

QUEEN SABINE.

The true motives of parties and factions, and the real springs of public measures, are not always visible to the public eye; they are, on the contrary, often concealed from all save the actors in the drama. It is only through a few men of reliability, who make a business of obtaining glimpses behind the scenes, that we can occasionally learn something of what is passing there. From one of these, whose experience, intelligence, and confidential relations with the Democratic party place him in the front rank—“Tom” of the Sun—of whose revelations we often avail ourselves, we copy the annexed extract, explanatory of the political views which he believes the course of many members on the important measures now before Congress:

In regard to the home-steal bill, the amendment affords subjects of grave consideration. The original bill limits its benefits to actual citizens of the United States, but it is proposed to embrace foreigners who have signed an intention of becoming citizens. Extending the bill with this amendment to the Kansas and Nebraska Territories, the House will nullify the effect of the repeal of the slavery proclamation. We shall give away the domain to foreign emigrants as fast as they come into the country, so as to render certain the exclusion of the slave-holders from it.

By reference to our advertising columns, it will be seen that JAMES M. EDNEY, formerly of Buncombe, has located in New York, for the purpose of doing Commission business. Mr. Edney is generally and favorably known throughout our State, and we doubt not will give satisfaction to all who may entrust business to his hands.

THE LATE TRESHAW-DAMAGES REPAIRED.

We were pleased to learn yesterday, that the damages done some portion of the South Carolina Roads, by the recent freshets, have been repaired; and that no obstruction to the regular transit of mails and travel now exist. We trust the work at the Watercress on the Camden Branch of the South Carolina Road, and the damage at the Congaree River have both been fixed, and the trains now run regularly as heretofore. The Wilmington and Manchester Road suffered but trifling damage by the occurrence of these freshets. About fifty yards of embankment this side of the Great Pee Dee, were washed away, but this did not cause five minutes delay in the transportation of the mails and passengers. These injuries have also been repaired.

The male went through on Tuesday last, and the trains came through on Wednesday with passengers, but the mail did not arrive, having gone probably on a pleasure excursion to Charleston. Mr. Fleming, the Resident Engineer of the W. & M. Road, has been untiring in his exertions to repair the injuries caused by the late unprecedented freshets.

These having all been repaired, as we have previously stated, the regular transit of the mails and travel will go on as heretofore. —*W. H. Herald.*

Mr. BARRINGER.—A letter from Paris, dated 6th ult., says that Mr. Barringer and his family arrived in that city on that day.

ASTOUNDING INTELLIGENCE. The New York Tribune gives publicity to the following characteristic piece of intelligence from its Washington bureau:

We make this remark, because it is well known to all in Washington that so far as the Administration are concerned, the President has time and again intimated, in the broadest terms, that he regards the position of gentlemen on the particular bill as the test of support of the Baltimore Democratic National Convention Platform.

National Intelligences.

The main hope of the opponents of the Nebraska Bill in the House is now evidently upon New York Hards, whom they are now plying with the argument that the Union has formally announced that any member of the Democratic party from the North may consistently vote against the bill. This, of course, is a perversion of the editorial in the organ to which it refers. We make this remark, because it is well known to all in Washington that so far as the Administration are concerned, the President has time and again intimated, in the broadest terms, that he regards the position of gentlemen on the particular bill as the test of support of the Baltimore Democratic National Convention Platform.

National Intelligences.

For the benefit of all whom it may concern, it may not be amiss to add the following intimation from our industrious neighbor the *Star*, which, if it do not occupy a semi-official relation to the Administration, is quite reliable in such matters:

The main hope of the opponents of the Nebraska Bill in the House is now evidently upon New York Hards, whom they are now plying with the argument that the Union has formally announced that any member of the Democratic party from the North may consistently vote against the bill. This, of course, is a perversion of the editorial in the organ to which it refers. We make this remark, because it is well known to all in Washington that so far as the Administration are concerned, the President has time and again intimated, in the broadest terms, that he regards the position of gentlemen on the particular bill as the test of support of the Baltimore Democratic National Convention Platform.

National Intelligences.

What is the Matter.—We have to mention the complaints of our subscribers at Spring Grove, Iredell County, and at Jerusalem, Davie County, in relation to their papers, which, we are told, are of ten two and three weeks on the road. Spring Grove, is only 20 miles from this place: our packages for that office are directed *Via Mt. Monroe*, Iredell Co., and if they were duly attended to by the Postmasters through whose hands they pass, would reach their destination on Saturday. Our packages to Jern-almen are directed *Via Mocksville*, and ought also to reach their destination on Saturday. What, then, can be the cause of these failures? It is a matter which we cannot explain. All we can say is, that our packages for these, and all other offices, are sent to the Post Office here, every Thursday evening and night, and we believe do, depart, by the mails next morning. Cannot some one give an explanation of the difficulty?

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE EAST.

POLKOVILLE, Jones County, N.C., March 6, 1854.—There is considerable excitement here about the determination of the contemplated Rail Road from Goldsboro' to the Atlantic. Some want it to terminate at Beaufort, some at Shepherd's Point, and some at Carolina City. Beaufort claims the pre-eminence as a town, already built, Shepherd's Point, as being the most convenient place to load and unload the water, and Carolina city, as being nearer the place selected for the naval depot. It is about 3 miles from Carolina city to Shepherd's Point, and 2 miles from Shepherd's Point across Newport river and bay to Beaufort. There will be great electroming down here soon, and no mortal or wily will be known, but the termination of the Rail Road will be its great topic.

WASHINGTON, March 6, 1854.—Developments may soon be expected which will establish beyond doubt the fact, that the assertion of the principle involved in the Nebraska bill is but the preliminary step toward the execution of one of the boldest and most stupendous enterprises ever heard of. It proposes no less an achievement than the forcible seizure of Mexico, Central America and Cuba, during the approaching struggle in Europe, and their subversion of slave States. Here we have the key to the solution of that most inscrutable political enigma of the times, viz.: the motives of those who have been most instrumental in springing this portentous question up on the country. It is said that some of the first men of the country will be implicated, and nearly all the Southern leaders.

WASHINGTON, March 6, 1854.—*A NEW BROOM SWEEPS CLEAN.*

What is the Matter.—We have to mention the complaints of our subscribers at Spring Grove, Iredell County, and at Jerusalem, Davie County, in relation to their papers, which, we are told, are of ten two and three weeks on the road. Spring Grove, is only 20 miles from this place: our packages for that office are directed *Via Mt. Monroe*, Iredell Co., and if they were duly attended to by the Postmasters through whose hands they pass, would reach their destination on Saturday. Our packages to Jern-almen are directed *Via Mocksville*, and ought also to reach their destination on Saturday. What, then, can be the cause of these failures? It is a matter which we cannot explain. All we can say is, that our packages for these, and all other offices, are sent to the Post Office here, every Thursday evening and night, and we believe do, depart, by the mails next morning. Cannot some one give an explanation of the difficulty?

For the Watchman.

HOW HARD TO GIVE THEE UP. Who can know what is sorrow, come but to my song. Who are my friends in days that are gone? Begone—sighed those scenes of life's early morn, From the hue of the clouds that now cover.

How east I go, in distant lands wander and stray, When those who are dearest like life are away; Perhaps they may return—perhaps they may die; And the green soil of the valley of their graves lie.

Up, be away, thy destiny calls, Although down thy pale face the weeping drops fall, Nor that bleeding life-let and crushed heart that tear, How much the lost lost let none ever know of.

For their pleasureless offspring home can never know, Dost not, with hope, for thy chosen, go? In right keep thy cynosure, let the talk tell— Larger, thy cannot profit—but them farewell.

MARCH 8, 1854.—**E. RAY.**

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS. A CERTAIN REMEDY FOR SORES, ETC.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. William J. Langley, of Huntsville, Yaxkin County, North Carolina, dated November 1st, 1853.—

To Professor Holloway,

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill!”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”

“And that a party is in power whose Convention deliberately refused to encourage the Administration in its conflict with abolitionism, and which did not even mention the Nebraska bill?”

Has the “Standard” any particular consideration for any other principle involved in the Nebraska bill, than that of non-intervention? And did not the Whig Convention explicitly affirm that doctrine? And is not the emphatic Whig doctrine? And has not Douglas, to whom the “Standard” would award so much credit for his sudden and hypocritical zeal in behalf of “Southern rights,” therefore expressly committed himself thereto?

(Signed) W. J. LANGLEY.

“Sensible.”