

**"THE MODERATION OF THE SOUTH"**

In the House of Representatives last week at Washington, Mr. Edwards, of Ohio, from the committee on the District of Columbia, reported a bill to prohibit the introduction of slaves into the District, as merchandise, or for hire, which was read, and provides that persons so offending shall be considered guilty of a misdemeanor, and punished by a fine of \$500, and all such contracts shall be null and void.

Members, and other non-residents, however, are permitted to bring their slaves into the District, for their own personal use, and also citizens to whom bequests of slaves may be made. The first of August next is fixed as the period when the law shall go into effect.

Mr. Edwards moved that the bill be printed, and referred to the committee of the whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. Wentworth was in favor of immediate action, and hoped the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Edwards) would go with him, in an effort to secure the passage of this bill, which he considered a good one—as good as one as could be passed at the present session—and a better must be left for a future Congress.

And yet with these aggressions repeated every day and hour, and avowals of a determination to sap and undermine our safe guards, a print published not two hundred miles from this place, (the Augusta Chronicle,) can palter with the peril, and play into the hands of our enemies by lulling the South into a fatal slumber.

The moderation of the South! God help us. If such moderation as it and its accomplices counsel were the true feeling of the South—which we utterly repudiate and deny. Let the Editor of that print take off the party bandage which blinds his eyes, and look at the ominous signs of the times displaying themselves in the popular movements and tone of the press throughout the entire South—and he will find that what he terms "moderation," the masses stigmatize as apathy or treachery.

The petty malevolence displayed against Mr. Calhoun, will not distress that great Statesman very terribly—the "Old Lion" has received too many kicks of the same sort to heed much either the assaults of the perpetrators; nor was the rock of Gibraltar ever yet stormed by a cock boat. There was a time in Georgia when the people suspected his motives and dreaded his ambition, but that time has passed—all his ambitious aspirations he has nobly offered up upon the altar of patriotism, and all Southern men must now acknowledge his honesty and truthfulness on this great question of Southern Equality, of which he has been the mightiest champion.

It is worse than idle, therefore, for a Southern print to give color and countenance to the pretexts of our assailants, by feeble flippancies, and appeals to old prejudices, as some seem disposed to do so—seduced into this course, no doubt, by early associations, which a long residence at the South has not been able entirely to obliterate. What, for instance, must be the effect produced by long articles, the tone and temper of which the following extract from one of them will clearly show:

"Northern Abolitionists and Free Soilers are in great tribulation at the 'moderation of the South.' They say and feel that this 'moderation is dangerous' to them. The 'Liberty party' could not live a year in any State in the Union, if entirely neglected and permitted to beat the empty air in idle amusement. No man or party can long fight alone. All that the most doughty champion of anti-slavery fanaticism can do is to bite his own nose off. To keep the head of abolitionism afloat, to prevent its leaders from sinking to rise no more from the great deep of things forgotten, they cry imploringly to Mr. Calhoun—they look most wishfully to South Carolina, to agitate the 'slavery question.' Without agitation we perish. 'Give us the bread of excitement or we starve.'"

[Augusta Chronicle.]

This is followed up by a long rignarole in the same strain—all going to show that in this matter the wrong, insult and injury are on the part of Southern Agitators—Messrs. Calhoun & Co. a Democratic rise intended only for the benefit of Democratic party and the distraction of the Whig—there being no real cause for excitement or agitation.

When such tame subserviency to the partisan whip is manifested by those supposed to echo public opinion in our midst, why should not our foes take heart, and lay the scourge still more heavily on the backs of the shrinking victims too abject and spiritless even to dare to murmur?

We solemnly protest against such doctrines and such assertions! No such "moderation" is manifested in the South, save by those partisan presses eager for the spoils of victory, or prizing the harmony of the Party above all else. We proudly point to the tone of the whole Southern Press from Virginia to Mexico, (with the few exceptions designated.) We point to the solemn Resolutions passed by all the Southern Legislatures in session, making the distinct issue of EQUALITY or RESISTANCE.

We point to the public gatherings, even in Georgia—which these moderates would misrepresent—breathing stern defiance; and warn these purblind encouragers of Northern fanatics and knaves, that the grim silence of the South which they mistake for indifference, is the silence of settled resolve—and that if goaded to action the fault will rest upon their heads for deceiving the North—not upon those of the 'agitators' who have warned them not to urge too far the spirit which they have already provoked; nor for the smouldering fire to burst forth into a fierce and consuming flame.

We have penned these hasty lines in no unkind spirit, but from a sincere conviction of the truth we have stated, and their important bearing upon the future safety of the South and of the Union. Those who deride or disregard them, will discover their true interests when too late.—Columbia Telegraph.

**THE PEOPLE AND POLITICIANS OF THE SOUTH.**  
The late events at Washington, it seems to us, have made it perfectly clear, that the people of the South cannot rely on their Representatives in Congress, for a faithful co-operation in any course calculated to protect the rights, or redress the wrongs of the South, on the subject of slavery. The hopes of office or preferment, which party organization, in connexion or affiliation with the North excites, are much too powerful both with Whigs and Democrats, to permit an abandonment of its ties, and a single devoted devotion to the interests and honor of the South. The great majority of politicians are, more or less, traders in politics. Distinction in Congress in the shape of the Speaker, or as Chairman of some leading Committee, can only be attained by an unscrupulous adherence to party, and a careful avoidance of any course of policy that may offend the great and growing majority from the Free States. That man from the South, who will tolerate with meek subserviency, their insulting aggressions, or palliate, or aid them in their efforts to sacrifice the South on the altar of fanaticism, or barter it away to the interests of

the North, is sure to be a favorite. These are the men they delight to honor. And then, there are all the offices and distinctions to be won by party, when a President is lifted to power. Sectional independence of party, of any kind or any subject, is fatal to President making. To make a President, and reach the honors and offices of the Union, there must be an absolute submission of the minority, not only in selecting the man who is to be the candidate, but also in all the leading measures of policy which the majority shall dictate. The South is that minority, and of course in such a game, her place must always be to follow. To refuse, is to ruin the party, and lose all the honors of the Government. Not to follow, is treason to party, although to follow be treason to country. Between country and party, under such temptations, there is little hesitation in the minds of old party hacks or ambitious aspirants. They will go with their party, though lighted on their way, by the fires of insurrection itself.

The South has nothing to expect from party or politicians, in the great struggle which is before her. The people must take the matter in their own hands. They must watch, command, destroy—watch every encroachment on their rights, command obedience to their sovereign will, destroy any and every traitor to their interests and honor. In primary assemblies every where throughout the South, let them speak out in terms not to be misunderstood, their indignant sense of their wrong; their fixed determination to redress them; their withering and consuming wrath against those who shall dare to counsel endurance, or attempt to sell them and theirs for self-aggrandisement. Let them, on this question, close hands one with another, and standing up for their rights, their honor, and their cherished institutions, present such a front, as corrupt and truckling politicians will cower under, and flee from, with fear and trembling. Let them do this, and our enemies throughout the length and breadth of the Free States, will feel and know that the spell of party and the fear of consequences no longer paralysed the South in her strong determination to enforce her own protection and salvation. With such a manifestation of their will, there is no power on earth that can prevent that will from proving omnipotent.—Charleston Mercury.

**NAVAL ENGAGEMENT AT MARACAIBO.**  
Correspondence of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.  
CERCAZO Jan. 6, 1849.  
There was a naval engagement on the morning of the 13th ultimo, near the fort of San Carlos, at the entrance to the Lake of Maracaibo, between the marine forces of Generals Monagas and Paez. The fleet of each party had been at anchor in the Bay within 6 or 7 miles of each other for some days. Each consisted of some 13 or 14 small vessels, those of Paez being the smaller of the two. Monagas had also a steamer, the Augusta, formerly of New Orleans. One barque and two schooners of Paez made the attack at 3 A. M., upon the whole fleet of Monagas at anchor. Three or four others of the vessels of Paez were under sail but did not go into the engagement. Early in the engagement the rudder of the barque (Maracaibo) was shot away and she became unmanageable in the strong wind then prevailing. The whole of Monagas's fleet aimed their fire at the barque and destroyed her. She went ashore by the violence of the wind, and her crew escaped, except such as had been killed or wounded. One of the schooners was disabled also and went ashore—the other schooner was captured. This was the extent of Gen. Paez's loss. The fleet of Monagas suffered great damage, and 3 or 4 of the vessels were disabled. The steamer suffered terribly, having received 6 balls in her hull and upper works. Paez's remaining vessels retired to the lake, and in a few days afterwards San Carlos (Castle) surrendered to the forces of Monagas, and his party have now possession of Maracaibo. Thus far only our information extends.

In the Eastern provinces, every thing is tranquil on the surface, but a general uprising of the people against the tyranny of Monagas, is confidently predicted by the friends of Gen. Paez, &c.

On the 2d Wednesday in February, to open and read the votes for President and Vice President, which was adopted, and Mr. Clayton was appointed teller on the part of the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the postage bill, and Mr. Allen replied, at great length, to the speech of Mr. Niles, made on Friday last.

Mr. Pearce followed, but the Senate, without action on the bill, adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.  
Mr. Sibley of Minnesota, offered a resolution respecting the new mail routes on the Upper Mississippi. Adopted.

Mr. Tuck offered a preamble and resolutions for settling disagreements between nations, by arbitration. He moved a suspension of the rules, to have the same acted upon. Motion lost.

Mr. Stephens then asked and obtained general consent to offer his resolutions of inquiry as to the existence of a protocol to the Mexican treaty.

The Clerk having read them, Mr. Wentworth called for the yeas and nays upon the question of suspending the rules.

Mr. Houston withdrew his objections to Mr. Stephens's resolution, and the House, 181 to 3, suspended the rules to receive the same.

Mr. Stephens, in presenting the resolutions, said that he considered the subject of great importance. He did not intend to discuss the matter now but he had good reasons for believing that such a protocol, so signed, was in existence. At the close of the last session, a call was made upon the President for the instructions to our commissioners, to which the President replied that he deemed it incompatible with the public interests to furnish such instructions; that the treaty, as amended by the Senate had been ratified by Mexico and ratification exchanged, and that in those instructions the commissioners were only directed to urge upon the Mexican government the ratification of the amended treaty.

It thus appeared that the President had refused to furnish the House with a copy of these instructions, under which these assurances had been given.

Mr. S. proceeded to read the articles of the original treaty struck out by the Senate, and also substituted, and the protocol having reference thereto; and contended that, whether the explanations were or were not correct, the President had nevertheless no constitutional right whatever to give such instructions. The voice in the Senate in favor of part of the original 9th article stood 18 to 29 and among the favorers of the original article, he found recorded the name of one of these commissioners, who subsequently made these explanations, that the change was not intended to affect the rights secured by the original article.

So in regard to the other portion struck out of the original 9th article, the vote stood 16 to 31 in favor of retaining the original words, and the name of the same commissioner was again found recorded among the 16, in the affirmative. The explanations in the protocol, in regard to the 10th section, he contended were wholly unauthorised, and as regarded Texas, wholly incorrect in point of fact. In reference to the 12th article—the power to transfer or dispose of the 12,000,000 as Mexico might deem proper he believed the action of the Senate was intended to prevent Mexico from so disposing of it either to carry on war or for any other purpose.

Whether these explanations invalidate the treaty or not, the President had assumed powers which he had no right to assume. He did not himself recognize the validity of the treaty, or the power of the President and Senate to make any treaty which imposed upon this house the duty of making appropriations to carry it into effect.

Mr. Houston, of Ala., considered the movement of the gentleman from Georgia premature, and as doing gross injustice to the President. By a proper examination of this protocol, and comparison of it and the instructions with the original treaty and the treaty as amended, it would be found that there was no discrepancy, though the language of the protocol might not be the precise language of the instructions. The explanations were strictly in accordance with the provisions of the treaty as amended by the Senate.

Mr. H. contended that it would not be in the power of the United States to divest the holders of lands in the new territories of the titles they held prior to the ratification of the treaty; and it was folly to suppose that by any treaty the government of the United States intended to abrogate any of those titles, whether of church property or any other. In this he coincided with the doctrines of Mr. Buchanan's letter, from which he read to sustain his position.

The protocol, though differing slightly in language from the letter of Mr. Buchanan, is strictly in conformity with his doctrines, and with the law on the subject. He further contended that the Senate never intended to prevent Mexico from transferring or disposing of the \$12,000,000 in such manner as she might deem advisable—the amendment was made merely to prevent the issue of certificates of debt by our government.

Mr. H. denied that any fraud had been practiced upon the Government of Mexico, and stated the fact that the treaty, as amended, was formally sanctioned by both houses of the Mexican Congress, before the signing of the Commissioners and the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs. If, then, the action of our Senate is necessary to the validity of this protocol, why was it not also submitted, subsequently to its adoption, to the action of the Mexican Congress? So far from this, however, the signing of the protocol was among the last acts of the Mexican government, and the sanction of the Mexican Congress to the treaty as amended, had been given before one word of conversation had taken place between the commissioners and the Mexican government in regard to explanations.

Mr. H. thought, in regard to the instructions, that reasons might have existed at the last session for the withholding of the instructions by the President, which did not now exist, and he concluded, by adding that the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to furnish a copy of the instructions to the commissioners, and such other correspondence as appertain to the treaty.

Mr. Schenk followed, contending that the President and Senate conjointly constitute the treaty making power, and that the independent action of the President, in causing these explanations and assurances to be made, were wholly unauthorised. Even though there had been no difficulty, in regard to the amendments, with the Mexican Congress, there were objections raised by the other branch of the Mexican treaty-making power, and hence the explanations.

In order to induce the Executive of Mexico to ratify this treaty as amended, to which he had objected, the President of the United States, through our commissioners, makes these assurances, which never would have been made, under any other circumstances, and without which the treaty never would have been ratified by the Mexican President. And how was it that these assurances were given by the President of the United States, without any correspondence or consultation with the Senate, a co-ordinate branch of the treaty making power of this government? What right had he to say, that these amendments made by this co-ordinate branch, were nothing? Whether the amendments were important or unimportant, made no manner of difference, so far as the question of right was concerned.

But Mr. S. contended that there were in the amendments essential modifications in regard to Mexican land titles, and particularly in regard to lands in Texas prior to 1836, to prove which he read at some length from Mr. Buchanan's letter in the same point, to show the reasons which influenced the Senate to make the modifications. When he had concluded Mr. Burt obtained the floor, and moved the previous question, which was sustained—The question was first taken by yeas and nays, on Mr. Houston's amendment, and it was negative 84 to 96.

Mr. Wentworth appealed to Mr. Stephens to embrace in his resolution, a call for the instructions to our commissioners, and the correspondence with the Mexican government subsequent to the ratification of the treaty by the Senate of the United States. Mr. Stephens consented to the modification, and the yeas and nays were then ordered on the resolution, as amended, and it was adopted, 147 to 34.

Mr. Meade introduced a resolution instructing the committee on the contingent fund to inquire into the expediency of causing a copy in marble to be taken of the Statute of Washington in the State House at Richmond, to be placed in the Rotunda of the Capitol, at the seat of the General Government. Adopted.

Mr. Sibley, of Wisconsin Territory, introduced resolutions in regard to the Indians and to the establishment of post-roads in that territory, which were adopted. Adjourned.

FEBRUARY 7.  
A message was received from the President of the U. States, by the hands of Mr. John Knox Walker, private Secretary, ordered to be read, and was understood to be substantially as follows:  
It is in reply to the resolutions of Mr. Stephens, (enclosing a report from the Secretary of State,) communicating the information called for in reference to the Protocol to the treaty with Mexico.

The President says that he had declined, when called upon by the House at the last session to furnish a copy of the instructions to our commissioners, because he then deemed it incompatible with the public interests. He did not think it proper to make public such instructions until some time thereafter. But, as he was now again called upon for them in connexion with the correspondence and other matters appertaining to the treaty, he had deemed it proper to comply with the request.

The instructions to our commissioners were, that none of the amendments made by the Senate could be modified—they might be explained, in conformity with the dispatch of the Secretary of State to the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, but not modified. Their instructions were confined to this; and on this letter of Mr. Buchanan, the treaty, as amended, was submitted to the Mexican Congress and approved by both houses. Next day, (26th July), our commissioners were introduced to the Mexican President, and addresses were made on both sides.

In a subsequent dispatch from our Commissioners to the Secretary of State, the commissioners state that the amendments have been agreed to, and ratifications exchanged, and enclosed a copy of the protocol. The proclamation of the fact was made here on the 4th of July last. The protocol and correspondence was not then communicated, because it was not deemed necessary, as the treaty had been ratified and amended, and it was not competent on the President and Senate to abrogate it, and restore war, except by a declaration of war by Congress.

The commissioners did not regard the protocol as part of the treaty. They knew they had no authority to alter the treaty or modify the amendments. Nor would the President of the Mexican Republic have regarded the protocol as modifying the treaty as amended by the Senate of the United States, for no reference is made to it by him on its final consummation.

The President then proceeds to notice the amendment of the Senate to the original articles, and to argue that the changes do not change any of the guaranties of rights, civil religious or political.

Of that portion of the original treaty relating to Texas titles, he had recommended the rejection, when it was submitted to the Senate, and it had not received a single vote therein. And it had been further stated to the Mexican government that no treaty containing such a provision could be ratified by the United States. The meaning of the protocol was, that its rejection was not intended to invalidate any legitimate titles in existence, but it was not intended to give validity to those which had been declared to be extinct. Without any treaty stipulations, such legitimate titles would have been secured, under the constitution and laws of the United States.

In regard to the amendment to the 12th article, though the Senate had declined to create government stock, it would not prevent the transfer for her own benefit, by Mexico, in such manner as she might deem expedient, the \$12,000,000 to be paid her under the treaty. The obligation may be assigned, but would stand her then in no better condition than if it had remained with the Mexican government.

In this view of the case, he had not deemed it necessary to communicate the protocol to the Senate, at the time of his proclamation.

In our editorial of last week, we warmly applauded Mr. Calhoun for his friendship to the South on the Slavery Question, and signified our confidence in him in the present contest between the North and South. Perhaps we should have qualified this; but our remarks were made in a positive manner, because we had seen former intimations from those who had seen Mr. Calhoun's Address, what would be his character, and were sure that every true friend of the South would agree with it. This is the Address which was adopted by the Southern meeting, composed of the ablest and most distinguished sons of the South.—It is a history of the aggressions of the North upon the South, from the formation of the constitution to the present time, set forth in a forcible clear and lucid manner. It recommends no particular course of action to the South. We publish a portion of it on the inside of to-day's paper.

We recommend the attention of our readers to a careful perusal of this interesting Address to the South. We see nothing in it to which any Southern man could object. It is an able, calm and dispassionate document. The object of it seems to be to give general information of the rise and progress of the opposition by the North. The aggressions of the North have been gradual, yet steady and unyielding—scarcely giving us any warning of their approach until they were down upon us in all their force and fury. We have some fearless and undaunted spirits from the South in the halls of Congress, who have stood like faithful sentinels upon the watch tower of the constitution, to give us warning of any encroachment upon our rights. They have met in solemn council, and have recited to us the story of our wrongs—they bid us prepare for the worst—they admonish us of our danger and call upon us to assist them in resisting the gross violation of the constitution, and the destruction of our dearest rights.—Macon (Ala.) Republican.

**THE CAMDEN JOURNAL.**  
Wednesday Morning, February 14, 1849.  
W. THURLOW CASTON, EDITOR.

The Editor of the Journal will be absent from the State for a few weeks, during which his duties will be attended to by a friend.

The Markets.  
The supply of cotton last week was not so large as that for several weeks previous, while the demand was brisk, sales being readily effected at 5 to 6½. On Monday evening telegraphic despatches were received, announcing the arrival of the Niagara, with advices of an advance of ½d in the Liverpool market. Enough of the news had not transpired at the time of going to press, to have an effect on our market; we have no doubt however, but an advance of ½ to ¾ will be established. (Charleston quotations on Saturday, 5 13-16 to 6½.)

A meeting of the Wateree Agricultural Society will be held at Swift Creek on Thursday the 22d inst., at 11 o'clock. A punctual attendance is desired.

J. BOYKIN, Secretary.  
The Camden Debating Club will hold its meetings hereafter, on Wednesday evenings, at 7 o'clock, at the Library Hall.  
Education.  
This important subject naturally engrosses much of the attention of all who are interested in the prosperity and welfare of the community in which we reside, and appeals particularly to parents.  
At no time since our infancy (when we "trudged unwillingly to school,") have so many excellent institutions of learning existed in this place as at present. Indeed, we think no town in this State affords better schools than we have at this time in Camden. We have two male classical schools; one already established reputation, and the other under the superintendence of a gentleman, who brings with him from a neighboring town, the highest evidences of success. The Camden Female Academy is one of the best we have known any where, and we are satisfied under its present management must continue to acquire eminence every year of its existence, while the infant and primary schools are numerous and under the control of teachers of experience and capacity. The town, and particularly the summer residences of the citizens of Camden, in the suburbs of the town, is as healthy and as delightfully situated for pure air and good water as any in the State. The society of Camden is too well known to require any notice at our hands, and our accessibility from all parts of the State is equally notorious. With all these advantages then, why may we not expect that our schools here will receive a liberal portion of the patronage bestowed on similar institutions in the up-country? We cordially invite those of our friends residing in the adjoining country, who have habitually sent their children abroad, to look at the advantages near home, and let their children form here, among friends and neighbors, those associations which exert so great an influence in after life. We are sure no higher polish could be acquired in the society of any place in South Carolina than here, while for purposes of instruction, our schools are most ample and efficient.