

## THE N. Y. COURIER &amp; ENQUIRER.

We find in the Courier and Enquirer of the 15th inst. the annexed remark: "The Troy Budget, a paper *not* warm and eloquent in its denunciation of us in consequence of our support of the United States Bank," *then* (some months since) "praised, endorsed and recommended us (the C. & E.) as a firm and consistent supporter of Jackson and Democracy," &c. &c.

We have never *denounced* the Courier and Enquirer. In our allusions to the sinuosities of its course we have expressed more regret than censure. Having no ill will, no private pique against that print, we have expressed none. We are fully aware of the extensive circulation and immense patronage of that journal—of its high popularity in commercial and miscellaneous matters—of its reputation for talent, wit and satire—and we have regretted and do regret that, placed in such an attitude, occupying such vantage ground, it should be shorn of its political influence by the inconsistency and impolicy of its movements.

When the C. & E. represented the United States Bank as an institution dangerous to our liberties, it doubtless spoke in sincerity and it spoke the truth, and when it brought its strong energies to bear against it, and day after day, and month after month denounced it as a gigantic monster trampling upon the rights of the people and buying up men and votes and presses like cattle in the market, we rejoiced at the correctness of its opinions and the ability and energy with which they were maintained. Pleased with such movements on the part of that leviathan print, we did most cordially recommend it to the patronage of the democracy of the state. But what must have been our surprise as well as mortification, when we saw our champion had fallen? When the banner which he unfurled was enlarged to make room to inscribe thereon the insignia of the monster he had promised to destroy? Surely it was sufficient to awaken our suspicions that something was wrong, something more than appeared upon the surface. What has caused this somerset? we involuntarily exclaimed. Has the touch of a Midas palsied its opposition, or changed it into friendship? Has the "monster" fixed his glaring eyes upon that print so intensely that their kaleidoscope hues have charmed it and awakened unknown emotions of love or shining motives of attachment? Such an event was unlooked for, and we might very properly regret it; but we uttered no denunciation.

of attachment? Such an event was  
we uttered no denunciation.

That we entertain no personal hostility to the editors of the C. & E., they have the fullest evidence; and that we have not attempted to abridge the circulation of their paper, they also well know. But we do object to many of the expedients to which they have resorted to carry their points, or to justify themselves in the positions they have assumed. We disapprove their attack upon the Comptroller of this state, an officer whose integrity is as far beyond the reach of suspicion as the political character of the C. & E. ought to be. The attack of the C. & E. upon the Commissioners of the Canal Fund we believe to have been without cause and without apology. The assertion that the country papers act at the bidding of the Albany Argus, is entirely gratuitous. The editors of the republican journals in the country are as independent of the influence of the Argus as they are of the Courier and Enquirer. While the Argus pursues a consistent course, advocates a sound and practical adherence to republican principles and usages, and illustrates its precepts by its own example, it will be responded to by the democratic journals of the interior. But when it departs from such wholesome tenets and usages, it will be rebuked as promptly as the Courier and Enquirer has been, and it will doubtless feel the rebuke as sensibly. When the C. & E. alleges that the country papers are subservient to the Argus, it does as great injustice to itself, as an honorable and manly journalist, as it does to the good sense, the integrity and independence of the conductors of those journals.

We have heretofore remarked that we differed with the C. & E. as to the propriety of thrusting Mr. Van Buren, nolens volens, before the public as the candidate for the Vice-Presidency. If the other states prefer to nominate him, New-York will of course go with them in supporting him. But it belongs not to New-York to put him upon the course.

The manner in which the C. & E. has brought forward the name of gen. Root is also objectionable. It is seditious. We concede to that print, and to every other, a perfect right to its preference in the selection of candidates to any office. But we deny the right of that print or of any other to misrepresent facts in the case, or to urge measures subversive of regular nominations, while it claims to be an advocate for such nominations. If gen. Root be nominated at Herkimer, of course he will be supported as the regular candidate. He *must* be so nominated before the people will support him. We have not forgotten his conduct in the legislature of 1830, nor his extraordinary movements and speeches in a republican caucus of the members of that legislature. His association with the Dorrs and Davis's of the worky party of that season are fresh in our recollection. Nor has his recent attack upon our safety fund system and upon our legislature, escaped our observation. We have noticed and shall remember all these things. The C. & E. will do well to reflect upon them.