

The consistent editor of the Richmond Enquirer attempts to be very witty on the course of Judge Clayton in relation to the deposits. Does that sapient and consistent editor recollect that when the deposits were removed he said it was wrong, and if so, what has made the act right since that time? What is wrong ought to be righted, and if Mr. Ritchie would not have done what the President did, he ought to be willing to undo what he would not have done. But if he has not honesty and principle enough to remedy an act of injustice himself, why should he complain of others who happen to feel and respect the claims of justice if they should be disposed to rebuke a flagrant usurpation? Judge Clayton was not more opposed to the bank than Mr. Duane, the bosom friend of Ritchie's master, and yet he pronounced the act of removal as "unwise, unnecessary, arbitrary, vindictive, and unjust." Now who says Mr. Duane is inconsistent? and can Judge Clayton be blamed for a course which seeks to repair the injury of a measure which the only person who had a right to remove the deposits, has pronounced "unwise, unnecessary, arbitrary, vindictive and unjust." So much for Mr Ritchie's consistency, the honest gentleman who so modestly passes upon every other person's consistency.