

Hartford, Nixinton, Elizabeth, Camden, c. h. Indiantown, Gurnetuck c. h. and Tulla creek to North Well bridge Va.

From Elizabeth to New Lebanon.

From Warrenton by Ransom's bridge, Sill's Bar, Nash c. h. Tarborough, Greenville, Washington, Bath, Woodstock and Germanton to Lake Landing on Mattamuskeet.

From Halifax by Enfield, Mount Prospect to Farborough.

From R. Leigh to Nash c. h.

From Halifax by Scotland neck, Hamilton, Williamson, Jametown, Plymouth & Washington c. h. to Scuppernong.

From Raleigh by Smithfield, Waynesboro' Kingston and Newbern to Beaufort.

From Kington to Snowhill.

From Fayetteville by Sampson c. h. Duplin c. h. & south Washington to Wilmington.

From Fayetteville by Elizabethtown to Wilmington.

From Elizabethtown to March Castle.

IN TENNESSEE.

From Abingdon, Va. by Blountsville, R.sville, Roger'sville, Whitesides, Bean's Station, Rutledge, Knoxville, Campbell, Meredith, Kington, Hartley, Alexander, White plains, Cartage, Dixon's springs, Cairo, Gallatin, Hendersonville, Nashville, Franklin & Columbia to the Big spring.

From Blountsville by Jonesborough, Greenville, Cheek's cross roads and Danbridge to Knoxville.

From Jonesborough by Elizabethtown to Ash c. h. N. C.

From the Warm springs N. C. by Newport, Sevierville, Knoxville, Clinton and Chitwood to Pulaski, K.

From Newport by Cheek's cross roads, Bean's Station, Tazewell and Powell's valley to Cumberland gap.

From Knoxville by Mayville, Tellico, Amoy river, Vanstown, Turkeytown, near the junction of Koofe and Talpoole rivers, being the head of Alabama river to Fort Stoddert on the Mobile river M. T.

From Cartage to Lebanon.

From Cartage to Fort Blount.

From Nashville by Charlotte, Hickman c. h. and Humphreys c. h. to Charlotte.

From Nashville by Springfield to Russellville, K.

From Springfield by Port Royal, Clarksville and Palmyra to Stewart c. h. & from thence to Eddyville in the state of Ky.

From Kingston by Rhea c. h. Bledsoe c. h. Warrenton & Jefferson to Nashville.

From Wayne c. h. K. by Overton c. h. and White plain to White c. h.

From Bledsoe c. h. to Franklin c. h.

(To be continued.)

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

BY THE JOHN ADAMS.

London, February 19th, 1810.

SIR,  
I received on the 12th inst. by Mr. Powell, whom I had sent some time before to France, a letter from Gen. Armstrong, of which a copy is enclosed; and, keeping in view the instructions contained in your letter to me of the 11th of November last, I have written to Lord Wellesley, to enquire whether any, and if any, what blockades of France, instituted by Great Britain during the present war, before the 1st day of January, 1807, are understood here to be in force. A copy of my letter to Lord Wellesley is enclosed.

It is not improbable that this official enquiry will produce a declaration, in answer to it, that none of those blockades are in force; and I should presume that such a declaration will be received in France as substantiating, if not certifying, the condition announced to me by Gen. Armstrong.

I am not aware that this subject could have been brought before the British government in any other form than that which I have chosen. It would not, I think, have been proper to have applied for a revocation of the blockades in question, (at least, before it is ascertained that they are in existence) or to have professed, in my letter to Lord Wellesley, to found upon Gen. Armstrong's communication my enquiry as to their actual state. I have, however, supposed it to be indispensable (and have acted accordingly) that I should explain to Lord Wellesley, in conversation, the probability afforded by Gen. Armstrong's letter, that a declaration by this government, to the ef-

fect above mentioned, would be followed by the recall of the Berlin decree.

I cannot, perhaps, expect to receive from Lord Wellesley an answer to my letter, in time to send a copy by the John Adams now in the Downs or at Portsmouth; but I will send it by an early opportunity, and will take care that Gen. Armstrong shall be made acquainted with it without delay.—I have the honor to be, with great consideration, sir, your most obedient humble servant.

WM. PINKNEY.

P. S. March 23, 1810.—Since the writing of this letter Lord Wellesley has sent me the answer (of the 2d inst.) of which a copy is now enclosed. It was not satisfactory, and I pointed out its deficiencies to Lord Wellesley in conversation, and proposed to him that I should write him another letter requesting explanations. He assented to this course, and I have written him the letter of the 7th inst. of which also a copy is enclosed. His reply has been promised very frequently, but has not yet been received. I have reason to expect that it will be sufficient; but I cannot think of detailing the corvette any longer. The British packet will furnish me with an opportunity of forwarding it to you; and I will send Mr. Lee with it to Paris, by the way of Marlaix. I have the honor to be, &c.

WM. PINKNEY.

The Hon. R. Smith, &c.  
(COPY.)  
From General Armstrong to Mr. Pinkney  
Paris, 25 January 1810.

SIR,

A letter from Mr. Secretary Smith of the 1st of December last made it my duty to enquire of his Excellency the Duke of Cadore, what were the conditions on which His Majesty the Emperor would annul his decree, commonly called the Berlin decree; and whether, if Great Britain revoked her blockades of a date anterior to that decree, His Majesty would consent to revoke, the said decree? To these questions I have this day received the following answer, which I halten to convey to you by a special messenger.

ANSWER.

"The only condition required for the revocation by His Majesty the Emperor of the decree of Berlin, will be a previous revocation by the British government of her blockades of France or part of France (such as that from the Elbe to Brest, &c.) of a date anterior to that of the aforesaid decree."

I have the honor to be,

With very high respect &c.

(Signed) JOHN ARMSTRONG.

(COPY)

Great Cumberland Place.

February 15 1810.

MR. LORD,

In pursuance of the intimation which I had the honor to give to your Lordship a few days ago, I beg to trouble your Lordship with an enquiry whether any and if any, what blockades of France instituted by Great Britain during the present war, before the 1st day of January, 1807, are understood here to be in force. I am not able at present to specify more than one of the blockades to which this enquiry applies; namely that from the Elbe to Brest, declared in May, 1806, and afterwards limited and modified; but I shall be much obliged to your Lordship for precise information as to the whole.

I have the honor to be,

With the highest consideration,

My Lord

Your Lordship's most obedient

Humble servant,

(Signed) WM. PINKNEY.

The most noble

The Marquis Wellesley, &c. &c.

Foreign Office, March 2, 1810.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 15th ult. wherein you request to be informed whether any and if any, what blockades of France, instituted by Great Britain during the present war, before the 1st day of January, 1807, are understood by His Majesty's government to be in force? I have now the honor to acquaint you, that the coasts, rivers, and ports from the river Elbe to Brest, both inclusive, were notified to be under the restrictions of blockade, with certain modifications on the 16th of May, 1806; and that these restrictions were afterwards comprehended in the order of council of the 7th of

January, 1807, which order is still in force.

I have the honor to be with great consideration, sir, your most obedient humble servant.

(Signed) WELLESLEY.

William Pinkney, Esq.

(COPY.)

Great Cumberland Palace,

7th March, 1810.

MY LORD.—I have had the honor to receive your lordship's answer of the 2d inst. to my letter of the 15th of last month, concerning the blockades of France instituted by Great Britain during the present war before the first day of January, 1807.

I infer from that answer that the blockade notified by G. B. in May 1806 from the Elbe to Brest, is not itself in force, & that the restrictions which it established rest altogether so far as such restrictions exist at this time, upon an order or orders in council issued since the 1st day of Jan. 1807.

I infer also either that no other blockade of France was instituted by G. B. during the period above mentioned, or that if any other was instituted during that period, it is not now in force. May I beg your lordship to do me the honor to inform me whether these inferences are correct, and if incorrect, in what respects they are so.—I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, my lord, your lordship's most obedient humble servant.

(Signed) WM. PINKNEY.

Most noble marquis Wellesley, &c. &c.

Extract of a letter from Mr. Pinkney to Mr. Smith, dated March 27, 1810.

"I have the honor to enclose a copy of Lord Wellesley's reply to my letter of the 7th inst. respecting the British blockades of France before the Berlin decree. I do not think it of such a nature as to justify an expectation that Gen. Armstrong will be able to make any use of it at Paris; but I shall nevertheless convey to him the substance of it without delay."

Foreign Office, March 26, 1810.

SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th inst. requesting a further explanation of my letter of the 2d, concerning the blockades of France instituted by G. B. during the present war, before the first day of January, 1807.

The blockade notified by G. B. in May 1806, has never been formally withdrawn; it cannot therefore be accurately stated, that the restrictions which it established, rest altogether on the order of council of the 7th of January, 1807; they are comprehended under the more extensive restrictions of that order. No other blockade of the ports of France, was instituted by G. B. between the 16th of May, 1806, and the 7th of January, 1807, excepting the blockade of Venice, instituted on the 27th of July, 1806, which is still in force.—I beg you to accept the assurances of his consideration, with which I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient humble servant.

(Signed) WELLESLEY.

Wm. Pinkney, Esq. &c.

London, Monday 2d April, 1810.

SIR,—I had the honor to receive on Saturday last by Dr. Logan in the British packet your letters of the 20th Jan. and 16th Feb. I have only time to add that I am to see Lord Wellesley to-morrow.—I have the honor to be with great consideration, sir, your most obedient humble servant.

WM. PINKNEY.

The honble. Robert Smith, &c.

Copy of a letter from Gen. Armstrong to the Duke of Cadore, dated Paris 21st February, 1810.

The minister plenipotentiary of the U. States has the honor to submit to his excellency the Duke of Cadore the copy of a letter this instant received from Bayonne, and begs from him an explanation of the circumstances mentioned in it.

The ministerial dispatch under date of the 5th inst. is arrived at St. Sebastian, bearing an order for the immediate transportation in small vessels, of all the confiscated American cargoes at Bayonne, to be placed in the custom house there. This news is publick at St. Sebastian; but what is not so yet, is, that the same order says,

"That these cargoes are to be sent to Bayonne, whether the commodities of which they are composed may have come from English commerce, or from the produce of the soil of the United States.

"Sdly. That they should be sent to the custom house of that place to be sold there."

The minister plenipotentiary offers to his excellency the assurances of his high consideration.

(Signed) JOHN ARMSTRONG.

General Armstrong to Mr. Smith.

Paris, 18th February, 1810.

SIR.—I wrote a few lines to you yesterday, announcing the receipt and transmission of a copy of the Duke of Cadore's note to me of the 14th ult. After much serious reflection I have thought it best to forbear all notice at present of the errors, as well of fact as of argument, which is to be found in the introductory part of that note; to take the minister at his word; to enter at once upon the proposed negotiation, and for this purpose, to offer to him a project for renewing the convention of 1800. This mode will have the advantage of trying the sincerity of the overtures made by him; and perhaps of drawing from him the precise terms on which his master will accommodate. If these be such as we ought to accept we shall have a treaty, in which neither our rights nor our wrongs will be forgotten; if otherwise, there will be enough both of time and occasion, to do justice to their policy and our own, by a free examination of each.—I have the honor to be, sir, with very great respect, your most obedient and very humble servant.

(Signed) JOHN ARMSTRONG.

Honorable Robert Smith.

Extract of a letter to the same from the same, 10th March.

"I have at length received a verbal message in answer to my note of the 21st ult. It was from the minister of foreign relations and in the following words: 'His majesty has decided to sell the American property seized in Spain, but the money arising therefrom shall remain in the deposit.' This message has given occasion to a letter from me marked No. 22."

(No. 22.) Paris 10th March, 1810.

Sir, I had yesterday the honor of receiving a verbal message from your excellency, stating that "his majesty had decided that the American property seized in the ports of Spain should be sold, but that the money arising therefrom should remain in deposit."

On receiving this information two questions suggested themselves—1st. Whether this decision was, or was not, extended to ships, as well as to cargoes? and—2d. Whether the money arising from the sales which might be made under it, would, or would not be subject to the issue of the pending negotiation?

The gentleman charged with the delivery of your message not having been instructed to answer these questions, it becomes my duty to present them to your excellency, and to request a solution of them. Nor is it less a duty on my part to examine the ground on which his majesty has been pleased to take this decision, which I understand to be that of reprisal, suggested for the first time in the note you did me the honor to write to me on the 14th ult. In the 4th paragraph of this note it is said, that "his majesty could not have calculated on the measures taken by the U. S. who, having no grounds of complaint against France, have comprised her in their acts of exclusion and since the month of May last have prohibited the entry into their ports of French vessels, by subjecting them to confiscation."

It is true that the U. States have since the 20th of May last forbidden the entry of French vessels into their harbors—and it is also true that the penalty of confiscation attaches to the violation of this law. But in what respects does this offend France? Will the refusal to us the right of regulating commerce within our own ports? or will the deny that the law in question is a regulation merely municipal? Examine it both as to object and means—what does it more than forbid American ships from going into the ports of France, and French ships from coming into those of the U. States? And why this prohibition? To avoid injury and insult; to escape that lawlessness, which is declared to be a forced consequence of the decrees of the British council? If then its object be purely defensive, what are its means? Simply a law, previously and generally promulgated, operating solely within the territory of the U. States, and punishing alike the infractors of it, whether citizens of the said states, or others. And what is this but the exercise of a right, common to all nations, of excluding at their will