

THE BANK REPORT.

In our last we briefly alluded to the report of "the majority" on the subject of their investigation into the doings of the United States' Bank. That report has gone to the world, and has had a good effect on the stock. It was a tissue of poor arguments and misstated facts; indeed, so entirely erroneous were its calculations, that if it were believed, the stock would not be worth twenty-five cents in the dollar. But what says the public voice *after* the exposition? It says emphatically it is worth much more than a dollar. On this subject, we would rather have the opinion of the buyers, who are generally nice calculators, than the naked assertion of any committee of congressional lawyers whatever. We could not hope to embody in our limited space all that is said against the Bank by the Committee; but to show the fallacious nature of their mode of argument, we take the case of the New York Courier & Enquirer, who were charged with being bribed, but who have most triumphantly shown that the Committee reported a wilful misstatement. The following among other questions were put to the senior proprietor of the Courier:

Mr. McDuffie—What is the value of your newspaper establishment, as near as you can make the estimate?

mate:

Ans.—It is impossible to state the value of the paper. I have invested in my portion \$30,000, and if any person were to offer me at this time 70,000 for my interest, and become responsible for all the debts of the paper, I would not accept of it.

Mr. McD.—What is your estimate of the annual income of the Courier & Enquirer, making the usual deduction for bad debts?

Ans.—I think the receipts from October 1st, 1831, to October 1st, 1832, will not fall short of \$75,000—possibly they may exceed that sum. I found this estimate on the receipts of the year preceding, and the subsequent increase of business.

Mr. Cambreleng—For how much did Col. Tylee sell his half of the Courier & Enquirer?

Ans.—\$20,000 and the amount charged him on the books for advances, which was about 4,800.

Mr. Cambreleng—What are the annual expenditures of your establishment?

Ans.—They are now much greater than formerly. From the 1st of October 1831 to the 1st of October 1832, they will be probably between forty and fifty thousand dollars.

The case of these applicants for a discount is then stated thus—

Here are two persons, of skill in their profession, engaged in an establishment of which the capital is

	\$35,000
The gross income	60,750
The expenditures	35,000
And the net income	25,750

In conducting such a business, where the receipts are semi-annual, the payments daily and weekly, they naturally require, like other men in business, some credit. They accordingly apply to borrow \$20,000. They wish to borrow it, not to pay previous debts, not to spend it on objects unconnected with their business, but for the purpose of employing it all in a way to increase the profits of the concern itself, by procuring a new press, and enlarging their means of obtaining early commercial information, and thus make the paper more valuable.

So much for the loan of 20,000.

We now put it to our readers, whether this was not only a *legitimate business transaction*, but a safe loan? If, as we represented, we had been deprived of our usual business facilities in consequence of advocating a re-charter of the Bank of the United States, then it was incumbent upon that institution to give us a preference over all other applicants, provided we demonstrated that we were responsible for the amount asked to be loaned.

We next asked for and obtained a loan of 15,000, on the 15th of December; but here again, we came forward and proved to the satisfaction of the Bank, that we were abundantly able to meet our engagements. On our first application for a loan, we stated the property of our establishment to be worth only \$8,000; but when we applied for the second loan, we showed to the Bank that our property had increased to nearly \$30,000! Thus showing at once, that the whole of the previous loan had been expended in boats, presses, types, &c. adding to the real value and responsibility of our establishment, and greatly benefiting our commercial and reading community. They saw that the first loan had been legitimately applied—that the money was safely invested—and that the unparalleled increase of our business warranted a much greater accommodation than we asked for. In relation to this loan, Mr. Biddle testifies as follows:

“The other loan rested on the same principles as the first, with this addition. The parties stated, that owing to the part which they had taken in regard to the Bank, they had been deprived of their usual accommodations in their business. Whatever might be the reason, the fact of an abridgment of these facilities furnished a reason for extending the loan in addition to the belief of its safety—which was, that by so doing, any hazard to the original loan might be prevented; and the best evidence of its security is, that the parties have since repaid the loan.

the parties have since rep-
“ In regard to the other loans which appear in their names, *they were given without any knowledge of their being discounted at the Bank.* They were done at the request of a person of undoubted solidity, which had been proved in the most decisive way—by the actual payment of the notes. That they intended to aid Mr. Noah, the drawer of the notes, in purchasing a share in a newspaper, was stated at the time. But that formed no objection to them. He borrowed money as thousands borrow money every day, to invest it in active business. If Mr. Noah had himself applied to the Bank for a loan to buy a share in a newspaper, and the security had been satisfactory, the purpose of the loan would have made no difference. Nine tenths of the loans made by the Bank probably are made to persons to pay for something already bought. Men borrow money to buy a share in a ship—a share in a cargo—a share in a bank—a share in a canal—and why not a share in a newspaper? The Bank had no difficulty about the loan, because it was thought secure; nor about the object, because that was not the concern of the Bank. It does not inquire, and does not care, where its money goes to, its only anxiety is that it should come safely back; and whether in the interval it is employed by a merchant, or a farmer, or a lawyer, or an editor, is a matter of which it takes no cognizance.”

It is evident, then, that so far as the Bank was concerned, it acted prudently in making these loans. Our applications and statements were verified by the affidavits of the Book-keepers, Clerks, Pressmen, &c. in our employ, and the Bank believed our statements to be correct. If they were not correct, then on us, and not on the Bank, let the public odium fall. If the loans were not safe, they were at least deemed to be so, and the Bank must stand exonerated from all censures.

The Editors state that now, directly or indirectly, they owe the Bank but \$18,000, and have, *exclusive of debts due them*, property in their establishment worth nearly \$30,000.

Did the Bank Committee (asks Mr. Webb,) know this? Most assuredly they did, and let them answer to the people for their unheard of *suppression* and *misrepresentation* of facts. We will point out a few of them. Mr. Cambreleng says—"we will now submit the facts in relation to the manner in which this loan (the 32,795) has been disposed of." "On the 14th March, Burrows obtained a discount from the Bank of \$14,150, and on the 15th of the same month the note of Webb and Noah for \$15,000, loaned them on the 16th of December previously, and not due till June next, was paid off by two drafts from Webb, obtained at the United States' Branch Bank at New York."

Now, what does this imply? What idea was intended to be conveyed by this statement? There is but one answer to be given to these questions, and that is, the writer (and we have Mr. Cambreleng's own declaration that he was *engaged* in writing it,) wished the public to believe that Mr. Burrows loaned us the money to pay the loan of \$15,000. No other inference can be drawn from the paragraph—no other inference was intended to be conveyed by it—and such inference is totally at variance with the facts of the case known to the Committee.

A letter was addressed to the Committee, asking them, in justice to the Enquirer Editors, that an expression of

an opinion in the report, whether they had or had not, had any other than fair business transactions with the Bank, and whether there had or had not been between that institution and the Editors, any collusion or understanding directly or indirectly, that in consequence of the loans and accommodations made to them, they were to advocate a recharter of the Bank. The Enquirer says:

“ It will be perceived that this letter has not in any way been regarded by the committee, although the demand we made in it was one to which we were justly entitled. They presumed, unauthorised by Congress, to bring our account before the public—their investigation made it the subject of newspaper comment—they saw us assailed in every quarter—they *professed* to believe us innocent of collusion with the Bank—and yet they refuse to say to the public that we are innocent. They could not, on the testimony before them, entertain a doubt of the fair business character of our transactions with the Bank, and yet they refuse to give an opinion. We invite them to censure if they please—to speak out at once and not leave their opinions to insinuation and inference, and they deny us this simple act of justice! Can their course in this instance be justified? Will the people countenance them in using their official station to the injury of individuals for the purpose of gratifying private malice?—We think not. We have courted a full investigation and a free expression; but to injure the Bank and pamper to the design of C. C. Cambreleng, that opinion is withheld, and that investigation so stated, as to mislead the public, and cast censure upon the Bank and upon us.”

Here we think the matter may safely rest till we have the expected counter report from Mr. Adams and Mr. McDuffie—men in whom the country repose much confidence. When it arrives, our readers may expect to be made acquainted with its main features.