

THE BANK REPORT.—We publish this document to-day. We claim for it the attentive perusal of every citizen, who values the reputation of his country, or the purity if not the perpetuity of our institutions. In the language of a journal friendly to the bank, “it confirms our worst apprehensions.” It more than confirms the rumors of a dangerous and alarming exercise of power in the corruption of the public press. It exhibits, in the worst aspect of previous reports, the fact of a *purchased* press, the corrupting means of the *purchaser*, and the unscrupulous use of instruments and agents in the accomplishment of its objects. We do not hesitate to say, that in our judgment, this report not only consigns the Courier and Enquirer, in the estimation of an intelligent and honest people, to lasting infamy, but the bank to certain rejection by any body of representatives that shall obey or be guided by the public will. Save the pointed remarks of the editor of the N. Y. Standard, we content ourselves to-day with the

previous warm support not only of a bank of the U. S. but of the present institution. It says: "The report confirms our worst apprehensions." It admits, that the course pursued, wrong and reprehensible as it is, "appears to have been authorised by the committee of exchanges, and approved by the whole direction." It adds:—

"The transaction which stands out in the report as altogether most offensive to sound principles, is that which relates to one of the presses in this city. After all the circumlocution which is introduced, it cannot fail to be seen as *a piece of downright corruption*,—which, instead of being palliated, is only rendered more odious by all the tricks of concealment. The bare fact that \$35,000, (to say nothing of the \$15,000 previously discounted on the same paper, though as the editors aver, without their knowledge,) was furnished to Messrs. Webb and Noah on long time, without an endorser distinct from the firm itself, and that this amount, in such a state of security, was permitted to be due from them to the Bank at one and the same moment, and for

the Bank at one and the same moment, and for months in succession, is sufficient to stagger the faith of the most credulous. *We do not hesitate to say that no Bank in this city would have loaned them or any other newspaper firm, a single dollar on such security.* And further, that no bank in this city would have loaned them, or any other newspaper firm such an amount, or any thing like such an amount, even with the best endorsers. There is no possible way to account for the transaction, without admitting the belief that *it was done to secure the influence of a widely circulated paper in favor of the Bank.* This, in plain English, is 'subsidizing the press.' "

The same paper, whilst it avows itself in favor of the general policy of a national bank, calls upon the people to "express the strong sense they entertain of the baseness of the transaction."

The *N. Y. Commercial Advertiser*, also a warm partizan of the bank and of its recharter, and which attempts to disparage the report in some respects, says:—

“The exception of which we speak, is the case of the heavy loans, made in a very extraordinary manner, for an extraordinary length of time, to the editors of the *Courier and Enquirer*, upon a security which would not have procured a discount of a thousand dollars from any bank in this city.— Coupled as that transaction was, with the conversion of that paper from a bitter opponent, to a decided partizan of the bank, it was altogether indefensible, and will make a strong impression against the conduct of the directors. And although this instance of great imprudence, is no argument against the rechartering of the bank, and ought not to be allowed to operate so as to deprive the country of this invaluable institution, yet we fear it will have a very untoward effect. *Our mortification at this disclosure is great.*”

The *N. Y. American* says :

“ Yet we are bound to say, that the loans to the *Courier and Enquirer*, coupled as they are with the fact of the remarkable change of opinion in that paper on the subject of the bank of the United States, ~~is~~ ^{is} manifestly and unwisely, though possibly not hazardous. As to the conduct of Mr. *Silas E. Burrows*, who borrowed money from the bank expressly to aid Mr. Noah in buying into the *Courier and Enquirer*, and then imposed upon the friend he was thus anxious to serve, a commission of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., under the pretext that the money was obtained from his own father, it would be needless for us to qualify it to our readers by its proper name.”

The same paper adds :

“ From the honorable sensibility that is evinced as to the *unjustifiable and censurable transactions with the editors of the Courier and Enquirer*, there is reason to fear that the true question at issue before the public—the expediency of rechartering the bank—may be lost sight of: we hope, however, only for a time. Indignation at *venality*, and surprise and regret that any person charged with the administration of the bank should so far have imitated the example, &c. &c. must not cause us to lose sight of the main question; nor because *abuses* have been practised, must we shut our eyes to the manifold advantages of a national bank.”

Here we rest the matter to-day,—with the single remark, that the only newspaper in the city of New-York, which has pretended to offer any thing in exculpation of the conduct of the editors of the C. & E., is *the anti-masonic organ in that city!* and that a part of their evasive and shuffling attempt to escape from the odium of these disclosures, appeared in *the anti-masonic organ of this city before it was published by themselves!*—The people of this state—and particularly the democracy of this state—will mark these things.