

[From the N. Y. Standard.]

M. M. NOAH AND THE U. S. BANK.

It will be remembered by the public, that when we pressed the SURVEYOR as having changed with the editors of the Courier and Enquirer on the subject of the Bank, Mr. JAMES GORDON BENNETT volunteered to say that HE wrote all the attacks on the Bank, *without consultation from any quarter and on his own responsibility.* We happen now to have evidence that Mr. Noah has long held the opinions expressed in the Courier and Enquirer, and we now submit to him a paragraph from his *Enquirer* (not the Courier and Enquirer of the 13th July 1826.) Will he now enforce his doctrine, and tell us why the government deposits should not be forthwith withdrawn from the Bank, since it cannot meet the government demands and yet lends its millions to states, corporations, and individuals, to the extremities of the Union? Let the local banks have the deposits—*they* will pay interest and give security and pay when called upon. Mr. Biddle has proved that Mr. Noah was right in his opinion, that if the Bank did not use the government deposits, it could not loan for *private* objects—it could not corrupt printers—nor subsidize lawyers. Oh how grateful our merchants must feel! How marvellously favored *they* have been.

From Noah's "Enquirer" of 13th July, 1826.

UNITED STATES BANK.—It should not be expected, that in a *scrutiny of local banks*, the concerns of the *United States Bank* should *pass unnoticed*. We shall enquire how much stock the "family" has secured; how much has been loaned upon hypothecation, and what facilities a certain person has received, to enable him to put the "screws" upon local institutions, and build ships for South America. WITHDRAW THE GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS WHICH THEY HAVE WITHOUT INTEREST, and what can they LOAN FOR PRIVATE OBJECTS?

Mr. Noah seems to be in the place of "the family," hence, he objects to "scrutiny" except of the "local banks."