

The Eve. Journal inquires why the Argus omits in its strictures upon the loans of the U. S. Bank to printers, all notice of the \$10,000 of the editor of the Richmond Enquirer? Without conceding the right of interrogation from that source, we answer, that *if* it is true that the editor of the R. Enq. has obtained a loan at the bank, we venture to say that it is upon unquestionable security, and that it is a *bona fide* business transaction. The editor of the R. Enquirer is one of the most uncompromising, as he is one of the ablest, *opponents* of the U. S. Bank, upon every ground of objection. He has steadily and fearlessly urged its unconstitutionality, its anti-republican character and tendencies, its fearful power, the dangerous if not corrupt exercise of that power, and the indispensable necessity, under a due regard to the constitutional principles and republican practice of the government, of preventing its re-charter. And he has not hesitated to urge the salutary alternative of the Executive *veto*, if a majority of both houses shall be found subservient

the salutary alternative of the Executive *veto*, if a majority of both houses shall be found subservient to this great monied power. The loan, *if* one has been had in this instance, has not in the least degree interrupted or diminished the efficient opposition to the Bank, now and from the beginning, of that influential journal. We know its editor—and we know that the Bank of the U. S. has not *the power* (great as that power is, and fearfully as it has been exerted in other instances) to purchase his departure from the high constitutional and republican principles for which he has contended with veteran energies and effect. His whole course *against* the bank repels the thought that it has been in the least degree controlled by this institution.

But how different is the issue between the Courier and Enquirer at least, if not the National Intelligencer? In the case of the former, a violent opposition to the bank was *changed*, at the instant, for the grossest subserviency to its wishes, under a loan to two of its irresponsible editors, they alone being the drawers and endorsers, for the large sum of nearly 53,000 dollars! What analogy exists between the cases of the Enq. of Richmond and the Enq. of N. Y.? The one is a fair, business transaction, upon undoubted security: The other, a marked instance of the corruptions by which, “as by a subtle poison,” the liberties of the press may be withered.