pretended to suppose that the decree had limits, were not the proper persons to pronounce upon it.

Let Mr Jefferson answer these arguments. Let him shew that he has even remonstrated against French and Spanish violences on neutrals. Still more; let him shew that he has retaliated on account of them as he has retaliated against England. He well knows that he neither prohibits the entry of French goods, nor the entry of French vessels of war; and if the Embargo is made a general one, it should be remembered, that it would be useles against England, were it otherwise; because England, in case of open trade, would get the supplies she might need, in defiance of our opposition, either under the name of shipments to the French, or as real or collusive prizes to her cruizers, or on the well known principle of forcible preemption. The French in the west Indies, accordingly, well understand the trick, and in a publick decree, call the Embargo a new proof of the friendship of the United States. When Mr. Armstrong foretold an Embargo, he was a prophet of the safe kind; foretelling that which he probably knew; for he might have known, if it were so, that the Embargo was settled with those, whose will would govern. Thus, whether France wants money or wants an Embargo, France must have it.

Our numerous writers on the law of nations ought to recollect, that if the United States are ever to take a lead in maritime affairs, they will require the use of the same principles now asserted by England, because the only mode in which a country with many seamen and a small regular army can attack its enemies, will be by distressing their trade. And let it be added, that when they look to commercial precedents as a rule for the present day, they ought to say, when they have found in history, that all the kingdoms of Europe have been united against one. A world then divided into two parts, with an impetucus chief at the head of one of the parts, is a new case, which refuses to be tried strictly by old rules. And if