

THE QUESTION SETTLED.—We have at last the pleasure of informing our readers that the deposite question, which has so long been the absorbing theme in Congress, has been settled in the House of Representatives. The final vote on the resolutions reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, was taken on the 4th inst. After several ineffectual efforts on the part of the Bank men to prolong the discussion, and thereby continue the commercial distress still existing, until interest might be supposed to have fairly nullified every patriotic feeling, and until the Bank should have time to intimidate, or buy over a few more supporters in the House, Mr. Mason's call for the previous question was sustained. We have not room for a complete list of the yeas and nays, but as our Georgia readers may like to know how their public servants voted on this momentous question, we have taken the liberty of informing them.

On the question whether the House should vote immediately or prolong the discussion, heaven knows how long, we find Messrs. Coffee, Gambie, Jones and Wayne in favor of action at once, and Messrs. Clayton, Foster and Wilde opposed to it; or in other words, in favor of continuing the state of uncertainty to which the community are indebted for the most, if not all of their unusual distress. Messrs. Gilmer and Schley were absent.

The question on the first resolution, viz. that "The Bank of the United States ought not to be re-chartered," was decided in the affirmative—yeas, 135; nays, 82. Messrs. Coffee, Clayton, Foster, Gilmer, Jones, Schley and Wayne, in the affirmative, and Mr. Wilde in the negative.—Mr. Gamble's name does not appear.

On the resolution "That the deposits ought not to be restored to the Bank of the United States," and which was carried, (119 to 104,) our delegation voted as follows: For the resolution, Messrs. Coffee, Gilmer, Jones, Schley and Wayne—against it, Messrs. Clayton, Foster and Wilde. Mr. Gamble absent.

The third resolution declares, "That the State Banks ought to be continued as the places of deposite of the public money, and that it is expedient for Congress to make further provision by law, prescribing the mode of selection, the securities to be taken, and the manner and terms on which they are to be employed." This resolution was adopted—yeas, 117; nays, 104. Messrs. Coffee, Gilmer, Jones, Schley and Wayne voted in the affirmative, and Messrs. Clayton, Foster and Wilde in the negative. Mr. Gamble absent.

The fourth resolution reads as follows:

"4. *Resolved*, That, for the purpose of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the cause of the commercial embarrassment and distress complained of by numerous citizens of the United States, in sundry memorials which have been presented to Congress at the present session, and of inquiring whether the charter of the Bank of the United States has been violated, and also what corruptions and abuses have existed in its management, whether it has used its corporate power, or money to control the press, to interfere in politics, or influence elections, and whether it has had any agency, through its management or money, in producing the existing pressure, a select committee be appointed to inspect the books, and examine into the proceedings of the said Bank, who shall report whether the provisions of the charter have been violated or not; and also what abuses, corruptions, or malpractices have existed in the management of said Bank, and that the said committee be authorized to send for persons and papers, and to summon and examine witnesses on oath, and to examine into the affairs of the said Bank and branches; and they are further authorized to visit the principal Bank, or any of its branches, for the purpose of inspecting the books, correspondence, accounts, and other papers connected with its management or business; and that the said committee be required to report the result of such investigation together with the evidence they may take, at as early a day as practicable."

It was carried—yeas, 174; nays, 41. Among the majority we find Messrs. Coffee, Foster, Jones, Schley, Wayne and Wilde; and in this lean minority we observe Messrs. Clayton and Gilmer—Mr. Gamble still absent.

Each of the above resolutions is important, and the votes recorded upon all of them, as matter of political history, will not be much less so. So far as some of our members are concerned, they present one of those unaccountable instances of desertion from long cherished and well-established principles, which we sometimes meet with in our intercourse with the world. In such changes men may be morally honest, but is it safe for a people whose principles are fixed, any longer to trust those who have misrepresented their wishes, whatever may be the claims they set up to honesty? If they have not clear heads and sound judgments, they will do but little good as our representatives, and may do much harm. Let us cast them off, then.

On examining the statement of votes here given, it will be seen, that of our whole delegation, Mr. Wilde is the only one who openly avows himself a Bank man. He goes the "whole figure," while some stop

at the half-way house. We like his independence—he turns his coat openly and above board, and stands ready to “assume the responsibility” without flinching. He is even willing to test the correctness of his present views, by voting for the appointment of a committee to investigate the affairs of the Bank. We cannot go with him, nor will the people of Georgia, but in their opposition they will accord the praise due to his candor, and respect the man while they deprecate his principles.

Mr. Clayton and Mr. Foster vote that the Bank ought not to be re-chartered, and yet advocate the restoration of the public deposits to that Bank. If, as these gentlemen contend, the removal of the deposits has caused all the distress, and if they oppose the recharter of the Bank, why do they vote to restore them, when in two years they must be removed again, and consequently re-produce the same calamities which our citizens have recently experienced, and from which they are getting gradually extricated? Do they wish to bring ruin and desolation again upon the country, in order to punish “old Jackson” for exercising his constitutional power? Or do they hope, that if the Bank triumphs now, a change will take place in public opinion in its favor, and that like Mr. Leigh, they can hereafter gracefully yield their constitutional scruples in obedience to the people’s will, and while they are effectually serving Mr. Biddle, get loud praises for their patriotism? If they hope for these things, they will learn by dear-bought experience, how sadly they are mistaken. The free citizens of Georgia will *not* change, and much as they may esteem, as individuals, the men who have gone contrary to their wishes, they will put the seal of reprobation upon their public conduct, in a manner that will teach our future representatives, that to trifle with the will of the people, must inevitably be visited with political prostration.

Mr. Clayton and Mr. Gilmer vote against the appointment of a committee of investigation. It is obvious from his other votes, that the latter gentleman thinks the Bank is corrupt and unconstitutional, and that it has been abundantly proved so to the people of the United States; it is fair to presume, therefore, that he believes any further investigation to be unnecessary. But what are we to think of the course of the former gentleman. Since his excellent and very conclusive report against the Bank, we do not recollect that any thing has appeared in its favor sufficient to change the opinion of a single individual. He believed last year that the Bank was an *unsafe* depository for the public money—now he is in favor of returning it into these same *unsafe* hands, without giving his constituents any good reason why he is so. If he thinks better of the Bank than he once did, why does he object to an investigation of its affairs, that the people may also receive some new light on the subject? He manifests more distrust of the soundness of his own judgment, than is compatible with the support of a good cause.

There is one more fact connected with this matter, which should not escape attention. Messrs. Clayton, Foster and Wilde were *opposed* to having the question settled by a vote of the House. Now is it not passing strange, that men who at the commencement of the session were so vehement in favor of immediate action, should be willing to wait four months, and then desire still longer to keep up a state of ruinous uncertainty? What does it manifest? We say, it shows any thing but a regard for the public weal.

But we have already extended our remarks farther than we at first intended. In conclusion we would observe, that it is not without regret we are compelled to censure some of those who once had our support and confidence; but we cannot change with every breeze, nor can we follow those who do; therefore, while we entertain for them personally none but the kindest feelings, we shall canvass their public conduct with scrutiny, and speak of it as we think it deserves.