

There has yet been no report on the subject of the United States Bank, the Committee having obtained the liberty of reporting in all this week. We shall have it, however, in a day or two. It is said it will be extremely lengthy, and decidedly opposed to the rechartering of the Bank. The objections to its being rechartered, however, are not based on the fact, that it granted liberal loans to printers or publishers of papers, as is supposed by many. There are other and more serious objects against it. It is said, that the institution, in order to gain friends in every quarter of the Union, both by neutralizing the stubborn opponents, and purchasing over the timid and wavering, has loaned upwards of seven millions of dollars more than it should have done, or that it was able to do! In consequence of this, the Bank is not able to pay the seven millions of three per cent stocks, which are due on the first of July, and which are said to be principally owned in Europe! There are other reasons still, also, which will operate equally against the Bank; but, as we shall have the report in a day or two, and no doubt a counter report from the minority of the Committee, it would be useless to speculate further on the subject.

One word on this topic, however, before I leave it: Why are certain Editors and proprietors of newspapers so *sensitive* in regard to the investigation? Why have they uniformly opposed an investigation? Why do they call it an "inquisition?" These facts will all appear in due time, and their motives will then be duly appreciated by the public at large. There is no man in society, no matter how much he is opposed to the United States' Bank, that would object to Editors or publishers of newspapers, more than to Merchants, or Farmers, or Manufacturers, borrowing money from that institution. No such distinction has been drawn by the opponents of that Bank—it has been drawn by those, *only*, who are interested in the matter, and who wish to excite public sympathy in their own favour—in short, it has been drawn only by those who have drawn largely from the coffers of the Bank? If it should be made to appear, however, that certain papers advocate the rechartering of the institution from interested motives; that some of them, which were opposed to it heretofore, had received large discounts on accommodating terms, and then came out in favour of it in warm terms; that others had received accommodations on middling security, when wealthy and respectable dealers could not obtain any on the best responsibility: that certain members of Congress could obtain favours which were denied to others—what would be said by impartial men? What would the public think! I shall leave you and your readers to draw your own conclusions from these facts.

The "Charleston affair" is still on the carpet in the