

*The Enquirer and Judge Clayton of Georgia.*

17 Judge Clayton of Georgia, has written a series of Nos. in the Milledgeville Journal, in reply to McDuffie's report last winter on the state of the currency. Some pains were taken by friendly presses, to clout and bandage the Judge's bantling, but in vain. We read the two first Nos. with great mental exertion, and as some contemporary forcibly says, from "a sense of professional duty"—but we could get no farther. The essays were too heavy and inelegant for this day, and have circulated in only one or two presses at the South.

This may be the reason why the Judge complains of the extraordinary circulation of McDuffie's Report. The gentleman *may* feel a little pique, that his own unlicked progeny should die obscurely, when the splendid offspring of McDuffie's genius adorned the pages of a thousand presses, and soared on the acclamations of a whole nation. It *may* be the reason, why the Judge, upon *anonymous* authority, has stooped to the littleness of attempting to strip McDuffie of the fame conferred by the authorship of that Report.

A likely notion truly, that McDuffie was unequal to what Langdon Cheves, or Mr. Biddle, or Mr. Ingersoll, able as they are, could accomplish either singly or united!

But, (says Judge Clayton,) "this much *we do know*: one hundred thousand copies of the Bank Report have been published *at the expense* of the Bank; it has been republished in all the papers in the U. S. friendly to that Institution."

To the first part of this assertion—touching the 100,000 copies by the Bank—we have nothing to say: only we should like to know, how if it be true, the Judge *could know it*?

To the other branch of the assertion, we have a word to say. McDuffie's report was published, we believe universally, by the papers friendly to the Bank. What then? Does this justify the insinuation evidently intended, that therefore, those papers were paid for publishing it? The Report was published also by the papers *opposed* to the Bank! What does the wise Georgian infer from *that*? Our contemporary published it—so did the Telegraph—were they too paid for it by the Bank? The Judge is certainly piqued and mortified, at the still born fate of his brat—else could he never draw such loose and illogical deductions. The truth is this—McDuffie's report embraced a subject affecting every part of the U. States—attention had been roused by the President's message—the report itself, was of transcendent ability—and therefore, was it universally published. Cankered must be the mind, and oblique the vision, that will not see the force of these facts, but prefers to throw the shade of suspicion over a whole class of fellow citizens.

Ever prompt with his insinuations, an ingenious neighbor of ours, seizes the opportunity of Clayton's remark, to repeat a former insinuation. He says,— "If the hand of the Bank be not in this thing, there are at least strong marks of it in certain newspaper articles." Which articles, and which newspapers?—We invite the candid editor to come out with his specifications, that the assailed may make their defence, and the innocent know that they are not attacked.—Did he not publish McDuffie's Report? Has he the assurance to infer the corruption of others, from the thing which he did himself? Or does he mean to admit, that he too was bribed by the Bank of the U. States, to circulate that Report?

---