

THE MINERVA.

ONE & A HALF DOLLS. PER
ANNU. Payable in 1 Year.

PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

TWO DOLLS PER ANN.
Payable in Advance.

Vol. 11.]

RALEIGH, (N. C.) MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 1806.

[No. 538.]

From the Charleston Courier.

THE OBSERVER.....No. V.

The whole business of the unfortunate *Louisiana* purchase has been a fruitful source of embarrassment, expence, and dishonor to this country, and will forever be a deep stain on the JEFFERSON administration.

We have seen developed the President's dark design on the constitution, and on the rights of the people, to pledge without authority, *two millions* of dollars of the public money; this is not all—it is but one of the many evils arising out of that calamitous transaction; having made a most absurd contract for an *undefined* and *undescribed* territory, having wantonly contracted an enormous debt of *fifteen millions* for a title full of *flaws* and difficulties, of which he was *warned* at the time, over and over again by the federalists in Congress; having rashly and obstinately persisted in completing the contract, before a good title was obtained, (which might then have been easily secured by withholding the delivery of the funded stock,) he is now driven to the disgraceful necessity of *bribing* the French government with a douceur of *two millions more*, to *compel* Spain to complete the title, and include in the bargain, in which the President's *will* was *supinely* asserted to have been *entangled* and *enmeshed* within the *treacherous* purchase. These same journalists have now the bare-faced assurance to attempt to *allay* a hitherto too credulous public, by simulating, and ever applauding this ignominious *treachery*, calling it by a profusion of terms, a fair contract, entered into by two independent nations, for the acquisition of a valuable territory at a reasonable price. But a judicious, enlightened and free people, however infatuated they may have been for a short period, will yet, now their eyes are fully opened to the truth, be no longer caught, either by the artifices and seductive representations of bad rulers, or the glosses and colourings of their hirelings and advocates.

The history of the *two millions* has been

fully in the Chief magistrate, employed in sending a *secret Message* to Congress, recommending one set of measures, and at the same time instructing *confidential* agents to promote another set of measures, totally repugnant to the former, and authorizing those agents to notify his *private wife* to be in favour of the latter. This charge has been boldly made, and most ferociously attempted to be repelled, as appears by extracts from the following speeches of Messrs. Randolph and Virginia, published in the *Times* of the 16th of May—“In my opinion (says Mr. R.) it is of the first importance that the *Message* should be published, from a material fact which took place in this house. A member in his place, told you, that the cattle recommended by a particular individual, was *conscient* *to the right wishes of the people*. I did then represent that language as the most *uncertain*, *old* and *reputable* ever uttered on this floor. I did believe that the people of the United States possessed *as free* a constitution as the *Bantu* people, and I had hoped freer, and I knew that such language had, in the *Bill for Parliament* brought forward a vote of censure. I then reproached this *bad man's* *language*—this *bad conduct*—the tendency *and influence* of the *agents* and *newspapers*, and *especially* in *advice* to *the King*. I shall always reprobate such language, and consider it unworthy of *any man* in holding a seat in this house. I had always before flattered myself that it would be a thousand years hence before our institutions would have given birth to *these *bad men's* *bad* *parties**. I did not expect them at this time of day, and I now declare it important that the message should be published.

The history of the *two millions* has been disclosed, and fills every honourable and independent citizen with amazement and disgust. It has been publicly announced, "that the President was ~~com~~ ^{about} to give this money to France, and that the Secretary of State was to devoid of those sentiments which should fill the soul of the minister of a free nation, proud of his honor, as to avow that *France had given us the vote and that it might be used*." John Randolph has explicitly declared this in Congress; his remarkable elevation has appeared in our public prints, it will be broadcast forth in every country in the world, where the English and French languages are read. What must be the poignant feelings of every true American, when he reads the following extract from John Ward Linn's speech, which was published in the *Advertiser* of the 16th of May:— "I with the heads of Department had ~~less~~ on this floor— were this the case, I would immediately propound this question to one of them (Madison)— Did you, sir, did you not, in your capacity of a ~~public~~ ^{private} functionary, that is, as a ~~public~~ ^{private} functionary, for ~~the~~ ^{your} benefit to tell Mr. [John] Randolph, that he wanted ~~to~~ ^{not} give her money or ~~to~~ ^{to} get ~~from~~ ^{from} France? and did ~~you~~ ^I say, that I was under ~~no~~ ^{any} ~~obligation~~, or ~~any~~ ^{any} ~~obligation~~ to Spain, but in ~~any~~ ^{any} ~~country~~?" Now, the degraded adulator of such an administration hide their dismally ~~decrepit~~ ^{disgraceful} behavior and confusion; for ~~it~~ ^{it} is ~~clearly~~ ^{plainly} composed of two parts:— 1. The Blackett ~~clerk~~ ^{adviser} of the Blackett ~~clerk~~ ^{adviser} ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~been~~ ^{been} offering a bribe to be exonerated from the menaces of France. 2. After offering to pledge the public ~~money~~ ^{money} in ~~aid~~ ^{aid} of that bribe, without delay, flatly, and in direct ~~disregard~~ ^{disregard} of the ~~law~~ ^{law}.

AN OBSERVER.

— 100 —

THE EGYPTIAN NO. VI.

* Two very serious difficulties are already
offered to the Executive of the United
States in having emanated from the la-
bel-*Loyalty* contract; the one a tame
inhibition to a palpable menace of France,
whereto the sum of two millions has

been extorted; the other, an attempt to coerce Congress into the grant of this money, by pledging it, before their meeting. For either of these flagrant violations of public duty an *impeachment* and *removal*, in *better times*, would have been a speedy punishment. But there still remains a *third head* of accusation, of a no less serious nature than the former, viz.—*Duplais* in the Chief Magistrate, displayed in sending a *secret Message* to Congress, recommending one set of measures, and at the same time instructing *confidential agents* to promote another set of measures, totally repugnant to the former, and authorising those agents to notify his *private will* to be in favour of the latter. This charge has been boldly made, and most feebly attempted to be repelled, as appears by extracts from the following speeches of Messrs. Randolph and Virginia, published in the *Times* of the 2d

the secret proceedings, to shew that the message of the President ought to be published, not only in justification of the report of the select committee which has been published, but in justification to the government itself. An attempt has been made in the public prints, and on this floor, to give a color to the proceedings of the House, when in concurrence, totally inconsistent with, and in opposition to truth.—It has been intimated that the minority were in favor of war; or by intimating that the majority were in favor of pacific measures, the inference has been drawn that the minority were in favor of war. The fact is this, and as the message of the President has been read as a part of the journal ordered to be published, as the speaker and clerk have attested, I will undertake to state what it contains unless prevented by the chair.

Mr. B. indicated. I will confine myself

Mr. Remond ph. I will certify myself then to flatly say that the division of territory in the House, was whether we should have a territorial accommodation of our differences with Spain, whether we should have a accommodation which did not merely fail Spain and us, or a modified accommodation which neither injured us or Spain, but France. A reference to the journals will show this to have been the principal difference that lay ~~laid~~ within the walls of this House, or elsewhere, in favor of war; for I beg leave to call attention to the committee to vindicate that the opinion of the majority of the select committee was that we should neither give or make war; but that we should defend the rights of the old United States and the territory acquired from Spain. What were the facts? Our army was dispersed in campements, God knows where... the country to be protected was but removed from any consideration by sending people away...a country which, from the circumstances in which it is placed, must be kept and held by military force. When the militia of the United States from the most corrupt motives to New Orleans were directed to take possession of the country, events proved that it could not be defended by militia, unless indeed by the militia of the Chickasaws, the Choctaws and Caddoaws. It is not only cut off from the populous part of the U. S. but is pro railed into the mouth of Mexico, and also surrounded by extensive rivers which do not admit of its

the high road to Paris. It was not because there was a party in the House induced to the most violent acquisition of the Floridas, but because there was a party induced to require them at the expense of the national treasure and honor, that opportunity is given to the measures you have taken. No, sir, we were not for war, we were for peace—for acting on true policy, on the principle of taking firmer ground than has been taken—that ground which we thought was called for; and not for endeavoring to curry favor with one of the European powers by throwing our weight in her scale, and thus making a cause of quarrel with another nation during a pending negotiation. This is the fact. We told gentlemen, that, after France had told, if you give Spain one blow I will give you ten or two. I do not recollect which—after she had told you that your claims against Spain must be abandoned—after she had in the most insulting and degrading manner, interfered in our differences with Spain—that under those circumstances to put money into the hands of France was not only a violation of your neutrality with Great Britain; but that they would subsequently taken towards G. Britain was a most flagrantly accommodation to the wishes of France, in order, by putting on a hostile attitude to Britain to curry favor with the Emperor of France; and which was not demanded by the situation of our affairs with G. Britain.

What is our true policy? To take part

What is our no-policy? To take part with neither of those nations—to let neither of them finger one dollar of our money—to resist the unjust pretensions of all. This policy we have abandoned, and what is the consequence? The national honor has received a stain which all the waters of the Potomac cannot wash out. It is on the page of history, and cannot now be taken off. The nation is stigmatised. It has received a blot, which all your Indian rubber cannot efface.

But has it been represented that I took part with the Spanish against the American government in relation to the disputed territory, between the Perdido and the Mississippi. I took part so far as this: I did not wish to see the American honor sacrificed in a contest with Spain. I took part so far, as to be called a Spanish partisan by some gentlemen, while others charged me with being willing to kindle a war with Spain. I stat-

There is another view of the subject. Against Spain, with whom we had tried the fair experiment of negotiation, and which had totally failed, we took no manly attitude; while we reserved all our energy for G. Britain, and determined to coerce her by prohibiting the importation of her munitionery. Yes, against Spain, when our negotiations had totally failed, and under circumstances of disgrace to the U. S. we took no manly ground, but begged her to take money; while with G. Britain, with whom negotiation had not failed, while a negotiation was depending we declared ourselves in favor of taking a decisive and hostile attitude.—Here is the real difference of opinion. In the other it had been tried and failed. But that is not all. Because we bought Louisiana from France, it was contended that we should be followed the old precedent by