

## UNITED STATES' BANK.

The subjoined letter from Mr. Crawford, is characteristic of that distinguished and steadfast statesman. Honesty, firmness and plain dealing, strong judgment, unaffected freedom of opinion, fearless of consequences—always characterized his conduct. His vote in the Senate, in favor of the former Bank of the United States, was an earnest of the independent course which he uniformly pursued. Brought up and into public life, in the habits and doctrines of a strict and literal construction of the Constitution of the United States, he always adhered to that principle. His view of the constitutionality of the Bank is extremely simple but conclusive, and testimony borne by such a witness to its utility, from his long experience while Secretary of the Treasury, ought, and no doubt will be received with great respect by all classes of his fellow citizens. No man ever passed out of public and eminent stations with a higher or purer reputation than Mr. Crawford. If he could be swayed by any bias at present, it would incline him against sentiments which his letter avows with the same prompt and manly spirit that always animated him: he points with consistent recollection to his recorded judgment twenty years ago as his judgment still.—[*Phil. Sentinel.*]

DEAR SIR—Your friendly letter on the subject of the Bank of the United States, has been received by due course of mail. The opinion which I formed of the constitutionality and expediency of the Bank of the United States when I was a member of the Senate, was the result of a careful examination of the Constitution of the United States, made without any preconceived opinions. That opinion is recorded in two speeches which I made in the Senate in the year 1814. Since that time I have had no occasion of reviewing the question. My opinion remains unaltered. I was Secretary of the Treasury more than eight years, and during that time I had ample evidence of the great utility of the Bank of the United States, in managing the fiscal concerns of the Union.

I am persuaded that no man, whatever his preconceived opinions may be, can preside over the Treasury one year without being deeply impressed with the expediency of the Bank of the United States, in conducting the finances of the Union. The provision in the Constitution which gives Congress the power to pass all laws which may be necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, gives Congress the right to pass the Bank Bill, unless a law most proper to carry into effect the power to collect and distribute revenue, should be excluded by that provision. The opponents of the constitutionality of the Bank, place great stress upon the word necessary, contained in the grant of power, and insist that no law can be necessary, but such, that without which the power could not be carried into effect. Now this construction appears to me to be indefensible. It does seem to me, that the words "necessary and proper," cannot exclude a law that is most proper to carry the power into effect. Yet the unconstitutionality of the bank can be pronounced only upon that construction. It does appear to me that the framers of the constitution never could have intended to exclude the passage of a law most proper to carry a power into effect, because it might be carried imperfectly into effect by another law. My construction of the grant of power to pass all laws which may be necessary to carry the enumerated powers into effect, includes the power to pass all laws which are necessary and proper to carry the enumerated powers into effect, in the most perfect and complete manner, and not in an incomplete and imperfect manner.

I have not seen a complete development of the President's plan of a Bank. It is possible that by his plan the transmission of the revenue may be effected, but the safety of the public deposits cannot be effected by the President's plan. The advantage of this security to the public is incalculable. It ought not to be relinquished, unless it can be satisfactorily proved that the Bank of the United States is unconstitutional.

This I think cannot be satisfactorily shown.—My speeches are recorded and can be re-published if necessary. They contain the result of the best investigation I was able to give the subject. I am persuaded I could not improve upon it now, if I had the means of investigating the subject, which I have not.

I am, Sir, your friend, &c.

WM. H. CRAWFORD.

CHARLES JARED INGERSOLL, Esq.