

From the Kentucky Advertiser
BIRMINGHAM
DEAR MAJOR: In compliance with your wishes expressed in yours of yesterday, it may not be improper to inform you, that in the fall of 1784, I made my place of residence in Lincoln county (now Mercer) where I have continued to live ever since. I think it was in 1782, not later than 1785, (but I think the former) I became a Deputy Sheriff in Lincoln, and acquainted with Col. Donalson and his family. The Colonel had then two daughters, young ladies, viz. Jane and Rachel, the latter of whom, I understand, is the lady of General Andrew Jackson.

Sometime shortly after my acquaintance in the family, Miss Rachel became the wife of Capt. Lewis Roberts, of the same county, who then lived in the family of his mother, a widow lady near Harrodsburg, where he brought his wife, and continued to live with her, in the family of his mother until some disagreement took place between the Captain and his wife, which resulted in a separation, and the Captain sent her to her father's, who, previous to that separation, and removed to the neighborhood of Nashville, Tennessee, as I was informed, and where I presume she first saw and became acquainted with Gen. Jackson. I never saw General Jackson in my life to my knowledge, nor have I any reason to believe, nor do I believe, that Mrs. Jackson ever was acquainted with the General until after her separation from Roberts and her arrival at her father's in Tennessee. Capt. Roberts obtained a special act of the Virginia Legislature for a divorce, I think in the fall of the year 1787, and prosecuted the same to judgment in the quarter Session of Mercer county, (of which court I was Clerk,) at the September term of said court, 1793. About that time Capt. Roberts married a Miss Winn, daughter of Mr. Thomas Winn, then, I think, of Edinville or Bardonia. I was much surprised when the separation took place between Capt. Roberts and his first wife, as previous to that affair, I had ever considered Mrs. Roberts, (now Mrs. Jackson,) a fine woman, and of irreproachable character. Upon an examination of the papers of the suit for the divorce aforesaid, I find nothing showing that the defendant had any kind of notice of the existence or progress of that suit. Should you consider any thing I have communicated, worth notice, you are at liberty to use it in any way you may think proper.

Your friend, &c.
THOS. ALLIN.
Maj. T. P. Moore.

GEN. RAY'S STATEMENT.
Harrodsburg April 13th, 1827.
DEAR SIR: In answer to your enquiries in relation to a publication in the last Spirit of '76, involving the character of Mrs. Jackson, in which I am referred to as being "one of the Jury" who found a verdict against her, I say that it is utterly untrue. I was well acquainted with Mrs. Jackson previous to her first marriage with Mr. Lewis Roberts, and for several years afterwards, and I can assure you she sustained an unblemished character, and was considered one among the first of our young ladies; her father Col. Donalson, being a man of the most respectable standing.

After her marriage with Mr. Roberts a disagreement took place between her and her husband, on account of a charge of immoral conduct on his part, and also his becoming jealous of a certain individual (not Gen. Jackson) which eventuated in her being compelled to return to her mother's, who had in the mean time removed to the State of Tennessee, where her father died or was killed by the Indians. I was intimate with Mr. Roberts, and after the separation, in a conversation with him, he admitted to me that his suspicions were unjust, and he expressly acquitted her of any illicit intercourse with the individual suspected.

As to General Jackson, I am of opinion he never saw her previous to her separation from Mr. Roberts, and the divorce, I believe, was obtained, entirely *ex parte*. An act of the Virginia Legislature was passed at the instance of the well known Capt. Jack Jouett, then a member of that body and a brother-in-law of Mr. Roberts, (having married his sister,) and without any notice, as I believe, to Mrs. Roberts; but of this, I suppose, Maj. Tho. Allin who was the Clerk of the Court, can speak.

For my part, I consider Mrs. Jackson's character and conduct as well as the circumstances, and respect to see the whole transaction misrepresented. I have always believed that Mr. Roberts had no person to blame but his own improper conduct and jealousy. I knew him well, but do not wish to enter into a detail of facts, calculated to wound the feelings of his respectable relations and friends.

I am myself for General Jackson as next President, and wish the Spirit of '76 not again to refer to me without authority, as I consider the attack on Mrs. Jackson, as *unjust, unwarranted and unjust*.

Yours with respect,
JAMES RAY.
Maj. T. P. Moore, Harrodsburg.

MR. JOHN MCGINNIS'S STATEMENT.
Mr. John McGinnis states, that he lived for some considerable time in the immediate neighbourhood of Mrs. Betsy Roberts, the mother of Lewis Roberts, the former husband of the present Mrs. Jackson; that Roberts and his wife then lived with old Mrs. Roberts; that Lewis Roberts was generally considered by the neighbors a bad husband; that his mother acknowledged that Rachel Roberts was an amiable woman, and deserved better treatment; that she, in fact, loved her as well as any child she ever raised; that old Mrs. Roberts told this affiant a short time before Mrs. R. Roberts left her husband for the purpose of returning to her mother's in Tennessee, that her son had ordered his wife to clear herself, and never again show her face in his house; that she appeared for some time before she returned to her mother to be an unhappy and miserable woman; that, finally, her brother came to Kentucky and carried her off to her friends in Tennessee. He states explicitly, that he never heard of General Jackson being in the neighborhood, and that he believes that Gen. Jackson never visited the house of Lewis Roberts during the time that they lived together; that Roberts' wife sustained a fair and irreproachable character, as long as this affiant knew her.

This day personally appeared before me, a justice of the peace for the county of Mercer, the within named John McGinnis, and made oath to the truth of the within statement. Given under my hand this 13th April, 1827.

GEORGE W. THOMPSON.
To all whom it may concern, be it known, that in the year 1784 I lived at Col. John Bowman's station, in the then County of Lincoln now Mercer, and have continued to live in Mercer County ever since. Whilst I lived at Col. Bowman's I became acquainted with Col. Donalson and his family, who lived then near Col. Bowman's. Col. Donalson at that time had two single daughters, young women, to wit; Jane and Rachel, the latter of whom, I understand, is the present Mrs. Jackson, the lady of Gen. Andrew Jackson of the State of Tennessee. I continued to be intimately acquainted with Col. Donalson and his daughters, until the younger, Rachel, was married to Capt. Lewis Roberts, and for some time afterwards, when some unhappy difference arose between Capt. Roberts and his lady, which terminated in a separation between them, and when Mrs. Roberts went to her father's, who had previous to that time removed to the State of Tennessee, near Nashville. Previous to that separation, I have ever considered that lady's character as fair and irreproachable as that of any other lady I ever knew in my life; nor have I any reason to believe, that General Jackson ever saw her until after her separation from Roberts. I recollect being one of the Jury when Roberts obtained his Divorce, but have not the most distant recollection of what evidence was offered on the trial.

JOHN MEAUX.
April 16th, 1827.
From the Richmond Enquirer.
SIGNS OF THE TIMES.
We are satiated with this subject—and so are our readers. We hasten to bring this discussion to a close. But a few words upon the only remaining branch of it, on which the National Intelligencer has very much relied, and we have done. In touching this point we shall have the advantage of stating the general merits of the question, by which our own humble course will be regulated, and the suffrage of the people will probably be decided.

The Intelligencer asks with much affected emphasis—*Cui Bono?* What are we to gain by a change of the administration? Will not Mr. Adams' successor pursue the same policy which has guided his own measures? If then the public interests are not to be improved by a revolution, what is the object of the Opposition? Is it not exclusively selfish on their part? Must it not be an unprincipled ambition—on the part of the leaders, a war for office, and for office only?

But, as this formidable Opposition is not altogether made up of leaders, what are the motives of that immense mass of people, who cry out for a change of their public servants?—They are not in search of offices.—The argument proves a great deal too much—and therefore it proves nothing. There

must be other motives, than unprincipled ambition, which general prospect of a change of the public interest, which estimates his people from the mountain tops to the deepest valleys.

What is the nation to lose by a change? The organization of the Cabinet has deservedly excited the severest animadversions; the interests of the country, and the principles of the constitution itself, have been sacrificed by the course of the administration. Mr. Adams has forfeited the confidence of the country; a successor will probably repair some of his errors.—Things can scarcely be worse than they are. Let us examine this question.

The administration commenced under the most unfortunate auspices. The first appointment of Mr. Adams was calculated to bring down upon him the suspicions of a jealous people. Mr. Clay made him President—and Mr. Adams made Mr. Clay Secretary of State. If they had previously belonged to the same political party; if there had been any intimate union in their opinions and their feelings, the world might have overlooked this portentous conjunction. But, it was well understood, that they disliked each other as men, and as politicians; and that there was still an unsettled political dispute between them. Under such circumstances, what movement could be more extraordinary? It subjected them both to imputations, which their own character as men, and their respect for the country itself, ought to have prompted them to avoid. Republics rest upon public virtue; and he is a miscalculating politician, who does not only strive to keep himself pure, but above all unnecessary suspicion of impurity.

The doctrines and measures of the Administration have drawn down upon it the just censures of an indignant people. Many an honest man who waited to judge the tree by its fruits, was alarmed by the extravagant pretensions, which were set forth in the first Message to Congress. The provisions of a limited constitution were despised; powers were claimed for the general government, which had been denied by its framers; and its whole theory, would have been overturned by the alarming doctrines of Mr. Adams. Even the remonstrances of the people were to be disregarded; and the representative was not to be "pulsed by the will of his Constituents." There was no limitation either in the letter of the instrument itself, or in the preservative force of the public opinion; but, the government was to assume a jurisdiction over the arts, over literature, over the labour and capital of the country, over the soil of the States themselves, which had been solemnly reserved to the States or the people.—As general powers were to be usurped by the government at large, so particular powers were to be usurped by the Executive Department, at the expense of other Departments. The President boldly avowed it to be within his "constitutional competency" to originate missions and despatch ministers on new and unauthorized embassies, without the advice and consent of the Senate.

The measures of the administration have also proved most inauspicious to the public interests.—Try them by the constitutionality or expediency of their course, and it is equally unfortunate. They boast of their Diplomacy; and what good purpose has it answered? Their mission to Panama is a splendid abortion. It violated in its outset the solemn injunction of Washington not to engage in any "foreign entangling alliances;" & its results are unpromising beyond all calculation. They have lost us, first by their idle affectation of diplomatic resources, and then by their inexcusable neglect of them, our lucrative commerce with the British Colonies. Now many corn-plagiers in Virginia, how many lumber-getters in North Carolina, or in the Northern States, how many ship-owners and merchants in the Union, are at this moment railing the blessed consequences of their measures. Their diplomacy has been equally marked by extravagance. Mr. Rufus King received eighteen thousand dollars for doing nothing. His son received an outfit of \$4,500 as Charge d' Affaires, for four weeks of empty services. Mr. Rochester, as Secretary of the Panama Mission, was paid for several months for doing nothing in the U. S. and the Secretary of State had to excuse the profusion by saying, that Mr. Rochester had resigned his Judgeship in order to accept of the Secretaryship, when in fact he had left the Bench before he was nominated to the Mission.

We seek in vain for the evidences of the statesman-like views of the existing Administration. By Roads and Canals our good people are to be *engineered* out of their principles. A Wollens Bill is to be patronized, which levies the severest tax upon the coarsest cloths and the poorest people—but, even if it fails to go through, it is to be the apple of discord, to the people of Pennsylvania, and to alienate their feelings from the cause of Andrew Jackson. The public press is to be "organized and regulated" by the Secretary of State, and the most distinguished of those Editors, who have in fact, and not in pretence, too much "stubborn independence" to obey his mandates, are to be cashiered from their public appointment.

Instead of contenting himself with adjusting a dispute by a practicable purchase of a small slip of territory—or, at least, of appealing to the authority of the States of the Union, with the military power—thus compelling her either to submit to the appearance of intimidation, or of asserting her dignity by a resort to retaliation or civil war. The treasury is reduced in its income; and the Army is agitated by a controversy between two most high and distinguished officers, about their rank—which ought to be adjusted. By a wretched system of management and patronage, friends are to be secured, abuses to be concealed, and power to be retained in the hands of Mr. Adams, and of the safe and precedented succession. In truth it is even now "the power behind the throne which is greater than the throne itself."—Mr. Adams has placed himself in such a predicament, that he is not so much the President, as the man who made him such.

Is it so wonderful, then that the people should desire a change? Is it so very surprising that an Opposition should be organized—and that some upon the high grounds of the Constitution, and others upon the broad grounds of the public interests, should desire to expel the present incumbents from their seats? Can nothing but unprincipled ambition account for the active association of different parties and various persons? Is their no motive to explain the phenomenon, but the lust of "office, and of office only?" What becomes of the incorruptible Macon, the intelligent Dickerson, the independent Chandler? Are they, too, the slaves of an unholy ambition? Some astonishment is expressed at the union of the various materials which constitute the opposition. It is asked, how Randolph can unite with Hayne; Macon with Rowan! And these questions are asked by persons, who have already before their eyes the strongest instances of political conjunctions. Can the union between the Albany Argus and the Richmond Enquirer be more portentous; or even the conjunction between Clinton and Van Buren be more remarkable; or the association between Macon and Rowan be more singular, than that which is shown between Webster and Trimble, or Adams and Clay! When we have seen members of Congress from Kentucky, declaring that they could never think of voting for the son of John Adams, or of voting against the instructions of their Legislature, yet in a few days brought over to the vigorous support of Mr. Adams, ought we to be surprised at any Union which may take place between the opponents of the administration? When politicians, like those which wield the powers of the nation, *coalise*, it is time for others to associate. It is true, that every member of the Opposition cannot succeed in all his wishes. The rigid Constitutionalists, the opponent of the Tariff, may not be able to obtain a successor to Mr. Adams, who will go at lengths with them. It is certain that Andrew Jackson, for instance, is a Tariff man—and to a certain extent the advocate of Roads and Canals; but even in these respects he may not be disposed to push his principles to the same extremes as Messrs. Adams and Clay. He has declared himself in his letter to Dr. Coleman, "in favor of a judicious examination and revision of it; and so far as the Tariff before us embraces the design of fostering, and protecting, and preserving within ourselves, the means of national defence and independence, particularly in a state of war, I would advocate and support it." Still he is the friend of the Tariff—and on the question of roads and canals, he is liable to objections, than he may confine their construction to military purposes, & may not go so far as the members of the Coalition. On some of the other questions of policy, he may accord more closely with the ideas of the Opposition. In one of his letters on record, he professes himself to be "friendly to its administration, agreeably to the true literal meaning of the instrument, and banishing the dangerous doctrine of implication"—"opposed to foreign political connections"—"opposed to the extension of executive patronage"—"friendly to economy in the public disbursements, and an enemy to the system of loans." If he will carry these principles into effect, the Opposition will consult the public interests by transferring the sceptre even into his hands.

We are fully aware of the charge of inconsistency which has been made against many persons, for thinking of supporting Gen. Jackson at all, after being so strongly opposed to him. Even the humble individuals, who pen these hasty lines, have come in for their share of the reproach. We have seen some of our own hasty paragraphs hunted up and glaringly displayed, with abundance of note and comment—in which we spoke freely of his qualifications for the Presidential Chair. The gentlemen are welcome. It is all fair game—we have no right to murmur at their criticisms. Whatever we have uttered, has been spoken out freely and fearlessly in the face of the people. We have no secrets—and we scorn all the arts of equivocation and diplomacy. We have never disguised our exceptions to Andrew Jackson. All

the splendour of his military achievements could never conceal from us errors which he committed in the private Campaign—the errors which he committed at Pensacola, or in the facts of his civil education. Much of what we have celebrated his distinguished services at New Orleans, and strongly as we have expressed the universal gratitude which they have inspired, we have always avowed that Gen. Jackson was not our first love. The object which we have entertained, and which we are yet ready to avow, will prevent our becoming his professed panegyrist, or taking a very active part in promoting his election. Yet, situated as we are, compelled both as citizens of a country and as editors of a free press, to select between the only two candidates, who are now and will in all probability be before the nation—compelled to choose between one whom we have implied to be no civilian, and one whom we have recently pronounced to have forfeited the character of statesmen—we cannot but choose that which we regard as the lesser evil of the two. Mr. Adams is governed by one of his Cabinet—and General Jackson may avail himself of the abilities of the distinguished men whom he may call into his cabinet—with a temper improved by time, and tested by the trying events of the last thirty months—a temper that may admit of being advanced, but not of being ruled—and with a spirit, which will never shrink from cleansing off the public abuses.—Should we err in the choice we are making, should General Jackson hereafter repay the suffrage of his country by a unalaministration of the power to which she may promote him—we shall deeply lament the error into which we have fallen; but as far as our humble abilities can go, we shall do all in our power to repair the mistake. In our past we have given the best pledge of our future course. We cannot sink into the sycophantic instruments of General Jackson. We shall speak as freely of him when in power, as we have done of Mr. Adams as President, or of General Jackson as the Major General in the army. We take sides with the People, and not with their oppressors. When a press sinks into the tool of power, it deserves to forfeit the confidence of the people.

SOUTH AMERICA.
A proof sheet from the office of the Mercantile Advertiser, contains the following intelligence from South America:
New York, Monday, April 30.
A Bogota paper of the 18th of February, (received by the Athenian) contains an official letter from Christoval Arango, the Colombian Envoy in Peru, to his Government, detailing the insurrectionary movements of the Colombian troops in Lima, the substance of which is that the superior officers left in command by Bolivar, had been removed and sent home. The troops had renewed their oath of fidelity to the old Constitution, and had retired from Lima to a neighboring town, to wait the directions of their Government. A revolution in the Government of Peru, in the same spirit, had taken place; new officers appointed provisionally, were managing the Government, until the meeting of the Congress, and every thing was tranquil. The letter is dated at Lima, 28th January.

Mexico.—We are favored with papers from Mexico City to the 1st of this month, brought by the Eliza. It appears that a revolt broke out about the 10th of March at Durango, the capital of the State of that name, instigated by a Priest named Arenas, whose emissaries had seduced the troops to unite in a project for obtaining certain reforms. The troops had gone so far as to arrest the Governor of the State, and to dissolve the local Legislature, but it does not appear that a blood had been shed. Placards had been posted, calling for the son of Turbide to govern the country. The General Government was adopting measures for the suppression of this insurrection, which did not appear to excite much alarm. The Generals of Division, Negrete and Echavarrri, (Spanish) suspected of being abettors of the revolutionary project, had been arrested and committed to prison.

The Mexican House of Representatives had approved of the Treaty recently concluded with England, and it was believed would be confirmed by the Senate.
From Carthage.—Captain Shipman, the Athenian, arrived at New York, who Carthage on the 4th inst. states that the country was considered in rather an unsettled state. The British residents had sent requisition to the Admiral at Jamaica, for a vessel of war to be sent down for the protection of their property. The apprehensions arose more immediately from the troops being some time without pay, and the expectation that they would soon be without rations, from the dissensions existing among the chiefs.

Accounts have been received of the events in Peru. The principal officers of a Colombian army in that country, who declared against Bolivar, had been sent prisoners to Bogota.
The Steamboat Bolivar had arrived from Barranquilla, with about 500 barrels of cargo of the brig Hurrows, which vessel was totally lost, and sold as she lay. The steamer Amazon, arrived 25th March, from Pernambuco, dated Carthage, Mar. 15.
"Our Market is in a perfect state of stagnation. Every one seems at a loss as to what may take place. It is known that Bolivar's Sautander are now decidedly opposed. We will not recommend the shipment of anything, nor do we wish to see property introduced here. We give no quotations, as it is impossible to fix a value, or to know whether we may not all in a month be have to leave the country."

From Caracas.—We have from Caracas Spanish hand-bill, dated the 2d instant, under the head of White Flag, and signed "On Many," in which the adoption of the Bolivar Constitution given to Peru is strenuously recommended as the only refuge of Colombia from political shipwreck.—*Nat. Gaz.*
We have private accounts from Laguna the 5th instant, which represent Bolivar aiming plainly at the Dictatorship—*Nat.*