

published a decree bearing date April 28th, 1811, in which, reciting our obedience and loyalty in excluding British goods and admitting his, he declares *on that account* his decrees repealed so far as regards us. Thus giving in the face of the whole world the *lie direct*—the *lie without apology*—the *lie* without circumlocution to all the declarations of our government, as to the repeal of the French decrees in November, 1810—cutting up also by the roots the foundation of all our statutes against Great-Britain, the last of which was in March preceding the repeal of the French decrees, and which were founded on her refusal to believe the decrees repealed in November. The main reason for which we went to war with Great-Britain was, that she would not repeal her orders in three months after France repealed her decrees, which she was bound to believe took place in November, 1810. Now Bonaparte justifies her incredulity, and accuses Mr. Madison of rashness and folly.

The manner of doing this last act has something extremely wicked and suspicious on the face of it.—That Bonaparte, when so often urged and solicited to furnish the evidence of the repeal of the decrees, should have kept back, for 12 months, a decree affecting *only us*, and necessary to the vindication of his constant friends in America, is extraordinary. It matters not whether it existed at its date, or was antedated. In either case it was kept back till he was satisfied that we had come to the *striking point*. It was kept back until it was impossible it should produce an operation in England, and that operation be known here before the war. It was well known to France and America, that the word of Great-Britain had been pledged to repeal her orders in council as soon as France should repeal her decrees. It is a word never lightly given, and never forfeited. Can any man have charity to believe that this almost simultaneous repeal of the decrees—of the orders in council, and of the declaration of war, was the effect of accident? In short that it was not the “result,” as Tureau says, “of other measures which the two governments have continued to take against the common enemy?”

Let any doubting man look at the Emperor’s publick declaration in March last, that “his decrees should be the fundamental laws of his empire, until the principles of the treaty of Utrecht, shall be recognized by Great-Britain.”

Let him look at the refusal of our government, to make even an *armistice*, after the total repeal of the orders in council and all other blockades.

Then let him say whether this war is not a fulfilment of the reiterated demands of France, to enter into the coalition.

Let him consider how admirably it was timed for the interest of France—how it cooperates with her views upon Russia and Spain, by making a serious diversion of the British forces at this most critical juncture, which the world has seen for 20 years, and then let him soberly ask himself, whether the war is carried on for French or American interest?