

"The enforcement of the law is a perilous matter. In the ward where most of the defaulters are found the collector is now thoroughly well known and cordially detested. One part of his district, Hope Town, is in open rebellion against the rates." The moment he shows himself the boys gather at his heels and shout along the streets, "Shut your doors." Unfortunately many of the streets are closed at one end, so that the collector is at the mercy of the foe, and has little chance of catching his people unawares. He is hissed, hooted and groined at in the most vehement style. We should add that there are very few Irish in the parish, so that the explanation of such a scene is not to be found in the superior excitability of the Celtic race. Threats are not wanting, and there is too much reason to fear that personal violence is really intended. Matters are getting worse every week."

"THE REVOLUTION" last week gave a somewhat gloomy picture of the present condition and prospect of Great Britain. Were Fenian forays and outrages all that fear and conscious guilt on the part of their oppressors have represented them, still England has a more dangerous foe in and among her own people, when once aroused, than all Ireland at home and scattered abroad, is, or can become.

Why Not?—Judge Underwood, of Virginia, President of the Constitutional Convention now in session at Richmond, writes to Washington of Mrs. Ellen Frances W. Harper, the colored lecturer and poet, who is now laboring among her people in the Old Dominion, that her lectures are well attended, are very eloquent and able, and that she is doing more real good in the work of political education than any two speakers who have previously been engaged there.

We do not doubt the truth of Mr. Underwood's praise. Mrs. Harper has power of an extraordinary character, and is endowed with the utmost earnestness and zeal in her chosen field. But, seeing that she does more good than any two ordinary male politicians, why cannot the Judge endeavor to make her at least the equal, politically, of one? We shall expect to learn that Judge Underwood has labored to keep the word "male" out of the new Constitution of Virginia.

THE EVENING POST

ON GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN AND "MUCH INFORMATION."

A TRAIN OFF THE TRACK.—"THE REVOLUTION" contains this week a cable dispatch from George Francis Train, sent especially to "THE REVOLUTION." Here it is—it does not appear to convey much information:

"BRITISH JAIL, Monday, 12 M.—My first gun is fired—Lord Derby quails—Revolution—Kuczkowski—Ireland for the Irish—American citizens' rights in Europe—Alabama—of war—galvanizes Johnson and Seward—are they Americans?—Adams a British Toady.

"GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN."

—New York Evening Post.

"It does not appear to convey much information?" Indeed. That Train is in a "British Jail;" that he, an American citizen, has been arrested; that the measures he has taken have made "Lord Derby quail;" that the results will be "Revolution" in the public mind; that the evils under which Europe groans are likely to be remedied as effectually as Dr. "Kuczkowski" remedies bodily ills with his water cure; that "Iriah" wrongs will be redressed; that "American citizens' rights in Europe" and the "Alabama" claims must be settled satisfactorily to the American people "or war" will be the alternative; that President "Johnson" and Secretary "Seward" must be "galvanized" into American citizens, and that "Adams," the American Minister at the Court of St. James,

leans to aristocracy and Great Britain instead of democracy and America—do not "convey much information" in the opinion of the *Post*. Well, during the time that OUR OWN HENDERSON, chief proprietor and editor of the *Evening Post*, was before Commissioner Osborn on trial for defrauding government by taking the people's trust funds placed in his hands as Navy Agent, would the *Post* have considered at that time the following telegram "conveyed much information?"

OUR OWN HENDERSON OFF THE TRACK.

SPECIAL TELEGRAM TO THE EVENING POST FROM OUR OWN HENDERSON IN COVENTRY.

Jing Jing Jolly Gong—Coventry, }
MONDAY, 12 M.

My Last Chance is gone—Commissioner Osborn won't quail—Confusion—Eureka—Plunder for the Plunderers—Loyal Leaguers and the Public Purse—The *Evening Post's* Claims—Or War—Galvanize Lincoln and Welles—Are they Patriots?—Delafeld Smith a Copperhead Sneak.

OUR OWN HENDERSON.

Our own Henderson sent to Coventry!

Does this telegram "appear to convey much information" to the *Evening Post*? Does it tell that Edward J. Owen, of Owen, Gray & Owen, who roomed at that time with Commissioner Osborn at the Bancroft Hotel, had rejected the offer of a fee of \$10,000 as counsel, and any other amount he chose to name, providing and after OUR OWN HENDERSON was cleared? Does it tell of "confusion" among the Loyal League ranks; that, "Eureka," their rascality had been found out? Does it tell that the "*Post* claims" must be asserted "or war" against government proclaimed? Does it tell that "Lincoln and Welles" must be "galvanized" to assert the rights of Patriots to protect "Plunder for the Plunderers" and the "rights of the Loyal in the Public Purse?" What does it tell when it calls "Delafeld Smith a Copperhead Sneak?" If this be thus, what, then, are Commissioner Osborn and Edward J. Owen, because they would not sell themselves in the cause of "Prosecuted Loyalty?"

What is "much information?"

GOVERNMENT EXPENSES.

An official return has been made to the House of Representatives in Washington of the expenses of its investigating committees to the 6th of the present month. The whole sum paid to that date is \$41,509 85. More than one-fourth of this sum was paid to the Sergeant-at-Arms, N. G. Ordway, of New Hampshire, for subpoenaing witnesses, and "for other expenses." Examining the detailed statement, we find that the Sergeant-at-Arms has charged for subpoenaing L. C. Baker, twice, \$190 20 each time; for summoning J. M. Wells, \$317 90; Gen. Hamlin, \$317 90; W. Jones, \$166 40; J. S. Fullerton, \$219 20; C. G. Halpine, \$49; E. J. Conger, \$227 20; Buck Lewis, \$190; E. F. Ferry, \$190; T. C. Wetherby, \$114 20, and so on.

These charges do not include the expense of bringing the witnesses to Washington and keeping them there; for it appears that T. C. Wetherby, for instance, last mentioned above, was paid, later on, \$12 for six days' attendance, and \$112 for 1,120 miles travel, and so of others.

Can any one tell us why this lucky Sergeant-at-Arms charges the government \$114 20 in the case of Wetherby? It is of course understood that some of the witnesses, as this one for instance, lived at a distance from Washington but why is it necessary in every case for the Sergeant-at-Arms to send a special messenger

with a summons? Is not this a most flagrant case of red tape and waste? But this, after all, is only a small item in the mighty amount now required to conduct the government. The Democrats of New Hampshire, it is said, have been zealously overhauling the accounts of this Ordway, and are using the startling disclosures made as party capital in their attempt to overthrow the Republican party at the coming March election in that State.

PRIZE-FIGHTING AND THE PRESS.

THE New York *Herald* one day last week had some comments complimentary on the decision of a New Jersey judge, who charged a grand jury "to indict all parties, whether at large or under arrest, who may be charged with prize-fighting." The *Herald* says:

It is high time that official action should be taken to put a stop to this demoralizing custom. If every prize fight within the next six months were to terminate by the death of one of the combatants and the seclusion of the survivor in the State Prison for the rest of his natural life for manslaughter, it would do more to put an end to prize-fighting than all the police interference that can be brought to bear. New Jersey hangs her murderers right out without any *dilatants* preliminaries or mock sympathy, and for this she has gained the envy of surrounding States. Why not indict and incarcerate her prize-fighters with equal promptitude?

The same page has an article on cock-fighting, and the *Herald* of the day before had a description and report of a cock-fight of the most revolting description imaginable, and exactly adapted to multiply and prolong the evils it so piously pretends to deplore. What can do so much to corrupt and harden the moral sensibilities, especially of the young, as these long newspaper accounts of such scenes, given with their disgusting detail, and with as business-like an air as though they were reports of the market or a meeting of the Humane Society? If all the newspapers would hold prize-fighting, dog-fighting and cock-fighting in such abhorrence as never to pollute their columns with one word of allusion to them, there need be no grand-jury indictments nor State-prison penalties for them. As at present, however, the *Herald's* estimate of the crimes may be just; but the penalties should be shared by such editors and the fighters alike.

A "SHORTER CATECHISM" FOR GEN. GRANT.

MR. CAREY, representative in Congress from Ohio, was elected as an "Independent Republican." He is likely to prove so, at the risk, as would appear, of perilling the party peace. He has lately delivered a speech in the House, into which he twisted with great effect the following questions, addressed to his colleague, Mr. Bingham, as appears in the proceedings, thus:

Mr. Carey said that he should like his colleague (Mr. Bingham) to answer these four questions: First—If General Grant shall neglect or refuse to execute the provisions of this law, or if in its execution he shall act in an oppressive and cruel manner, to what tribunal will he be amenable for his nonfeasance or malfeasance? Second—As by the terms of the bill the President cannot interfere, can the General be tried by court-martial; and if so, by whose orders, and who shall constitute the court? Third—Not being a civil officer, can he be impeached; and if so, by whom and before what tribunal? Fourth—If he cannot be arraigned by any earthly tribunal, is he not made an absolute despot?

The *Evening Post* says of Mr. Bingham's attempt at reply:

Mr. Bingham, in his closing argument, made no respectable answer to Mr. Carey. He regretted that "his