ELECTION.—On the 12th next month the people are called on to elect a Representative in the place of Mr. Lumpkin. Two candidates are before the people- both worthy men, who have filled important stations under the State Government. But notwithstanding the excellence of the character of both gentlemen, in all the relations of private life, there are many reasons why Judge *Clayton* should be preferred to Judge *Schley*, to fill the existing vacancy in Congress, some of which we will briefly advert to:

1. The whole up country, and especially the *Western Circuit*, with a population of about 75,000 souls, is now without a Representative in Congress. Mr. Lumpkin, formerly, represented it, and it would seem that his successor should come from the same quarter. The rest of the State is well represented according to its population; and though we do not approve of the district plan, yet we hold that members should be selected from such parts of the State, with reference to residence, as will enable such parts to have a member, not only to do their private business, at Washington City, but if necessary, to give the information, connected with their local interests, if such should ever be the subjects of legislation. For instance, there should be, as there is, a member to represent the commercial interests of Savannah, another to represent the planting interest of the sea coast, in particular, in addition to the general interests of the people of the State. So with regard to the other parts of the State, and particularly the North Western portion of it, where new and very extensive interests, in relation to the gold mines are daily being made. It would be very important to have an office connected with the mint, established some where in the gold region—and indeed various are the relations in which such an interest stands connected with financial legislation. The upper country has generally been neglected, in the distribution of popular appointments, to the preference of the middle and lower sections. Augusta already has a member, Mr. Wilde, and we cannot see the necessity or propriety of having another located there, particularly as the whole North Western portion of the State will have no representative of its particular interests, in addition to the general interests of whole State.

2. Judge Clayton is better acquainted with the peculiar interests, habits and feelings of the people of the upper country, than the other candidate—having served them long in other capacities, much to the satisfaction, in general, as we have understood, of all parties; and if they could, for so many years, trust him as a judge, with their liberties, their property and their lives, they can surely put their general political interests into his keeping, in preference to one whom they do not know as well, and who, perhaps, does not feel and think with them, on several important subjects which may come before him in Congress.

3. Judge Clayton's information on the Indian question, together with that of the Missionaries, which have been thoroughly investigated by him, and the many facts within his knowledge connected with both, well calculated to make the Northern members of Congress give up their hostility to the State; these considerations make Judge Clayton's appointment, at this particular time, a very important circumstance for the State of Georgia. The prejudices of the Northern people, we think can be removed, by enlightening their minds as to the true state of the case; and certainly Judge Clayton has it in his power to contribute as much to that end as any man in the State.

4. The Tariff will come before the next Congress. On that particular subject Judge Clayton has written, and thought much.—We have already published his speech at the Athens meeting in August last, so that his opinions are before the people, on that subject. The great struggle will be at the next session of Congress; and it is immensely important a man, who holds to the unconstitutionality of a protective tariff, should be elected to fill the existing vacancy.

5. On the question of the Bank of the United States, Judge Clayton, is with the majority of the people of Georgia. His Review of Mr. McDuffie's Report, has been republished all over the United States. So that on this subject, if the people elect him, they will be giving a direct expression of their opinions.

Concerning Judge Claytons Review, of Mr. McDuffie's Report, the Southern Review, for Nov. 1831, contains the following highly commendatory remarks:

"The pamphlet of Judge Clayton is chiefly occupied with the question of constitutionality. It is a specimen of condensed reasoning, seldom exceeded in form and effect."—Page 3.

"But there are constitutional objections to the Bank of the U. States, that have not, as yet, received any reply. Most of them are very strongly put in Judge Claytons pamphlet."—Page 12.

"Judge Clayton puts the following strong case"—page 16—Then follows a quotation from Judge C's Review.

"*Again*—To make use of an argument very strongly put by Judge Clayton, let us grant the necessity and propriety of this incidental corporation"—page 17. Then follows an argument copied from Judge C's Review, which is adopted by the Review.

"It is merely because we do not deem it fair to copy a page, that we do not continue this extract with the very strong, and, to us, unanswerable illustration of Judge Clayton, substituting the Banker Rothchild, for the Bank of the U. States; but we hope the reader of this summary will not be content without referring to the pamphlet of Judge Clayton, enumerated in the list at the head of this article. Those who are really interested on behalf of the public in this monetary question will not pass it over."—page 18.

These extracts show how Judge Clayton is estimated, on this all important question, by the Reviewer. This is high praise—commendation worth striving for—and what but few men can obtain.

There are, on the other hand many reasons why his opponent should not be elected—notwithstanding his admitted excellence as a man. We have room now to mention only, his views of the constitutionality of the Tariff—his doctrines in reference to the Supreme Court—and his vote on the resolutions, in the case of Tassels, at the last

session of the General Assembly.—See Journal of the House—page 449.