A Proclamation.—Is not here, I may be asked, a proclamation that issued to which he alluded, or he would not have made this inquiry, it nothing is necessary to show the thoughts that contributed to his part of the report, to which he alludes, to be examined, and understood? The proclamation which the gentleman read are therefore first, in his opinion, part of his report? "The Milan decree of 1807, that bill laws yet for its defence on the suppressed correspondence of the Ex. Ministers in the British orders of the preceding month, those those orders, which unquestionably have existed, and which were not even known in America at the date of the decree." The other paragraph, was in the 8th and 9th pages. "This, (the insertion of the counsel of prizes, &c.) was published on the day of December; and a copy of the decision in the case of the *Horsome* being at the same time reached government, the President, a view of the outrages which had said Fallon that we state of things continuated immediately to Congress the accounts of the Foreign Ministers and continuated the embargo, which was accordingly laid on the 22d December, 1807; a couple since it was well, considered in this country, that the British orders in council of November preceding and issued, although they were not officially communicated to our government." Now, all these statements have made, are, that on the day of the Milan decree, the orders of council of 11th of November were not known in America, and that when the embargo was laid it was well understood that they had issued. The Milan decree is dated on the 17th of January 1807, the embargo was laid on the 22nd of that month—five days afterwards. The question therefore is the report in that those orders of council were not known here to have issued on the 17th, but that on the 22nd of that month it was well understood they had issued. This is perfectly consistent with the statement, and was in fact the case, as I shall show by facts. It may, however, be proper here to observe, that in such a document as that before you, it would not have been consistent that those orders were known here, so as to require no one part any account of measures to be taken in regard to them, in order to avoid the charge of acquiescence in them being made by a third party until they were officially communicated to our government. On this ground issues in the report, "It states that "the Milan decree of 1807, and the orders of the British on the supposed acquiescence of the U. States in the British orders in the preceding month." &c. &c. I do never beyond a doubt that France had not such purpose in issuing the decree, we say, that so far from having acquiesced in those orders, they were not even known here at that time. The knowledge of them, here means, would properly be considered that they would result from an official communication of them to the government. This might with propriety be considered the intention of the report, and in that sense we have made acquiescence in those orders, until the 22d of February 1808, when they were officially communicated by Mr. Erskine. But in the present instance it is not necessary to resort to this construction to justify the measure in the report, "I acordingly to the ordinary meaning of the term, the expression of the report, and in that sense we have made acquiescence in those orders, until the 22d of February 1808, when they were officially communicated by Mr. Erskine."