

MINERVA; or, ANTI-JACOBIN.

Two & a half DOLL PER ANNU. Payable half Yearly.

PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNU. Payable in Advance.

Vol. 9.]

RALEIGH, (N. C.) MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1804.

[No. 439.]

From the New-York Herald.

FEDERAL MISREPRESENTATIONS.

Under this head the despicable Maniken who prints the government paper at Washington, has been occasionally ornamenting its columns for a long time past, with a series of the most impudent attempts to abuse the public credulity, that modern days have witnessed. He is one of those fellows who approach you under the guise of candour and moderation, but while he fawns about you with a smirk on his countenance, will do you the most serious injury. — A few months past, under the head of "Federal Misrepresentations," he had the assurance to contradict the relation in the Evening-Post of Mr. Jefferson's public exhibition of himself at the festival of the Mammoth loaf. I immediately called on a respectable member of Congress, who happened to be in town, to shew him Smith's paper and to ascertain whether my first information had been correct. He confirmed almost every particular, and when I expressed my surprise that any one could be found who would call in question what had passed before his own face and in the presence of more than an hundred witnesses, his reply was, "Why, Sir, this Smith, under the semblance of softness and moderation, is as great a liar as Duane himself, though he wants the brass to carry it through in the same shameless manner. His management, in relation to the speeches of the federal side of the House, is beyond all endurance." But though I was thus prepared to expect every thing bad from Mr. Jefferson's editor, I did not suppose that his baseness was fully equalled by his folly, as I have since found in. He is such a lick-spittle to Mr. Jefferson, that whenever it becomes, in his opinion, advisable to sacrifice himself to serve his patron, he hesitates not a moment to do so. The following instance, among others, will make this apparent—

In the Evening Post of the 16th of July, we introduced an extract from an Address to the King of Great Britain, which was drawn up and presented in Sept. 1775. In this paper the addressers professed the most sincere attachment to His Majesty's person, family, and (monarchical) GOVERNMENT; they deplored, as the greatest misfortune, every event that might tend to weaken the ties that connected Great Britain with America, and ardently desired that the former harmony between the said monarchy & her colonies might be restored; they particularly hoped that His Majesty's name might be transmitted to posterity "adorned with that signal and lasting glory that has attended the memory of those illustrious personages whose virtues and abilities have exalted states from dangerous convulsions, and by securing happiness to others, have erected the most noble and durable monument to their own fame;" concluding with the strongest assurances that His Majesty would find "his faithful subjects ready and willing at all times, with their lives & fortunes, to assert and maintain the rights and interests of His Majesty, and the mother country."

This extract it may be recollected was made principally with the view to expose the impropriety of continuing to make the reading of the Declaration of Independence, a part of the exercises of our annual festival. It was observed that in our opinion, it was hardly consistent with the professions of loyalty and the acknowledgements contained in the above address to declare within a few months afterwards that "the history of the present King of Great Britain, was a history of repeated injuries & usurpations," &c. But admitting that the peculiar circumstances of the times might justify this, still we did not accede to the propriety of repeating it once every year for the purpose of keeping alive animosities & resentments against a nation with whom we were now at peace and connected by treaties. We then in a separate paragraph, attempted to shew that Mr. Jefferson particularly, was chargeable with the inconsistency above mentioned. We said that we "suspected" that it was he who penned the address to the King, but that "at any rate it was signed by him in his own hand writing," for which we referred the reader to the public records of the country; and as his friends claimed for him the exclusive credit of having draughted the Declaration of Independence, which was done only ten months after the above address, it was for him to reconcile if he could the language of the two instruments. Not long afterwards Mr. Saucybox Smith comes out with the following contradiction under the head of "New-Series of Federal Misrepresentations."

"Sick" (yes, cursed lick, I dare say) of the unceasing falsehoods and misrepresentations with which the federal papers swarm, we determined to abandon, at least for a time, the detection of what we hoped had been disarmed of its capacity of doing injury. In this purpose we probably should have persisted but for the daring effrontery of the following libel on a citizen, whom the high station he holds, no less than the dignity of his mind, forbid to notice the low falsehoods by which his reputation is assailed."

Then followed the Evening Post paragraph at full length, that the stroke might be more completely a knock down blow. After which Smith proceeds thus—

"It is on the authority of a friend of Mr. Jefferson, who has long enjoyed his confidence, and acted with him in many of the important scenes of the revolution, that we are enabled to declare,

"That it is false that Mr. Jefferson ever DREW such a paper as is there ascribed to him."

"And that it is likewise false that he ever signed such a paper drawn by another."

As soon as this appeared, one of our morning papers, with the praiseworthy disposition to preserve the American history from being contaminated with falsehoods, very obligingly informed the public of the detection made by the editor of the National Intelligencer, and cautioned the future historian against adopting the error of the Evening Post. Doubtless the design was good, and we hope the same candor and love of truth will now induce the editor of that paper to take notice of the circumstance once more, for he has not yet done it, and inform his readers that he was a little too hasty in his former remarks. Next, all the Democratic papers throughout the United States republished Smith's detection, and the Aurora grinned a malignant smile in his editorial paragraphs for more than a week. With what color of truth Smith contradicted me, will now be seen—

Extracts from Foote's edition of the Journal of Congress.

"June 3, 1775. Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to draught a petition to the King."...Vol. 1 p. 106.

[The names of this committee are not mentioned] "June 19, 1775. The Committee appointed to prepare a petition to the King, reported a draught of one, which was read."—p. 115.

"June 21, 1775. Mr. Thomas Jefferson appeared as a Delegate for the Colony of Virginia, and produced his credentials, which were read and approved."—p. 116.

"July 4, 1775. The petition to the King being again read, after some debate, the further consideration of it was deferred till tomorrow."—p. 135.

"July 5, 1775. The Congress then resumed the consideration of the petition to the King, and the same being debated by paragraph, was agreed to, and ordered to be engrossed."

[Here follows the petition itself from which our extract was made.]

"July 8, 1775. The petition to the King being engrossed, was compared at the table, and signed by the members present." p. 139.

[Then follows the petition—An exact copy of this petition may be found in Dodley's Annual Register, for 1775. Vol. 18 p. 262 &c.]

This petition is entitled "the second petition from the General Congress in America to his Majesty, and has the following certificate prefixed to it.

The following is a true Copy of the Petition from the General Congress in America to his Majesty, which we delivered to Lord Dartmouth the first of this month, and to which his Lordship said no answer would be given. September 4, 1775."

"RICHARD PENN,
ARTHUR LEE."

Among the other signatures to the Petition are the following:

"Virginia. P. Henry, junior; R. Henry Lee; Edmund Pendleton; Benjamin Harrison; Thomas Jefferson."

Before we could leave another and very different subject, to defend ourselves against the accusations and the sneers of Smith & his coadjutors, some one it seems informed from a respectable source, that the "federal misrepresentation" would certainly be proved to be a democratic falsehood; he therefore, on the 10th inst. comes forward, much in the graceful manner of a sniveling school boy; to acknowledge his error. But it had been well for him if the dread of the rod had induced him to do it in a suitable manner, and to ask pardon for the offence: he has not done so. Instead of this, he begins his recantation by meanly misquoting from the Evening Post, and attempting by a miserable quibble, to reply to his own garblings. His conduct is certainly too despicable for particular animadversion, but as it may not be amiss to

expose him for once at some length, we must be excused for devoting so much of our paper to so contemptible a trifler.

He acknowledges he pronounced it false that Mr. Jefferson ever drew or signed the address in question; the last of which only as the reader perceives had been asserted in the Evening Post, while the former had been merely mentioned as a conjecture.—Smith repenting this assertion, now says, "the substance of it is true, but the form erroneous." And now, you begin to wonder, gentle reader, is the ingenious gentleman to make out this? The address, he admits, "was, as a matter of form signed by all the members and of course by Mr. Jefferson, there was therefore, (continued he) a verbal incorrectness in declaring that he did not sign it." He adds, "we make this statement, exclusively for the purpose of correcting a verbal error, which the distortion of party might here-after make an unjust use of." Yes, truly, here is a pretty strong "verbal error," Mr. Smith, in saying Mr. President did not sign a paper which you acknowledge he did sign. In this we agree with Master Manikin, and we will go further too, and say there is in this verbal error, substantial violation of the truth—such a violation as, when made knowingly and persisted in, a reverend clergyman once pronounced to be "a damnable lie," Mr. Smith. "The substance of our first declaration, says he, remains unshaken. Indeed the additional facts that we have stated confirm it." In other words, "our first declaration that Mr. Jefferson did not sign the paper, is confirmed by the fact that he did sign it." And this is what Smith calls logic, and candor, and truth.

Oh! rare Samuel Smith!

LATEST from EUROPE.

CHARLESTON, August 30.

By the brig John & James, capt. Shearman, which arrived at this port yesterday, in 42 days from Liverpool, we have been favored with London papers to the 14th of July. Our dates, from the 5th to the 13th, are irregular.

It is stated that Bonaparte was to be crowned emperor of the French at Lyons, and that the Pope was to perform the ceremony of coronation. Bonaparte had been occupied in visiting several military institutions; but had returned to Paris.

The accounts from Holland indicate that every thing was in readiness for the long talked of invasion—but the English papers suggest an opinion that the measure will never be attempted, and suppose Buonaparte will make advances, in order to prepare the way for being quieted in his present authority. Dates of the 13th say that rumours of peace were in circulation in London, but that they could not be traced to any source which commanded credence.

Of the reported engagement between the English and French fleets, off Toulon, we see nothing further than a French account that Admiral Nelson quitted the station on the appearance of the French fleet! and an English account, that the French fleet did not dare to go beyond the protection of their batteries; but were, notwithstanding, attacked by the English, on which they immediately retired into Toulon.

The slave trade abolition bill has been negatived in the House of Lords.

Sir Sidney Smith was recovering from his late illness, and was expected soon to resume his former command.

A variety of accounts, it was said, tended to confirm the opinion that the arrangements making by Russia were hostile to France.

It was reported that the King of Prussia had, by the demand of Bonaparte, written a second letter to Louis XVIIIth, with proposals to resign his claims to the throne of France; but that unfortunate Prince had given no other answer, than that he would send a copy both of his Prussian Majesty's letter, and that of Monsieur Buonaparte, which accompanied it, to Petersburg.

The Pope's minister had been ordered to quit the court of Russia.

It is stated that Gen. Moreau intends leaving France for America; all that we have met with, in the papers received, on this subject, will be found under the London head.

A London paper of June 29, states, the King's physicians have pronounced his perfect recovery, in consequence of which all the dispatches received from abroad during his indisposition, have been laid before him; and all the foreign ministers had been admitted to his presence.

The following is extracted from a London paper of July 6:—A private letter from Paris, dated June 21, says, "The American Minister, Livingston, has returned with good bills, for fifteen millions of livres; but he was, notwithstanding, not received by Talleyrand in the manner he expected, after his financial and political expedition to England; because, more money and a better issue, were hoped for here. On Livingston's first conference, after his arrival here, he remained closeted with Talleyrand for six hours, and a courier was sent to the Emperor immediately afterwards, who ordered Talleyrand to wait upon his Majesty. The rumour of peace caused by Livingston's journey, was received with a satisfaction every where, not agreeable to the conquerors of England in petto; even the proud warriors on our coast began to express a desire of rather negotiating with, than combating the shop-keepers, because they began to think, from the intrigues of their Sovereign for a peace, that his means to destroy modern Carthage did not correspond with his desire. This has caused the paragraph in the *Moniteur*, denying what is very well known here, and which, a month ago, Government did not conceal, that Mr. Livingston was sent *pour sonder le terrain*, "to sound the Cabinet," as Talleyrand himself said. But what confirms the particulars of the mission of Mr. Livingston is, that another neutral Minister was asked to undertake it, but refused until he could obtain permission from his Court; regarding, as most politicians here do, these missions merely as intrigues, to lull England into a fatal security when the blow is intended to be struck."

PARIS, JULY 1.

The following are the expressions employed in the extraordinary Protest of the Count de Lille, against all that has been done, and is doing, in France, since the reunion of the States General:—

Protest of the Count de Lille.

Warsaw, June 8, 1804.

"In assuming the title of Emperor, and attempting to render it hereditary in his family, Buonaparte has put the seal to his usurpation. This new act of revolution, where every thing from its origin has been null and void, cannot weaken my rights; but being accountable for my conduct to all sovereigns, whose rights are not less injured than mine, and whose thrones are shaken by the dangerous principles which the Senate of Paris has dared to publish—accountable to France, to my family, and to my own honor, I should consider myself as betraying the common cause, were I to keep silence on this occasion. I declare then, after having renewed my protestations against all the illegal acts which, from the opening of the States General of France, have led to the alarming crisis in which France and Europe are now involved—I declare, in the presence of all the Sovereigns, that, far from acknowledging the imperial title that Bonaparte has received from a Body which has not a legitimate existence, I protest as well against that title as all the subsequent acts to which it may give birth."

LONDON, JULY 13.

The gradual rise of the funds for some days has revived the rumours of peace.—These rumours are not founded on any known fact; they rest entirely on speculation. It is the rise of the funds that occasion them, not they that occasion the rise of the funds. It is said that Buonaparte, seeing the impracticability, the folly of making any attempt to invade this country, will speedily make overtures of peace. If that impracticability and folly be admitted by a treaty for peace, if the Corsican usurper eats back his words, and confesses that England is capable of contending with France single handed; then the principal object of the war will be attained, and terms may be adjusted. By these terms, however, we trust Malta will be retained to this country; not so much for the value of the island, as that it may stand in proof that England comes out of the contest triumphantly. But it is idle to discuss the terms, as we are persuaded peace is not in the immediate contemplation of either government, and that to betray an impatience for it in England, would be the very way to lay the foundation of a new war should a speedy end be put to the present struggle. If it be true, as the coalition prints assert, that Mr. Pitt's object uniformly is to govern by dividing his opponents, by no step could he succeed more than by making peace. Mr. Fox would undoubtedly support any peace.