

THE COUNTER BANK REPORT, made by Mr. McDUFFIE, on Friday, and published in the Washington papers of Monday, we shall copy into our columns to-morrow or the next day. It is little else than a matter of special pleading—an attempt to perform for the reader, what the report of the committee did not assume to do, to draw conclusions from, and to indulge in comments upon, the *facts* stated—and to do so *against* the facts, and in the face of the facts. We content ourselves to-day with the remarks of the editor of the New-York American, (whose devotion to the bank cannot be questioned, and who will stand between it and condemnation as far as possible), on that labored part of the counter report which attempts to justify and explain away the *purchase* of the Courier and Enquirer. He says :

tempts to justify and explain the
chase of the Courier and Enquirer. He
says :

“ On the sixth head, the loan of \$25,000 to the Courier and Enquirer, we here in New-York, who know the sort of estimate in which that paper and its conductors are universally held, can *never be satisfied*: because we reason, and cannot help reasoning from what we know, *independently of the testimony upon which the Bank made the loan*. But because the conviction in this city is thus strong and general, that the application of the Courier and Enquirer should not have been granted, it does not follow that the eminently respectable individuals in Philadelphia—who only knew the parties through their own representation, and the introduction of Mr. Walter Bowne—were bound to, or could, see the matter in the light in which it strikes all in this city: they had to form their judgment upon the facts before them; and in so doing, though they may have arrived, as we think they did, at an erroneous conclusion, they may still claim to have acted without sinister motives. Yet, with all this explanation, and although the directors believed, as doubtless they did, (for the loan, it must be remembered, was in both instances made not by the President alone, but by himself and the directors,) that the Courier and Enquirer had been curtailed of its ordinary bank accommodation in New-York, by reason of its favoring the re-incorporation of the Bank of the United States, it seems to us indefensible, that—having a branch here through which the requisite inquiries might have been made, and the requisite discounts, if these inquiries were satisfactorily answered, ordered—the mother bank should, on affidavits of property, and solely on the names of two partners who were responsible for each other—have made loans on such terms, and to such an amount, as those to the Courier and Enquirer.”