor would have been saved. The doctrine of Retaliation is inadmissible, when it operates to the injury of a neutral—"Retaliation is only to be exercised on him who has committed the injury, and not against a common friend."—(*Bynkershook*.) Retaliation may be a flimsy excuse in the mouth of an Englishman, but it is folly in that of an American. Again she issued her Orders in Council before it was possible for our government to know of the obnoxious decrees of France. It was not the edicts of France, but our prosperous commerce, at that time, which induced England to issue these orders—our fair trade was to be saved, *fas aut nefas*—it rankled like a thorn in the sides of England. She sickened at the sight of the immense quantity of American canvas, which spread on every sea. She was determined to destroy it at the expence of public law.

The insults of the English in our waters have exceeded those of any other nation, and with the exception of the affair of Copenhagen and Genoa, are more gross than her swaggering commanders ever offered to any other nation. The affair of Copenhagen is too well known to re-

quire my recapitulating it—that of Genoa was as follows—The French frigate *La Modeste*, who in the year 1794, was reposing tranquilly under the protection and assylum granted by the perfect neutrality of the Genoese Republic, saw, without suspicion, a British ship of seventy four guns place itself along side of her; all at once, the English ordered the French to lower their flag. On their refusing to obey the summons, flying ladders, already prepared, were thrown upon the frigate—the French disarmed, were massacred—the English pursued those who had thrown themselves into the sea for safety and despatched them with their oars.

In the waters of the United States and the adjacent sea, the British did commit the following injuries and insults among many others, whilst this nation was neutral and considered England as a friend.

The Chesapeake frigate was fired into and many of her men killed. The frigate *President* was fired into by the drunken Captain of the *Little-Belt*, and proper chastisement was immediately administered. They fired at a merchant vessel entering the port of New-York, and killed a man by the name of Pearce. They ran aground and burnt a French Ship of War on our coast, which was entitled to assylum and protection by the laws of nations—they overhauled vessels and impressed men from them in the Harbours of the United States, and when one of these minions, (the Captain of the *Cambrian Frigate* in the port of New-York,) was informed that he was in the territorial waters of the U. States, his insolent reply was, that all the waters within the limits of his buoys belonged to his Majesty. It may be said that these acts were done by inferior officers and not sanctioned by the British Government, I answer that the insults offered by the British officers to this nation, have ever been a sure passport to promotion—not one has been chastised by that Government, but invariably promoted in their commands. It does appear to me that he, who can tamely submit to the catalogue of insults and wrongs which I have given, can tamely submit to any thing—no injury, no insult can arouse him from that political torpor in which he is sunk, a torpor, which appears to my mind to befit him rather for the meridian of Turkey, than the mild and genial one of the American Republic.

It has been said, that we lost a golden opportunity of closing the war, by refusing the Armistice offered by admiral Warren. When it is known that the admiral's powers were barely to negotiate relative to the Orders in Council, and the admission of British ships of war into our waters, no real American could wish this country to have closed with him upon such terms—his powers did not authorize him to touch the question of impressment—they did not authorize him to offer any indemnification for past spoliations, nor security for their future conduct. Mr. Russell offered an armistice to the British Government, if they would desist from the practice of impressing from American vessels, until the question was settled by treaty—the same was offered by our Government to Sir G. Prevost and both were refused.

We have not demanded of England to stipulate that "free ships shall make free goods," although the principle is recognised in the several treaties made by us with France, Holland, Sweden, Russia and Spain—nor is it any new thing to England herself, notwithstanding the great clamour made by the opposition in this country—she allowed the principle in her treaty with Portugal in the year 1654—with France in the treaties which she made with her in the years 1653 1677 and 1712—with Sweden in 1746—with Spain in 1667, 1670 and 1713—with Holland in 1668 and 1674—vide 2 Azuni 165—the same principle was incorporated in the treaty of Utrecht in 1713—this treaty was arguently supported by Queen Anne and her