

by an addition of two-thirds of the sum at which they were formerly sold, you consider it justifies you in moving to have the original amount multiplied by ten, to enable you to pocket a fee of \$12.50—one-half dollar more than what was formerly charged for a lot—for a few minutes work, to say nothing of the half dollar for the certificate of sale.

We have not the time nor space at command to riddle and sift the whole of the sexton's open letter at this writing. We will put the balance of it through at another time. Were it merely a personal matter we would not waste a word on such an insignificant subject. The interests of the community are involved in this question and we are bound to defend the right. Incidentally, however, it must, as a consequence of the discussion, be made to appear that it is unnecessary to ask this question: Mr. Dunne, "Have you ever thought what a big fraud and humbug you are?"

#### PARNELL'S MANIFESTO.

LONDON, Nov. 28.—The manifesto which was made public this afternoon begins by saying:

"The integrity and independence of a section of the Irish Parliamentary party having been apparently sapped and destroyed by the wire pullers of the Liberal party, it has become necessary for me, as leader of the Irish party, to take counsel with you, and, having given you the knowledge which is in my possession, ask your judgment upon a matter which now solely devolves upon you to decide. A letter from Gladstone to Morley, written for the purpose of influencing the decision of the Irish party in the choice of a leader, and claiming for the Liberals and their leaders the right to veto upon the choice, is the immediate cause of this address, the purpose of which is to remind you and your Parliamentary representatives that Ireland considers the independence of her party as her only safeguard within the constitution, and above and beyond all other considerations whatever. The threat in that letter, repeated insolently on many platforms and in numerous British newspapers, compels me to put before you information which until now has been solely in my possession, and which will enable you to understand the measure of loss with which you are threatened unless you consent to throw me to the English wolves now howling for my destruction.

Parnell then tells how at Hawarden last November he received from Gladstone the details of that gentleman and his colleagues' proposal with regard to home rule in the event of the next general election favoring the liberal party. Upon the subject of retention of

Parliament Gladstone told him, in order to conciliate the English public opinion, it would be necessary to reduce the Irish representatives from 103 to 32.

Upon the settlement of the land question Mr. Gladstone intimated, while he would renew his attempt to settle the matter by imperial legislation on the lines of the land purchase bill of 1886, he would not undertake to put any pressure upon his own side. In other words, that the Irish Legislature was not to be given the power of solving the agrarian difficulties.

With regard to the control of the Irish constabulary, it was stated by Gladstone that in view of the necessity of conciliating English public opinion, it would be necessary to leave this force to the appointment of its officers, under the imperial authority, for an indefinite period, while the funds for its maintenance would be compulsorily provided out of the Irish revenue.

"I further undertook," says Parnell, "to use every legitimate influence to reconcile Irish public opinion, to graduate the coming into force of new privileges, and to postponements necessary for English opinion with regard to constabulary control and judicial appointment, but I strongly dissented from the proposed reduction of the number of the members during the interval of probation and pointed to the absence of any suitable prospect of a land settlement by either Parliament as a constitutional and overwhelming drag upon the prospects of permanent peace and prosperity in Ireland."

At the conclusion of the interview Parnell was informed that pending the general election, Gladstone and his colleagues were agreed that silence should be observed with regard to these points of difference. The absence of any provision for the settlement of the agrarian question and of any policy on the part of the Liberal leaders, Parnell says, filled him with concern and apprehension. On the introduction of the land purchase bill by the government at the commencement of the last session Morley conferred with him, and having a desire to avoid the absence of any policy on the part of the liberals, Parnell strongly advised Morley against any direct challenge of the principle of State-aided land purchase, and that we should direct our efforts on the second reading to an association of the principle of local control. In this Morley agreed with him, but was at the same time hampered by the extreme section of his party, led by Labouchere, and in a subsequent interview impressed upon Parnell the necessity of meeting the second reading of the bill with a direct negative, and asked him to undertake the motion.

"I agreed upon condition that I was not to attack the principle of the measure, but to confine myself to a criticism of details. I think this was a false strategy, but it was a strategy adopted out of regard to English prejudices and radical

peculiarities. I did the best possible under the circumstances and the several days debate on the second reading contrasts favorably with Labouchere's recent abortive attempt to interpose a direct negative to the first reading of a similar bill."

Yesterday, just before the commencement of the session, Parnell had another interview with Morley and impressed upon him the policy of the oblique method of procedure with reference to land purchase and the necessity and importance of providing for the vudstion of local control and limitation in the application of funds.

He agreed with me, says Parnell, and I offered to move on the first reading of the bill an amendment in favor of this local control, advising that if this was rejected it might be left to the radicals on the second reading to oppose the principle of the measure. I left Morley under the impression that this would be my duty, but, in addition, he made a remarkable proposal. Referring to the probable approaching victory of the liberals, he suggested some considerations as to the future of the Irish party and asked me whether I would be willing to assume the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland, or whether I would allow another member of my party to take the position. He also put before me the desirability of filling all of the land offices of the Crown in Ireland by legal members of my party. I told him, amazed as I was at the proposal, that I could not agree to forfeit, in any way, the independence of the party or its members; that the Irish people had trusted me because they believed the declaration at Cork in 1880 represented my conviction, and that I would on no account depart from it.

I considered Morley's proposal, that we should allow ourselves to be absorbed into English politics, was based upon an entire misconception of our position. In conclusion, Morley directed my attention to the plan of campaign estates. He said it would be impossible for the Liberal party, when it attained power, to do anything for these evicted tenants by direct action, and it would also be impossible for the Irish Parliament, under the powers conferred, to do anything for them, and flinging up his hands in a gesture of despair, he exclaimed: "Having been in Tipperary, I do not know what to propose."

I told him this question was a limited one; funds would be available from America and elsewhere for the support of those tenants as long as necessary, and this difficulty should not be allowed to interfere with the general interests of the country.

Parnell says he alludes to this matter only because within the last few days a strong argument for his expulsion has been presented. Unless the Liberals come into power at the next election, the plan of campaign tenants will suffer. He has shown that the Liberals proposed to do nothing for them by direct action and is entitled to ask that the existence of these tenants, whom he has supported in every