ADDRESS OF MR. EPPES,

TO THE

People of Charlotte, Prince Edward, Cumberland, and Buckingham.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

When an individual becomes a candidate for a public trust, it is his duty to state distinctly to those to whom he makes a tender of his services, the principles by which his public conduct will be regulated if honored with their suffrages. If in ordinary times this duty is important, it is peculiarly so at a period when our country has been driven by repeated and continued acts of hostility either to abandon the principles rendered sacred by the revolution, or to assert them with the combined force of the nation. On union depends the strength of a free government. The enthusiasm of freemen struggling to maintain their rights, gives to free government a degree of energy which a tyranny cannot command from reluctant slaves. To produce union it is essential that a free people should be convinced of the justice of their cause.—He who enjoys the blessings of peace, & all the advantages flowing from a free government and an impartial administration of justice, will never shrink from the evils of a war, when convinced that every species of forbearance has been practiced by the constituted authorities of the country, and that no alternative has been left but war, open and direct, or an abandonment of rights essentially connected with the independence of the nation. In no form can this truth, in my opinion, be more fully impressed on the minds of the people than by a review of the course pursued by the present republican party towards foreign nations, from the year 1801, when they were first honored with the public confidence down to the present time. Such a review will carry conviction to every unprejudiced mind, that peace has been cherished as the sheet-anchor of our political safety by the republican administrations, and that during the last eight years, if only our injuries had been consulted, we have had abundant cause of war with almost every power with whom we have commercial relations. In 1802, immediately after the interests of the nation were confided to the present republican party, the treaty of Amiens was concluded, which restored peace to Europe. The storms which overshadowed the last years of the federal administration were dissipated. Our expences were reduced within a narrow compass, and the fair prospect presented of reaping a rich harvest from our neutral position, and of applying the whole proceeds of a rapidly increasing revenue to the extinguishment of the debts contracted in our struggle for independence. Our first difficulties were with Spain. The right of deposit at Orleans was denied us in December, 1802, and the people of the western country deprived of an outlet for their produce.

On this occasion the opponents of the republican party made every exertion to plunge the U. States into a war. While, however, preparation was made for maintaining the rights of the nation, by holding in readiness a detachment of militia, an acquisition of the territory by peaceable means was considered more congenial to the genius of a free government, and more consistent with the principles uniformly professed by the party recently honored with the national confidence.—A secret appropriation was made for the purchase of the territory, which being instituted at the mouth of the Mississippi, and commanding the whole commerce of the western country, would have subjected us to constant collision with the nation possessing it. The territory being ceded by Spain to France, and war recommencing in 1803 between Great Britain and that power, the favorable opportunity was seized on by the U. S. & the Territory of Louisiana, including Orleans, purchased. While the territory was possessed by foreign nations, no opportunity was omitted by the opponents of the republican party to magnify its importance. It was described in their speeches as a country larger in extent than all Europe, and in climate and soil a perfect paradise. No sooner, however, was it acquired in a peaceable manner, than it was represented as a wilderness fit only for the habitation of beasts, and the republican party denounced for squandering the funds of the nation in the purchase of a territory for the acquisition of which they were willing to plunge us into war. The good sense of the people approved the pacific policy of the government, and the importance of the acquisition was soon acknowledged by men of all political opinions. The recommencement of the war between G. B. & France in 1803, subjected us to new difficulties. In that year orders were issued by the British government for the seizure of neutrals with return cargoes, who were suspected on the outward voyage, of having supplied the enemy with articles contraband of war. Under these instructions the outward and return voyages were considered as one. This was the preparatory step for throwing the United States entirely out of the colonial trade. The next step was to declare that the landing of colonial produce, and securing the duty according to law, did not break the continuity of the voyage. Thus, West India produce brought first to the U. S. and landed, was considered as going direct to Europe. These decisions gradually formed on the orders of 1803, were not known in the U. S. until 1805. The order was issued without notice, & the application to our commerce made known to the U. S. by the capture and condemnation of vessels. Upwards of three millions of dollars of American property were captured under these orders, for which no reparation has ever been made.

The immense capital embarked in this commerce, its unexpected and unexampled destruction, covered the table of the House of Representatives with memorials from almost every commercial city in the union, pledging their lives and fortunes to support the government in demanding and obtaining reparation. At this period also, recommenced the impressment of our seamen, who were seized, wherever found, by the British officers, & dragged from the protection of our flag. A flagrant insult of this kind occurred at this period. In the summer of the year 1804, in the port of N. York, capt. Bradley of the British frigate Cambrian, caused a vessel just arrived, to be boarded by persons under his command, resisted the officers of the port, impressed and carried off many seamen and passengers actually within the port of N. Y. and claimed jurisdiction to the length of his barges. On this occasion a law was passed authorising the President to exclude by proclamation armed vessels violating the jurisdiction and laws of the U. States. In 1805, Capt. Whitby, of the British Leander, fired on a coasting vessel within less than a mile from the shore, and murdered an American citizen of the name of Pierce. The murder of Pierce produced on the part of the President, an exercise of the power to exclude, by proclamation, armed vessels violating the jurisdiction and laws of the U. S. The exclusion on that occasion was confined to the vessel committing outrage, and not made general as to the British armed vessels, until after the attack on the Chesapeake. The case of Bradley, and of Whitby, was presented to the British government. In the case of Whitby, full and adequate proof was forwarded; the officer, however was honorably acquitted and promoted. At the succeeding session of Congress, under the feeling excited by the capture of $3,600,000 of our property and the flagrant insults in our ports and waters, the first Non-Importation Act was passed against Great Britain. It was suspended from time to time and did not go into operation until all hope of reparation was abandoned. At this period our situation became again critical with Spain. Payment for spoliations on our commerce, to a considerable amount, was refused and a duty of 12½ per cent. was laid on our imports and exports passing thro' the Mobile. Two persons, of the name of Kemper, were seized within the territory of the United States by persons authorised by the Spanish government. On this occasion the same pacific policy was persued as in the year 1803. Negociation was still continued—a secret appropriation was made for the purchase of the Florida's, which probably would have succeeded but for the opposition made to the measure, which delayed the passage of the law until the opportunity for purchasing was passed. On the 16th of May, 1806, the blockade of the coast from the river Elbe to Brest, inclusive, was notified by the British government. On the 21st of Nov. 1806, the Berlin and Milan Decrees was issued, declaring the British Isles in a state of blockade, and professing to be a retaliation on the blockade of May, 1806, & antecedent proceedings of G. Britain, violating the law of nations. This decree was not extended to the commerce of the U. States until the month of October, 1807. It was followed first by the British order of January, 1807, professing to be a retaliation on that decree, and subjecting to capture the trade of the U. States from one belligerent port to another, and secondly, by the orders of Nov. professing to be a still further retaliation on the same decree, and prohibiting all commerce on the part of neutrals, with the enemies of G. Britain. These late British orders were followed by the Milan decree of Dec. 17th, 1807, purporting to be a retaliation on the said orders, and prohibiting all commerce to neutrals. In the month of June, 1807, the attack on the American frigate Chesapeake, by the British ship of war Leopard, was made. The circumstances of this transaction are too well known to require any comment.

In October 1807, Congress was convened under a Proclamation of the President, on account of the attack on the Chesapeake.—On the meeting of Congress, it was stated in the message, "that an armed vessel of the U. States was dispatched with instructions to our minister in London to call on that government for the satisfaction and security required by the outrage. A very short interval ought now to bring the answer, which shall be communicated as soon as received."—This notification, on the part of the Executive, suspended all proceedings on the affair of the Chesapeake; and information being shortly afterwards received of the appointment of Mr. Rose as minister extra to the U. States, the measures which might have been adopted were left the issue of his mission. In the month of October, 1807, the Horizon, an American ship, bound from G. Britain to Lima, wrecked within the territorial jurisdiction of France, was condemned under an exposition of the Berlin decree, extending to the high seas its operation against neutrals. "In Dec. 1807, a copy of the decree in the case of the Horizon, was received from our minister at Paris by the President, who, aware of the consequences which would follow that new state of things, communicated immediately to Congress, the alteration of the French decree, and recommended an Embargo, which was accordingly laid on the 22d of Dec. 1807, at which time it was well understood in this country, that the British Orders of Council of November preceding had issued, altho' they were not officially communicated to our government.—These aggressions would have justified war against both France and England. It was tho't, however, more eligible in the first instance by withdrawing our vessels from the ocean, to avoid war at least for a season, and at the same time to match our immense and defenceless commerce from impending destruction."

(Vide Report Com. on Foreign Relations.)

Power was vested in the President to suspend or remove the Embargo, in the event of such a change in the decrees and orders of the belligerents as would render our commerce secure. No change, however, took place—The embargo continued until the next session of Congress—during that session it was repealed; the Non Intercourse law adopted as a substitute, and so amended as to exclude the armed vessels of both G. Britain and France.—This law contained a provision authorising the President, on the withdrawal, either by G. Britain or France, of their edicts infringing the neutral rights of the U. States, to suspend the operation of the law as to the power so revoking its unlawful edicts. On this occasion, the British government, through its accredited minister, Mr. Erskine, tendered reparation for the attack on the Chesapeake, and stipulated a withdrawal of their decrees and orders on a certain day. The pledge of their minister was promptly met by the President of the U. States, an extra session of Congress convened, and Non Intercourse law taken off as respected G. Britain, and enforced against France. This arrangement solemnly entered into by their accredited minister Mr. Erskine, a man whose reputation has never been assailed, was disavowed by the British Government on the ground that he had violated his instructions. At the ensuing session of Congress, a new modification of the Non Intercourse law took place, under which the President was authorised to carry into effect its provisions against the power continuing its edicts after a revocation by either. France accepted the conditions held out by the law—the Berlin & Milan Decrees are revoked, so far as respects the U. States. The other subjects of difference, viz: the spoliations on our commerce, will probably be adjusted, as negociations are still depending. With the British government, negociation has failed: That government continues to persevere in a system which directly assails the Independence of the nation; reduces us to worse than colonial bondage; excludes from market four fifths of our Tobacco, two thirds of our Cotton and a large portion of our flour and other staples. After six years of forbearance, under injuries which no nation but one warmly attached to peace could have borne, our government has declared war. If a majority of the people of this district approve of the course pursued by the government, and determine to support it, it will be grateful to my feelings to be their Representative; as, in the discharge of my duty, I should be pursuing the dictates of conscience and judgment.

With these sentiments, I make you a tender of my services as your Representative in Congress; and if honored with your confidence, will endeavour to discharge, with fidelity, the duties of the station.

With sentiments of respect,
I am your Fellow Citizen,
JOHN W EPPES.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER

No. III.

Among the misrepresentations that party violence has propagated, the allegation that the present war with Great Britain is an *offensive war* is not the least flagrant. It is, moreover, an allegation, that, in proportion to its falsehood, demands reprehension.—With whatever professions it may be urged, it is, notwithstanding, intended to shake the confidence of the people in the government, to make them believe that the war is undertaken without adequate cause, that the motive of our rulers is not the defence of our rights or the protection of our interest, but ambition, false glory, aggrandisement. As the ascription of such motives is a base libel, totally destitute of foundation, originating with men who know its untruth, those who propagate it deserve an unqualified detestation, and more especially those, who from the high political stations they occupy are bound by the most sacred obligations to maintain by every means in their power the character of their government.

What! shall these malcontents dare to tell us, that the solemn step taken against Great Britain, after the insults and injuries she has heaped upon us for near thirty days, is not in *defence* of our violated rights and outraged honor, but is a wanton attack upon her, merely because it is our purpose, after having exhausted every hope of an amicable arrangement, to touch her, in the first instance, in her most vulnerable point? Do the laws of just defence among individuals require the aggressed to retort upon the aggressor the identical kind of blow he has received? If a man of a small stature is pugilistically assaulted by one of gigantic strength, is it forbidden to the former to use in his defence the sword or the musket? If the mid night robber approach my house, may I not, in my own defence, give him the first blow before he has broken my locks and entered it? If a person with whom I have dealings cheats me of *my property* and transfers it to another, may I not, without the reproach of attacking his rights, legally seize upon *his property*, and through it obtain an indemnity? If these are the plain, imprescriptible, hallowed principles of equity and law between man and man, in cases where rights and interests have an individuality of character, shall they be disallowed to large communities, in whose general interests, personal rights and local limited concerns are necessarily in a great degree merged?

Let us put the case in plain terms—We have citizens, ships and merchandise; Britain has colonies. For thirty years, Britain seizes, incarcerates, lacerates our citizens and, worse than all, compels them to aid not only in fighting her enemies, but in enslaving and oppressing their citizens. She likewise seizes our ships sailing on the common domain of nations, carries them, with the goods they contain, into her ports, condemns and applies both to the gratification of her own appetites. We solicit redress. It is withheld. Our request assumes the tone of remonstrance, but without avail. We demand, still however in respectful terms, that the persons of our citizens may be respected, and our rights to property regarded on the high seas—upon those high seas, which for our use are as much ours as the air we breathe. But this tyrant of the ocean, hypocritically canting about national honor and liberty, with the depravity of the highwayman without his sincerity, proceeds in her career of insolence and robbery. She, indeed, sometimes promises, but never performs. Her promises seem only intended to shew that she can be as perfidious as she is tyrannical. She proceeds in seizing our citizens, in capturing our ships—why?—Because *we are not strong enough* on the ocean to prevent her; and she does all this without cause; she does it, too, while with our redundant crops we are feeding her armies and supplying her manufactories——And now, forsooth, the despicable apologists of her injustice, because in returning her blow when further forbearance would sink us in irretrievable disgrace, we contemplate the invasion of her adjacent territory, charge us with waging offensive war. And they address themselves to our sympathy, our generosity, our magnanimity! Have, say they, the people of Canada given you any offence? Why then attack them? Why, we may in our turn, ask our interrogators, why attack the innocent soldiers who compose the armies of your enemy? Explore her wide domains, and you shall not find a set of men whose hearts are freer from hostility to you, or who have in thought, word or deed, done you less injury; and yet, without a pang of conscience, you can proceed murderously to put them to death. Were it not too harsh language to apply to any body of men, we should be tempted to say that these men presented the solecism of acting like dishonest men and talking like fools. What is war? Is it not that dire appeal to force, in which, for some end, one whole people are arrayed against another, and in which the whole physical force is called forth?—Does it not belong to its very essence to embark the active community in one common cause, to cast fell swoop to involve in the same fate the innocent and the guilty?——Humanity deplores it. Reason incessantly strives to avert it. But, once entered upon, the chief, if not only consideration is how one nation can do the other the most harm. The means are dreadful; but they are in a war sanctified by the end, which is, as we have already said, a safe and honourable peace.

If then Britain has driven us into a declaration of war; if the step was unavoidable; once taken, we are bound to use our force in that way in which she will most feel it, and our rulers would be madmen or traitors did they not attack her in her most sensible point. If that point be Canada, and that province be occupied by our arms, the act of occupation is as strictly defensive in its nature as if we took the very frigates that seized our merchantmen and enslaved our sailors. For the frigate is not a whit more the property of our enemy then Canada; and in defending or avenging our violated rights, whatever appertains to her, whether persons, effects, or territory, are equally legitimate objects of War. CATO.

PUBLIC NOTICE.

Certain sentiments having been within a few days published as from a *town meeting* of this town; a meeting of all such citizens as are not disposed to have those go to the world as the sentiments of the citizens of the town *generally*, are requested to meet at the Market House, at 4 o'clock to morrow evening, to take the same into consideration.

Georgetown 14th Aug. 1812.

(Nat. Intel.

TOWN MEETING.

At the time assigned by the above notice, and for the purpose therein signified, as numerous and as respectable a portion of the citizens as ever were assembled met—and

On motion, it was determined, that *Thomas Corcoran*, Mayor take the chair—and

John Lockerman, be appointed Secretary.

On motion, it was further agreed, that the chairman select a committee: And accordingly the following gentlemen were designated:

James S. Morsell, chairman of the committee, Charles A. Beatty, Abner Ritchie, Daniel Reintzel, Thomas L. M'Kenney, Ninian Magruder, William S. Nichols, George Magruder, Thomas T. Gantt, Nicholas Hedges, Vincent King, Daniel Bussard, Joel Brown, Charles A. Burnett.

The committee after having retired, returned with the following resolutions, which, being put to the vote, unanimously passed.

Resolved, That we have seen with surprize & regret the proceedings of some of our fellow townsmen, lately published as those of the citizens of this town; that we highly disapprove of many of the sentiments there declared, and that we protest against the manner in which they have been conveyed to the public as the result of a town meeting;

Because it is well known that at the meeting held at the Union Tavern on the 7th inst. there were present but few persons of the town; not exceeding thirty.

Because, however, deeply stricken with the distressing circumstances that have lately taken place in the city of Baltimore, as we certainly are, and however we may deprecate the lawless and violent doings of mobs at all times and at all places, as we certainly do, we are by no means prepared to excuse or to palliate the lawless and violent proceedings of men, whatever may have been their stations in society, who could associate, officer and arm themselves, long and secretly before hand for the purpose of taking the law into their own hands to the terror of the people—

Because we can by no means consider those who are by the late meeting designated "a little band of supporters, &c." as employed in a praiseworthy work and although we are compelled to reflect with "wonder"! how men could permit themselves thus to be arrayed for battle by fortifying and garrisoning a house in the midst of a populous city, without the knowledge or permission of the civil authority, warned too by one of their own friends, "that this you know the law will not permit, that instead of protecting the laws, it would be violating them." We can view with no "*delight*" the manner in which they attempted to execute their purpose.

Because we do not assent to the insinuation, that the civil power of a neighboring city on the late melancholy occasion, did, either through lukewarmness or timidity, suffer social rights to be invaded or destroyed—and that we abhor the doctrine that on any occasion of tumult those who may call themselves "the virtuous and the brave of society" shall take upon themselves to act independently of the civil authority and to assume the power at their own will of protecting those rights, thereby inviting resistance equally lawless, by trampling themselves the first on the very rights they would pretend to protect.

Resolved, That any legal investigation, (it is to be presumed) is going on as to the authors of the events, and the actors in the scenes lately exhibited at Baltimore, which have so outraged humanity, and spread distress in the bosom of families, we deem it improper that any assemblage of persons should undertake to prejudge the case—that we therefore refrain from giving any opinion, as to the cause or the effect on this lamentable occasion; or from expressing our feelings as to the blood unfortunately spilled on either side.

Resolved, That at the same time that we, equally with any of our fellow citizens, value most highly as the palladium of civil and political liberty, the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, and that we protest as strongly against all violence of mobs or despotic power to restrain the one or the other—we can never approve or countenance words or writings which go to insult and calumniate individuals to excite the angry passions and thereby to break up the harmony of society, or which by a habit of arraigning the motives of legislators, and of villifying the magistrates tend inevitably to bring the law into disrepute and lessen the respect due to those appointed to execute them:—since such a state of things is but too well calculated to lead to anarchy, commotion and domestic violence.

Resolved That we are entirely confident of the good sense, the regular habits, and the peaceable disposition of the great majority of our fellow townsmen, and of their magistrates and of the civil power, in every shape, and that we have not the smallest apprehension of the commission or outrage among us; but if unfortunately such circumstance should take place, we pledge ourselves promptly to obey the civil power, and firmly to encounter every risk of life and fortune to support them in their authority, and to aid them in suppressing every species of violence and disorder; but as good citizens, we ought not, and we will not assume to ourselves the singular or unwarrantable pretension of deciding, while the civil power is, or is not, too slow to redress a wrong—much less of rallying around what we in our individual characters, may at any time and particularly at a moment of heat and irritation, undertake to determine to be the law, independent of the decision of the magistrates.

We will stand or fall with the law, as expounded, and as ordered to be executed, by those who may be regularly set over us according to the excellent principles of our beloved republican government.

Resolved, That the aforegoing resolutions be published in the National Intelligencer, and in the newspapers of George Town.

THOMAS CORCORAN, Chair'n,
JOHN LOCKERMAN, Secretary.

George Town, Aug. 15, 1812.

THE FEDERAL PARTY.

It is most truly surprising that the federalists, as a political party, should so far adhere to the *minor* leaders among them, as to decline the lofty ground which they might occupy, to place themselves in a situation which must, sooner or later, totally degrade them.

The men who now attempt to direct their course, are obviously *new* men——Such are Messrs. Quincy, Gold, Lewis and others, who have so great reputation for intelligence or prudence; and are all individuals, who are rather *seeking* a name than such as have already acquired a standing. Messrs. Lloyd, Bayard and Goodrich; King, Wolcott and Pinckney, are, in general sentiment, favorable to the war. You cannot find *their* names among the *protesting minority*, nor among *disorganizing conventionalists*. Mr. Pickering, who, from passions, always was, and always will be a *boy*, is no exception to the remark. He has never been regarded as a pillar of the federal party; and has only been upheld, as men like Wagner and Hanson are, for the inflammatory qualities of his mind.

By the documents which the President has laid before Congress, and particularly those recently published relative to *impressment*, it is manifest, that it has been in the power of the federal party to place themselves before the public as the champions of American rights. And, really, it is extraordinary that they should, wantonly abandon the ground which Washington, Wolcott, M'Henry and Stoddert took *in cabinet*, and run into the other extreme, openly advocating British interests! There is *one* way, and only one, of accounting for this curious and humiliatic desertion of old principles. Quincy,