

PHILADELPHIA:

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1832.

We publish this morning, *in extenso*, the exposition of the editors of the Courier & Enquirer. Our readers will find that its text sustains what we said of it on Tuesday. It is curious, entertaining, and we may add, *instructive*, in the view which it affords of New York politics. The quarrel is between the editors of the Courier as antagonists of the Albany Regency, and Mr. Cambreleng as champion. Colonel Johnson was not far wrong when he said—"I consider this pretty much a New York fight." The editors of the Courier & Enquirer are now to be immolated, if possible, at the shrine of the Regency, and in order to remove an impediment to the design of rendering New York the pecuniary metropolis of the Union.

In the Washington Globe of Monday a fierce rally is made against the Enquirer and the Bank. The institution is accused of having bribed the press, by lending money to editors "without security or expectation of payment;" and it is broadly insinuated that Mr. McDuffie and the other leading advocates of the Bank in Congress, have been also bribed. So, according to the Globe, the legislature of Pennsylvania were corrupted by the Bank. The practice of that paper is to attempt to blacken and begrime whatever is supposed to be in the way of the President's wishes, or the designs of the back-stairs cabinet. It labours to paralyse, by the foulest aspersions, every arm from which blows which it knows to be merited may be apprehended. Senators, representatives of States, in Congress, are assailed in the same manner, when they resist in any degree what may be called the *personal system* in the executive branch of the government. They are suffered sometimes, to act in obedience to their own judgments, and the predilections of their constituents, on great questions of national economy; but woe to the member who opposes the nomination of a favourite, or refuses to join in running down a selected victim! It is not an independent senate, giving its "advice and consent," that is wanted, or can be tolerated; but a chamber for registering presidential edicts;—no other majority is to be allowed, than an obsequious one to co-operate in the distribution of the "spoils of victory," and the great aim of a re-election;—there must be a senate submissive without a murmur, and always ready to speak and act like that of Rome in the times of the Cæsars—"Tibi summum rerum iudicium dii dedere—nobis obsequii gloria relicta est."

There is no broader "joke of the day," than that a thorough going Jackson editor should raise an indignant outcry against the board of the National Bank, upon the assumption that it assisted some editors with discounts for the purpose of securing their pens in behalf of the assailed institution. The outcry of the tigers and the wolves, in the fable of *the Plague among the Beasts*, against the poor graminivorous animal that had cropped a little of the parson's grass, has about as much congruity and modesty: See La Fontaine. Has no patronage been given by the President and administration to the Press, as a *douceur* or a reward? For what was Mr. Noah, one of the editors of the Courier, appointed Surveyor of the Port of New York? Have no members of Congress, no editors been rewarded? Are there no members of Congress, no editors or printers, who reasonably expect reward for "devotion to the President?" Was the public money patriotically, disinterestedly, abstractly employed, when it was given, in large amount, to Mr. Randolph, to do nothing but disgrace the country abroad? The squeamish gentlemen who swallowed this camel, strain at the gnats which are *alleged* to have been detected in the case of the Bank! Suppose a committee to be appointed by Congress to examine into every instance of office obtained from the President—every act of patronage in relation to the Press, and the pecuniary history and condition of every public functionary chosen since his accession, and how would his administration appear? More pure, safe, defensible than that of the President and Directors of the Bank? What conscientious observer could reply in the affirmative?

On no occasion would we vindicate or palliate what is absolutely wrong; but nothing was more natural and just than the exclamation—*Quis tulerit Gracchos*, &c. Who could endure the most seditious of tribunes complaining of sedition? Retort, if ever proper, is so against those administration writers—the "mercenary Swiss of State,"—who, after having attacked the National Bank, merely to echo and gratify the President, or promote some local Bank interest, affect to be profoundly scandalized by the story of the discounts to editors, and raise an awful clamour about the purity and independence of the Press. They do not remind us that, in Europe, it was always held allowable, when, in a war, Swiss bands were hired on one side, to hire others as a counter-force—that, when in our contests with Great Britain, Indians were enlisted as auxiliaries by the British government, the authorities of our own country thought they had a sufficient warrant to employ also the savage tribes, for defence and retaliation. The Bank has done nothing like this; but if it had, no right of complaint could be claimed by those who have raised the war-whoop against it, as mercenaries or partisans, or who approve of the aggressions which it has experienced.

—A Congressional enquiry into the *private concerns* of every person appointed to office since General Jackson became President—with a view to ascertain what special favor was done to each, the motives and relations in each case, and how far each functionary could be deemed a safe depository of the public ~~confidence~~ *confidence*, would seem to us quite as constitutional and regular, quite as conformable to usage and the rights and expectations of an American citizen, and at least as important to enable the People to judge of the administration of their affairs, as the inquisition into private accounts which was practised here by Messrs. Clayton, Cambreleng and Thomas.