of that either. People have a sentimental attachment for greenbacks. If anybody is going into the business of non-interest-bearing loans, however, of course the government ought to be the party, but I hope to see the greenbacks eliminated by the simple process of self-retirement.

"I believe in a United States bank similar to the bank of England. I get it from heredity, I suppose, for my grandfather, Nicholas Ridgely, was an officer of the old United States Bank, which Jackson broke up."

It may not be out of place to observe that Mr. Ridgely's prejudice against the greenback as a non-interest bearing loan does not extend to those other loans in the form of National Bank notes, which the banks obtain from the governmen not only without the payment of interest, but while, at the same time, the banks are the recipients of interest on the bonds deposited for the security of the notes.

It is in keeping with the notions of Republican financiers and politicians that a descendant of an officer of "the old United States Bank which Jackson broke up" should become Comptroller of the currency at this time. Mr. Ridgely's grandfather doubtless had the courage of his convictions and boldly and bluntly defended "the old United States Bank." Were he alive today, Grandfather Ridgely would probably be as greatly prejudiced against the greenbacks as his distinguished descendant appears to be.

It cannot be denied that Mr. Ridgly has plenty of company among leading politicians in the Republican party in his position concerning the abolition of the Sub-Treasury system and the establishment of a United States bank. As we recall it, Secretary Gage is already committed to such a bank and it will not be surprising if in the near future an organized effort is made to build up in this country the very institution which went down before the righteous wrath of Andrew Jackson.

Speaking of Andrew Jackson recalls the fact that he, as well as the distinguished grandson of Nichols Ridgely, had an opinion on this United States bank question. History records the tenacity with which General Jackson adhered to this opinion and the courage and vigor with which he defended it. The evils of the United States bank in Jackson's time suppy us with a hint of the evils that would attend a United States bank if established now. Some of these evils were well pointed out by President Jackson in a message to congress wherein he said:

"It is was not until late in the month of August that I received from the government directors an official report establishing beyond question that this great and powerful institution had been actively engaged in attempting to influence the elections of the public officers by means of its money, and that, in violation of the express provisions of its charter, it had by a formal resolution placed its funds at the disposition of its president to be employed in sustaining the political power of the bank. A copy of this resolution is contained in the report of the government directors before referred to, and however the object may be disguised by cautious language, no one can doubt that this money was in truth intended for electioneering purposes, and the particular uses to which it was proved to have been applied abundantly show that it was so understood. Not only was the evidence complete as to the past application of the money and power of the bank to electioneering purposes, but that the resolution of the board of directors authorized the same course to be pursued in future.

"It being thus established by unquestionable proof that the Bank of the United States was converted into a permanent electioneering engine, it appeared to me that the path of duty which the executive department of the government ought to pursue was not doubtful. As by the terms of the bank charter no officer but the secretary of the treasurer could remove the deposits, it seemed to me that this authority ought to be at once exerted to deprive that great corporation of the support and countenance of the government in such a use of its funds and such an exertion of its power. In this point of the case the question is distinctly presented whether the people of the United States are to govern through representatives chosen by their unbiased suffrages or whether the money and power of a great corporation are to be secretly exerted to influence their judgment and control their decisions. It must now be determined whether the bank is to have its candidates for all offices in the country, from the highest to the lowest, or whether candidates on both sides of political questions shall be brought forward as heretofore and supported by the usual means.

Alien and Sedition Law.

At this time an inspection of the "Alien and Sedition Laws" will be interesting. This title was employed to describe two acts of congress passed by the federalists in 1798.

The "Alien law," in brief, authorized the president to order out of this country all such aliens as he might regard as dangerous to the peace of the United States.

The "Sedition law," in brief, provided fine and imprisonment for any one who should write or print any false, scandalous or malicious things against the administration or congress.

These laws remained on the statute books until 1801 when they expired by limitation. The downfall of the federal party is credited in part to the fact that that party was responsible for these laws.

The details are described by the American Statesman as follows:

"Of the first mentioned of these acts, (the Alien law), the first section authorized the president to order all such aliens as he should judge dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, or should have reasonable grounds to suspect were concerned in any treasonable or secret machinations against the government thereof, to deport out of the country within a given time, to be expressed in the order. An alien so ordered to depart who should, after the time limited for his departure, be found at large without a license from the president to reside in the United States, was liable to imprisonment not exceeding three years, and was never to be admitted to become a citizen. On satisfactory proof being given by an alien that no injury or danger would arise from his remaining here the president might grant him a license to remain for such time and at such place as he should designate. The president might also require a bond with sureties for his good behavier.

Section 2 authorized the president, whenever he deemed it necessary for the public safety, to remove out of the country all persons in prison in pursuance of the act, and all who had been ordered to depart and remained without a license. And on their return, they might be imprisoned so long as, in the opinion of the president, the public safety might require.

Section 3 required masters of vessels coming into ports of the United States to report all aliens on board, the country from which they came, and the nation to which they owed allegiance, their occupation, a description of their persons, etc., under a penalty of $300.

Section 4 gave to the circuit and district courts of the United States cognizance of offenses against the act.

Section 5 secured to aliens the right of disposing of their property.

Section 6 limited the act to the term of two years from its passage.

All courts of the United States and of the several states, having criminal jurisdiction, were authorized, upon complaint against aliens or alien enemies at large, to the danger of the public peace or safety, and contrary to the intent of the proclamation or other regulations established by the president, to cause them to be apprehended and brought before any such court, judge, or justice; and after a full examination and hearing and for sufficient cause appearing, to order their removal, or to require sureties for their good behavior, or to restrain, imprison, or otherwise secure them, until the order should be performed. Marshals of the districts were to provide for their removal, and to execute the order for their apprehension, under a warrant of the president, or of a judge or justice.

The act relating to "the punishment of certain crimes against the United States," or, as it is called the "Sedition law," provided that any persons unlawfully combining or conspiring together, to oppose any measure of the government of the United States, or any of its laws, or to intimidate or prevent any officer under that government from undertaking or performing his duty; and any persons, with such intent, counselling or attempting to procure any insurrection, riot, or unlawful combination, were to be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, and by imprisonment not less than six months, nor exceeding five years; and, at the discretion of the court, they might also be held to find sureties for their good behavior.

But the provision deemed most objectionable, was the second section, which declared that any person who should write, print, utter or publish, or aid in writing, printing, uttering or publishing, any false, scandalous, or malicious writing against the government, congress, or the president of the United States, with intent to defame them, or to bring them into disrepute, or to stir up sedition within the United States, or to excite any unlawful combinations for opposing or resisting any law of the United States, or any act of the president done in pursuance of any such law, or to resist or defeat any such law, or to aid or abet any hostile designs of any foreign nation against the United States, their people or government, should be liable to be fined not exceeding $2,000, and imprisonment not exceeding two years.

The act further provided that any person prosecuted for writing or publishing such libel, might, in his defense, give in evidence the truth of the matter contained in the publication charged as a libel; and the jury had the right to determine the law and the fact under the direction of the court, as in other cases. This was an essentially mitigating provision of this obnoxious law. The English law of libel was at that time a part of the common law of this country. The defendant in a libel suit was not permitted to justify by proving the truth of the statement charged as libelous. Hence, the common expression, "The greater the truth, the greater the libel." But this law allowed no conviction except in cases in which the defendant failed to furnish evidence of the truth of his statement. This provision, now incorporated into the laws or constitutions of all the states, had then been adopted only in the states of Pennsylvania, Delaware and Vermont.

The act was to continue in force until the 3d of March, 1801, and no longer.

These laws were intended to counteract the schemes of the unprincipled French directory, whose emissaries in this country abused the freedom of the press by defaming the administration, and exciting the opposition of the people to the government and laws of the union. They did not, however, accord with the disposition and liberal views of the American people."