

the mine-owners want to make an excuse for increasing prices they deliberately produce a strike by reducing the miners' wages to a point at which the men cannot work and live. In this way they limit the output and throw the blame on the men. The condition of the miners, at the best of times, is inconceivably wretched to those who have not visited the mining regions, while the bosses have accumulated almost fabulous fortunes.

Reflecting on these things and observing that, wherever possible, the same inhumanity, difference to all considerations, save the one of making money, prevails, can we wonder at the growth of that movement known in its most moderate expression as political reform and in its extreme manifestation as Nihilism?

On this continent the Governments of the United States and Canada have been blind to public interests. Apparently they have not noted the stupendous, economic and social changes that have taken place. President Cleveland's message was a warning rather than an awakening, and the pottering compromise of legislators will only have the effect of making a small break in the dam, which the pent up waters of discontent will soon widen into a formidable breach.

Canadians, more stupid or more infatuated, are slower to rebel against the shackles of a false system, but there is satisfaction in the reflection that as the tide flows in the States, so must it flow in Canada. Among our neighbors a revolution is impending in methods of taxation, debt collection, payment of labor, regulation of currency and control of corporate wealth. It is coming fast, and among other blessings let us hope it will bring destruction of monopoly and cheap coal.

OVER-PRODUCTION.

Germany, after a brief trial of a revenue tariff, returned some years ago to a highly protective system, and with the same results as have been reached in the United States. Monopolies are in full swing, and agreeable to the despotic tendencies of the Government—evils which fortunately do not exist in America—State Socialism is being built up on the ruins of freedom and enterprise. In that country every protective move has been a step towards Socialism.

It seems the infatuation of human folly to suppose that prosperity can be created by restriction and artificial laws to produce scarcity. This is the sort of political economy which deserves Carlyle's description of "the dismal science," and no mistake. But his doctrine of scarcity is breaking down of its own weight in Germany as well as in America. It is, however, amusing to find the upholders of it producing the same false, threadbare arguments that we are familiar with on this side of the Atlantic. To account for the troubles and inequalities protection has created, the restrictionist advocates raise the stupid old cry of over-production, while everything goes to prove that in this world there is no super-abundance, no over-production. What is wanted is better products with better distribution. Under-consumption is the real trouble caused by artificially created scarcity. How can there be over-production while thousands of people are in want of food and the ordinary comforts of life? Those in want, be it noted, being the men who work.

"Over-production is the cry of men who selfishly desire scarcity," says a recent writer. "There are too many machines; too many cotton and woolen mills; cut off the supply or our markets are done for." Abundance, the deplorable manifestation of God's bounty, is a human curse, according to the over-production sophists. With them business depends upon scarcity; then the rich get richer, and if the masses are not satisfied, what cares the millionaire? His reasoning runs thus: "A war in Europe would be a Godsend to America; the longer the war continues and the more nations engaged in the butchery, the bigger our profits." Abundance is a burden; scarcity a blessing. Pests, wars, famines and blights bring grist to our mills; the more the merrier." To people who argue like this the blessings of protection are manifest. No argument is needed to convince the cotton manufacturer that the exclusion of all foreign cottons and the granting to him of monopolistic rights is going to give him a bonanza whose every rock is a gold nugget. What is true of cotton is also true of every monopolist. Abundance, cheapness; scarceness, high prices. Abundance impoverishes; scarcity enriches.

Yet there is the man who can say that he ever found pleasure in having his comforts curtailed? Where is the blessing in scarce and dear food and clothing to him who is in need of both? To talk about over-production, with millions in Europe and America hungry, ill-clad, homeless and homeless, is the wildest nonsense that could be uttered. Those who speak thus are the enemies of the workmen.

All men are either sellers or buyers. The manufacturer sells his goods and the workman his labor. What sense or justice is there in passing laws to enable the manufacturer to charge the workman what he likes for his goods, while the workman has to bring his labor to an open market and be content with the wages that the manufacturer pleases to give him? Human greed and dishonesty have invented a more cruel, a more insidious system. As the writer before quoted observes: "Money has only a relative value—its purchasing power. This is affected by scarcity or abundance as rapidly as the thermometer by heat, or the barometer by the changes of the atmosphere. Our interests are those of sellers and buyers. Do we sell, we want high prices, high as possible, though we would purchase our own needs cheap as possible. All are buyers; not all, not half, are sellers. Is it better that the consumer have a bountiful market to go to, or a stinted one? Do the most people gain by the presence of abundance or the prevalence of an artificially produced scarcity? In other words, is it good to choke off God's natural springs of universal plenty to assist the Goulds and Goddards, the Villards and Vanderbilts?"

Never was there so much wealth in the world as at the present time. Vast areas of virgin land have been brought into cultivation. Human energy and invention have increased the capacity of production and transportation a thousandfold. Yet, instead of plenty for all, there is more want and misery than ever! Why?

Because men of insatiable greed have got possession of the money, the machinery and the roads created by the general industry. They have seized upon the legislative power and have made laws to restrict distribution—Protection, they call these laws—and have combined among themselves in a system of banking, manufacturing and transportation to rob the people. The whole system, in all its parts, is a huge fraud, and must be reformed from root to branch if social revolution is to be avoided in America as well as in Europe.

LITERARY REVIEW.

REMINISCENCES OF THE LATE HON. AND RT. REV. ALEXANDER MACDONELL, first Catholic Bishop of Upper Canada, Toronto; Williams & Co., 1888.

Most of those who peruse this small work will join with the author in regretting that no biography, supplied with details and accessories which time has now put beyond reach, has heretofore appeared of the pioneer bishop of the Catholic Church in Upper Canada. His was a life of more than usual interest, embracing within its broad span the period which has seen the greatest social revolution of modern times, along with the sowing of the seed of a great nation on the continent of America. The Right Reverend prelate was born in 1793 in Glen Bervie, Invernesshire, Scotland, took his theological course at the Scottish College in Paris, and the Scottish College at Valladolid in Spain, where he was ordained priest in 1817. He now returned to Scotland as a missionary, and remained there four or five years, stationed in the Braes of Lochaber. After witnessing the shameful ejection of the Highlanders from their small holdings, negotiations were opened, under his direction, with a view to securing work for the dispossessed Catholics in the manufacturing districts of Glasgow. Then followed trials and sufferings incident to the wild excesses of the anti-Catholic riots led by Lord George Gordon. His chapel was burned, but worship continued to be conducted in secret places and under extreme precautions. Brighter times ensued for him subsequently, but a general failure among the Glasgow manufacturers succeeded, caused by the exclusion of British imports from the markets of France, then in the grip of the Revolutionary war. A national crisis was now at hand, and never at any other time was the greatness of England manifested with such an annihilator. At such a trying moment we find the staunch-hearted Catholic Highlanders offering their services to the British, being accepted as the "Glenerrry Fencibles," and serving with distinction in Guernsey and Ireland. When the danger was over and their regiment disbanded, they found themselves in great straits, and eventually they resolved to settle in Upper Canada, where many of their relatives had received grants of land for their services in the American Revolutionary War. These latter Highlanders had emigrated in 1773 to Sohoarie County, New York. Father (afterwards Bishop) Macdonell, the chaplain of the Glenerrry Regiment, obtained grants of land for his people in 1802, and emigrated in 1803 with them to Canada. Their first settlement was in Glenerrry, but afterwards they removed to York, Ontario. Father Macdonell found only three Catholic Churches in the entire Province of Upper Canada; and the people were scattered and without suitable organization. He at once set to work, devoting the next thirty years of his life to missions, building churches and schools, and traveling horseback and in canoe through the Province. On the breaking out of the war in 1811, Mr. Macdonell, then one of Bishop Plessis' vicars-general, succeeded in organizing a second Glenerrry regiment, which, by its bravery and despatch, captured the frontier posts of Ogdensburg, St. Regis and French Mills. Mr. Macdonell conducted several missions to England on behalf of the struggling hierarchy. On the 31st of December, 1820, he was consecrated Bishop of Resina and Vicar-Apostolic of Canada. This is the career of the reverend Bishop up to his elevation to the episcopate, from which time the story of his life becomes the history of the place in which he lived, over which he exercised a potent influence till his death in 1840. Bishop Macdonell's life is a most interesting study, and all who care for a work will be sure to find it so.

EMMANUEL: The Savior of the World. Vol. III. of A Popular Defence of Christian Faith, by Rev. John Gensiner. Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros.

Professor Gensiner, of St. Thomas' Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., now adds a third volume to his "Popular Defence of Christian Doctrines." This volume is devoted to the establishing of the prime fact in Christianity, and the proving by complete testimony, gathered diligently from all sources, that the salvation of the world is the work of the great Founder of Christianity. Father Gensiner begins by showing that all nations were expecting a Deliverer, the one desired of all men. Then the prophecies concerning a Messiah are gone into with minuteness, and compared with their fulfillment in Christ. The most important chapter is the third, "What think you of Christ? Whose Son is He?" in which the reverend author discusses the nature, credentials, and prophecies, doctrine and life of the Redeemer, closing with a demonstration of the fulfillment of the prophecies. Numerous authorities and references are cited, and the book is stamped by accuracy of statement, clearness of treatment and a wide grasp of the subject. Every page bears testimony to the patient industry and deep research of the author.

THE DOMINION ILLUSTRATED. G. E. Desbarats & Son, Montreal.

Besides the usual political cartoon, there are to be found in this number some excellent reproductions from photographic views of such places as Gorge of the Niagara River, Kanaraska Falls, the Canadian architecture we find at the Grand Docks, Winnipeg Post Office and Parliament House, Banff Hotel, National Bank. The Canadian statesman whose portrait is given is Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. Love and Innocence is from a painting by Parrault, and a Roman Beauty from the studio of Paul Thumann, a German artist. So far as the letter-press is concerned, errors in proof-reading still continue again; what would otherwise be a very creditable production of Canadian art.

THE MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY for August, 1888, opens with a portrait and sketch of Kosciusko Conkling. The life of that distinguished American statesman is treated by the Rev. I. S. Hartley, D. D. Mrs. Martha J. Lamb writes "About Philadelphia in 1750." Hon. Charles K. Tukerman contributes some "Personal Recollections of General Grant," and Alice D. Le Plougeon the conclusion of "The Conquest of the Mayas." An article on "A Frenchman's Estimate of Washington in 1781" is illustrated by a hitherto unpublished portrait of the great American, and facsimiles of some of his letters. There are also contributions entitled "Incidents of Border Life in Ohio," "An Englishman's Pocket Note-book in 1828," "Journal of Lieut. Tjerk Beekman," besides the usual departments of Minor Topics, Original Documents, Notes, Queries, etc. The magazine is \$3.00 per annum, or 50 cents a number. Published at 743 Broadway, New York.

THE LEAGUE IS NOT DEAD.

A HANDSOME AMERICAN DONATION OF \$10,000 FOR THE IRISH CAUSE.

DETROIT, July 28.—The following cable was sent from here last evening: DETROIT, July 28, 1888. To Sir Gratian Edmond, House of Commons, London, Eng.: Tell Biggar and Kenny I am drafting each \$1,000. Tell murderers of Mandeville the League is not dead. CHARLES O'REILLY, Treasurer.

CABLE TELEGRAMS.

Specially reported for and taken from THE MONTREAL DAILY POST.

LONDON, July 24.—The crowd in and around the House of Commons, occasioned by the great debate on the second reading of the bill appointing the Royal Commission, was the greatest since the night of the decision on Gladstone's Home Rule bill. Mr. Smith was plain, matter-of-fact, and produced a painful impression in naming the judges. Instead of Bowen, Wells and Young, they are Hannon, Day and Smith. The first is an old man, considered impartial. The others are not considered so, although Day is Catholic. Parnell was paler and more careworn, but seemed glad to speak. He is eccentric in dress, which detracts from his impressiveness. There was no complaint about his coldness this time, for his blood was evidently up. His passion was marked when he said he never even sent Patrick Ford nor met with Mr. Parnell on the part of the Government, the Speaker rose and put the question. Gladstone looked astounded, then nervous. Finally he arose, but his own party shouted "No," and there were cries for Webster. Harcourt pulled Gladstone bodily back into his seat. Webster did not move, and the Speaker actually put the question. The crisis was ending when, then, when Gladstone fairly roared with Harcourt and began to speak. He very soon let fall the ominous words, showing that he and his friends would not accept the selection of judges without demur, nor a commission without great limitations. Sir Charles Russell, following, was vehement in denouncing the commission as the mere game of a political party. His speech was loudly cheered. The debate made plain that there could be no compromise between the Government and the Home Rulers. The ministry will not consent to restrict the enquiry in the way demanded. The Parnellites say they cannot and will not accept the commission in its present shape, and the result will be it will fall through, doubtless in committee.

LONDON, July 25.—The most important contribution of facts in the Parnell matter was made by Hon. Reginald Brett. He said that eighteen months ago an ex-member of parliament, who was named as Parnell, offered him evidence of the genuineness of the documents which were concerned in the Phoenix Park murders. Brett was at that time private secretary to Lord Hartington, and it was his visitor's desire that he should bring the matter to Hartington's notice, stating that he could have the documents on a pledge of strict secrecy and payment of £1,000. He refused to have anything to do with the matter, knowing that Lord Hartington would do likewise. Afterward, seeing the publication of the letters in the Times, he was struck by the fact that they were probably the same documents offered to him. I called on Brett at his house this morning. He said he would willingly tell the whole story, but he had just received a message from Parnell to say nothing. He ventured, however, his opinion that the Irish members should accept the commission on any terms, as he was confident that the fraudulent character of the documents could easily be established. This explains the confidence of the leading Parnellites over the forged letters, and it is more than likely they are in possession of the authentic history of them. The ex-member of parliament, whom Mr. Brett is supposed to be Philip Callan, though other names are mentioned. Callan was put out of the Irish party by Parnell as absolutely valueless, and has been his bitter enemy ever since. Of the judges selected by the commission, Sir James Hannan gives general satisfaction. As president of the Court of Appeals and Lord Chief Justice, he has a long and honorable record. The great experience he is looked upon as eminently fit. The Parnell party are not so well satisfied with Justices Smith and Day, however. Neither two are looked upon as men of sufficient eminence and general experience to fill the peculiar position. Both are Tories, Sir James Hannan's sympathies being those of a moderate Liberal. A notable fact in connection with Hannan is his disbeliefs in expert testimony as to handwriting, having always refused, wherever possible, to admit such testimony in court.

ANOTHER PARNELLITE JAILED.

James J. O'Kelly, member of Parliament for Roscommon, was arrested this morning at Mark Lane station, London, on a charge of making a seditious speech. He was taken to Chester jail immediately and will be sent to Dublin to-night. The arrest was a government surprise and has created much excitement among the Parnellite members. O'Kelly was once a newspaper man in New York city.

LONDON, July 25.—James J. O'Kelly, the well-known journalist and member of Parliament for the north division of Roscommon, was arrested in London last evening for offences under the Crimes Act. The warrant for his arrest charges him with making speeches in the Strand and in the City, and with inciting to intimidation and boycott. Mr. O'Kelly, under an escort of police, left for Dublin on an early train this morning. The charges against him are based on utterances in a speech at the recent election in the south division of Longford, which resulted in the return of Mr. Fitzgerald Parnellite to the House of Commons. It is expected that Mr. O'Kelly will be released on the expiry of his term of imprisonment for south Sligo, will also be arrested.

LONDON, July 26.—The arrest of O'Kelly has excited general surprise. He is so quiet a member in the House and so universally popular that the news of his offending Balfour's delicate feelings was quite unexpected. Nobody knew a warrant was out against him, and he had a meeting at Boyle county Roscommon, he sought the audience to refuse to give evidence under the Crimes Act. O'Kelly's arrest means that Balfour instead of wavering in consequence of the late cabinet councils means to push coercion to the bitter end.

The real fight on the Parnell commission bill will take place on the third reading, the date for which has not been fixed. The Parnellites will make a resolute stand in favor of specified charges. Chamberlain's speech causes much comment, and it is now believed the member for Birmingham had a great deal to do with the drawing up of the bills, a fact which makes the Irish members' conduct and unbounded indignation against the Parnellites. The Times people are greatly irritated over Labouchere's demand that Parnell's charges against the Times be investigated as well as the Times charges against Parnell.

Gladstone had quite a youthful air at his golden wedding. He wore a neat Finesse Albert suit of light green, and a notable fact in the automobile which Mrs. Gladstone wore a white lace shawl in moment of her wedding. The presentation of the portraits of themselves was the suggestion of Mr. Agnew, the millionaire art dealer of Bond street. Gladstone's portrait is by Hall; Mrs. Gladstone's by Harkomer.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL.

A committee of Parnellite members of the House of Commons have drafted a series of amendments to the Parnell commission bill instructing the commission to enquire how the Times obtained the information upon which its charges were based and to investigate whether the names of the "other persons" referred to in the bill, be stated specifically.

Mr. Labouchere will give notice of his intention to offer an amendment making it the duty of the commission to enquire into the charge made by Mr. Parnell against the Times beside the charges of the Times against Mr. Parnell, and also to exclude from the operation of the indemnity clause the publishers and authors of libels.

HEALY'S SECURES DILLON'S RELEASE.

It is a source of gratification to the Parnellite party, and a relief to the public, that the liberty of the famous prominent leader next to Mr. Parnell, Mr. Healy, upon whose application the order was granted, seeks to quash the indictment against Mr. Dillon, thereby nullifying the whole of the proceedings against that gentleman by advancing the claim that a certain form of blank certifying the dismissal of the prisoner, which showed the evidence against him, was the work of his being found guilty here, has not yet reached the judge, whose sig-

nature should be appended thereto. Upon this ground, coupled with the fact that Judge Parnell's order denies the jurisdiction of the county judge before whom Mr. Dillon's case was argued for a hearing, Mr. Healy claims that his client has been illegally incarcerated. Moreover, it is held that in the absence of the certifying of conviction, the court before which the hearing was had was without means of knowing what had occurred in the conduct of the case in the court below, and in these circumstances, not Mr. Healy alone, but several Tory lawyers contend that the proceedings were rendered invalid.

O'KELLY'S SUDDEN ARREST.

The arrest of Mr. Jas. J. O'Kelly, member for North Roscommon was a complete surprise to everybody. Mr. O'Kelly left his house at 11 o'clock Tuesday night and proceeded to the Mark Lane Underground Railway station. Before he could mount a train he was arrested on the authority of a warrant based on a speech made by him on June 14, and early in the morning was hurried to Dublin to answer the charges against him.

A REPORT DENIED.

Despatches from Berlin deny the report that Germany will make a definite move toward the solution of the Bulgarian question. On the contrary, it is asserted the German Government will remain in an attitude of the strictest reserve.

LONDON, July 27.—A report, which may almost be called startling, is current, or rather whispered, among a few well informed persons on both sides. It is nothing less than the probability that Parnell may, after all, bring an action of libel against the Times. It is certain he was seriously considering it yesterday. One of his friends said he had made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and he made up his mind. It is needless to say what momentous a resolution this would be if really taken. I believe most of his Gladstonian counsellors, who held a conclave to-day, counsel him against it. They urge all the old arguments, the probabilities are a prejudiced judge and disinterested jury, the expense, the peril of cross-examination, which cannot be limited to the direct issue, extreme difficulty in proving the letters forgeries, and so on. Parnell's answer, I understand to be substantially this: His position before the special commission would be worse than in a court of law as plaintiff. This commission, opposing all the limitations were not his friends, and