

embargo to vindicate the rights or the honor of the nation, its maintenance is deemed of the first importance to the administration, who have staked their reputation upon it. Hence the unvaried efforts of the administration and their partisans to impress the belief, that the British orders in council were the principal cause of the embargo. For they see that the documents originally laid before Congress as the cause, are utterly insufficient. But if those orders were the cause, the great, the primary cause, "before which all other motives sunk into insignificance," it would seem to follow that the embargo must be continued until these orders are revoked.... Hence, sir, it appeared to me of the last importance to shew that the British orders in council were *not* the cause of the embargo; and impartial observers think I have shewn it, by *proving* that when the embargo was recommended by the President, those orders were in this country unknown. But as some gentlemen persist in asserting the contrary, and on that ground advocate the continuance of the embargo, with the reinforcement of the bill on our tables, and that to be followed, I suppose, with a non-intercourse law; ...I must be permitted to adduce some further proofs.

We have been gravely told that the French Emperor's Berlin decree, declaring all the British Isles in a state of blockade, could not be justified as a measure of retaliation against England, on account of her declaring in a state of blockade a certain extent of coast, the whole of which could not be invested and blockaded even by her powerful navy...because France had it not in her power to station a single ship before any one port in the British dominions: and that the Milan decree of 1807, can still less rest for its defence on the supposed acquiescence of the United States in the British orders of the preceding month, "since those orders, which have not certainly been acquiesced in, *were not even known in America at the date of the decree.*" Now gentlemen will be pleased to recollect, that the French Emperor's decree of Milan bears date on the 17th of December, 1807; and that on the very next morning, December 18th, came the President's message to both Houses of Congress, recommending the laying of an embargo.

Now, if the British orders were unknown in America on the 17th of December, what man of common sense will believe that the plan for imposing the embargo (a plan fraught with such extensive and terrible consequences) recommended by the President in the morning of the 18th, had for its basis the British orders in council, which were not known in America on the next preceding day? As I observed on a former occasion, even *four days* (the time which intervened between the arrival of the dispatches from France, by the *Revenge*, and the 18th of December, when the embargo was recommended) "gave little enough time to digest and mature such a plan. I now add, sir, that *that plan*, as far as it then went (and more was not then practicable) was conformable to the views and wishes of the French Emperor. I say further, sir, that should the strong bill now on our tables become a law, we shall have advanced one large stride further towards such conformity; and that when we concur in one other measure, a resolution for a *total non-inter-*