

6  
*THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.*



---

THE

SMITH-BARRY ESTATE,  
TIPPERARY.

---

PUBLISHED BY THE LIBERAL UNION OF IRELAND,  
43, DAME-STREET, DUBLIN.

---

*JUNE, 1890.*







*THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.*

\*\*

---

THE  
SMITH-BARRY ESTATE,  
TIPPERARY.

---

PUBLISHED BY THE LIBERAL UNION OF IRELAND,  
45, DAME-STREET, DUBLIN.

---

*JUNE, 1890.*





## THE STRUGGLE IN TIPPERARY.

---

ALTHOUGH the combination which has been formed among the tenants on the Tipperary estate of Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P., is not avowedly part and parcel of the Plan of Campaign, it is so closely connected with it that it may be appropriately dealt with under that heading.

“What is now going on in Tipperary is

**the most extraordinary spectacle**

that ever was witnessed in a civilized country.” Such was the opinion expressed by *United Ireland* in its editorial columns on the 14th of December, 1889, and it is one which must be thoroughly endorsed by everyone who has followed the course of events in that town during the last year. It may safely be said that no incident has occurred in connection with the Irish land war so unjustifiable as the attack which has been made upon Mr. Smith-Barry, and there is none which shows the folly of the Nationalists in a stronger light.

That tenants should be induced to strike against rent in the hope that they may exact terms from the landlord which he would otherwise be unwill-



ing to grant is intelligible, though undoubtedly illegal ; but that prosperous tradesmen, who have no grievances whatever, should give up flourishing businesses and fine houses which they themselves have built, and for which they pay only a nominal rent, is sheer insanity, and this brilliant idea seems to have originated in the fertile brain of Mr. William O'Brien, M.P.

### Tipperary

is a town of some 7,000 inhabitants. It is situated in the famous tract of country known as the Golden Vein, and is surrounded by some of the richest dairy land. It was the best butter market in Ireland next to Cork, and one of the most prosperous towns in the country.

What Mr.  
Smith-Barry  
has done for  
Tipperary.

The central portion of the town, containing all the principal shops and public buildings is on Mr. Smith-Barry's property. The poorer parts at either end belong to other landlords, and the contrast thus presented is remarkable. Mr. Smith-Barry has done much for the town. He built the Town Hall and Clock Tower at a cost of £2,800, and gave the former to the Town Commissioners for their meetings free of cost. He expended £1,500 on the Butter Weigh-House, and £500 on the Market Yard. He put in order, at a cost of £300, the Fair Green, which had previously been held by a tenant; and took up eighteen acres of grazing land outside the town, for which he had been receiving rent, paying the tenant compensation, and expended £200 in planting and laying it out as a public park.



In 1884, after the passing of the Acts empowering Boards of Guardians to borrow money for building labourers' cottages, Mr. Smith-Barry offered sites for the purpose, free of all rent or compensation. He has also built ninety model cottages for labourers, which are kept in order entirely by him, and are in great request.

A certified report of Messrs. Atkins & Co., chartered accountants of Cork, shows an expenditure on Mr. Smith-Barry's Tipperary estate, town and country, including two farms in his own occupation, but not including office and agency expenses, from 1857 to 1888, of £87,337 5s. 9d., of which £37,485 5s. 9d. was expended on buildings, while a further sum of £13,430 was remitted to tenants in the form of allowances for buildings and drainage, and voluntary abatements of rent, making a total

**expenditure of over £100,000**

in thirty years.

The gross annual rental of the Tipperary and Cashel estates, both town and country, was £12,000; and as showing the large interest which Mr. Smith-Barry has in the administration of local finance, it may be mentioned that his average contributions to County, Town, and Poor Rates, during the last five years amounted to £959 5s. 8d. *per annum*.

It has been represented by the *Freeman's Journal* (November 22, 1889) that rents have always been raised on the estate at the expiration



of a lease in consequence of the tenants' improvements. So far is this from being the case, that it appears from the evidence given by Mr. H. H. Townsend, Mr. Smith-Barry's agent, before the Select Committee on Town Holdings in 1886, that it is the custom of the estate, on the renewal of a lease, for the tenants to receive an allowance, in fixing the new rent, for all unexhausted improvements.

The following observations regarding the estate appeared in the *Cork Examiner*, a Nationalist paper, in connection with a visit paid to Tipperary by Mr. Smith-Barry, in the autumn of 1868, on the occasion of his marriage:—

'The rents are moderate, considering the richness of the land. Much encouragement is also given to improvements; and where old leases drop they are generally renewed on fair terms . . . From these few circumstances it will be seen that the general administration of the estate is admirable; and the consequence is, as might be expected, a thriving, happy, and contented tenantry.'

An address was presented to Mr. Smith-Barry by the Tipperary Town Commissioners on the same occasion, in which they stated that they availed themselves

'With pleasure of this opportunity of conveying to you the appreciation we entertain of the manner in which your family have hitherto contributed to the improvement of our town.'

Mr. Smith-Barry was also, during the same visit, entertained by his tenantry at a banquet.

He has always resided for a considerable portion of the year on his property in Ireland, and formerly represented the County Cork in Parliament.



The Roman Catholic Bishop of Cloyne, Dr. John MacCarthy, a prominent Nationalist, writing to Mr. Smith-Barry with reference to one of his tenants, on the 16th of August, 1886, said:—

Mr. Smith-Barry's character as a landlord.

‘From the reports I have heard of your character as a landlord in the parish of Queenstown and elsewhere, I am satisfied that you will deal with this case justly, and I would only ask you to deal with — as leniently as the circumstances of his case will permit.’

Mr. Daniel O’Leary, Chairman of the Clonakilty Town Commissioners, and one of the deputation of tenants who waited upon Mr. Smith-Barry last July, said that ‘he had been commissioned by the tenants to say that they acknowledged that Mr. Smith-Barry had always been

one of the kindest of landlords, and that his name had been a household word among them.’ And

**Sir Charles Russell, M.P.,**

in his speech before the Special Commission, on the 9th of April, 1889, specially selected Mr. Smith-Barry as

‘an instance of a good landlord,’

taking a good landlord to mean, ‘not merely a landlord who is considerate in the matter of rent,’ but ‘a landlord who takes an interest in the condition of his people.’\*—(*Freeman’s Journal* report).

---

\* Certain cases of alleged harsh treatment of tenants on the Smith-Barry estate were brought forward at a meeting of the Tipperary Tenant League in January, 1870, and they have lately been re-published in a pamphlet entitled ‘Smith-



The dispute  
on the Pon-  
sonby Estate.

Nevertheless, though Mr. Smith-Barry was admitted to be a model landlord, he committed the unpardonable offence of going to the assistance of Mr. Ponsonby, one of his neighbours in the County Cork, whom the Nationalists expected to have crushed long since by means of the Plan of Campaign, which they introduced on his property in the autumn of 1886. It has been repeatedly stated that Mr. Smith-Barry interfered in the Ponsonby dispute, when it was at the point of settlement by purchase under the Ashbourne Act, and that he did so for the purpose of preventing a peaceful solution, and of exterminating the tenants. This allegation has been fully answered in a previous pamphlet dealing with the Ponsonby estate, in which it is shown that there was

**a difference of over £20,000**

between Mr. Ponsonby and his tenants, when Mr. Smith-Barry and others came to the assistance of the former; that they only did so on condition that a further offer should be made to the Ponsonby tenants, and that accordingly an offer was made, which would have given them reductions in their annual payments of 32 or 24 per cent., according as their rents were respectively non-judicial or judicial, would have made them absolute owners at the end of 49 years, and would have wiped out no less than £21,800

---

Barry's Record twenty years ago.' These charges related to a time prior to that at which Mr. Smith-Barry entered on the active management of the property, under the provisions of his father's will, and they were fully answered by the acting-trustee of the estate at the time when they were made.



of arrears—an offer which was described by Mr. Justice Gibson, speaking from the bench, as ‘most liberal,’ and ‘almost extravagantly generous.’

The first suggestion of the recent attack upon Mr. Smith-Barry appears to have been made in a letter from Canon Keller, parish priest of Youghal, who has taken an active part in the struggle on the Ponsonby estate. It was addressed to Canon Cahill, parish priest of Tipperary, and was read by him at a meeting of the Tipperary branch of the National League, on Sunday, May 5th, 1889. In this letter Canon Keller urged that Mr. Smith-Barry’s Tipperary tenants should ‘in some way mark their disapproval of his conduct,’ and that he ‘should be made to direct his attention to his own concerns.’

Canon Keller suggests an attack on Mr. Smith-Barry.

There is no doubt, however, that the movement would never have taken practical shape but for

Mr. William O’Brien, M.P., intervenes.

**the intervention of Mr. William O’Brien, M.P.**

On the 23rd of June, 1889, Mr. O’Brien visited Tipperary, and delivered an inflammatory speech, in the course of which, addressing Mr. Smith-Barry’s tenants with reference to the action of their landlord, he said:—

‘If you were to stand inactively by here while he and his agent were using your money to perpetuate this abominable wrong upon your brother tenants in Cork—well, all I can say is you are as much his accomplices as if you enlisted as his Emergencymen and took up the crowbar against your neighbours’ homes (hear, hear). . . . I say it would be madness on your own part in your own interest, as well as it would be treachery, and the basest treachery, to your brother tenants, if you did not make this man feel that the battle is your battle as well as that of the Ponsonby tenants.’—*Freeman’s Journal*, June 24th, 1889.



A resolution was thereupon adopted condemning Mr. Smith-Barry's interference, which was stated to have 'had the effect of destroying a settlement actually arrived at between Mr. Ponsonby and his tenants,' and determining to appoint a deputation to wait upon him to demand his withdrawal from 'the landlord conspiracy against the Ponsonby tenants.' A form of protest was also drawn up, which Mr. O'Brien himself took round to the shopkeepers for signature, but several of them refused to sign it.

Letter from  
Archbishop  
Croke.

On the 26th of June, 1889, the movement received the public approval of Archbishop Croke, who wrote a letter under that date to Canon Cahill, in which he declared that:—

'Mr. Smith-Barry's intervention in a landlord and tenant dispute that does not immediately concern him, proves beyond all manner of doubt that he is an aggressive busy-body, and a virulent partisan. It proves, moreover, that he has been somehow led to believe that he can not only dictate terms to his own tenants generally, and in a special way to those of Tipperary town, but that he is so safe and so unassailable in that respect as to be able with impunity to lend a hand in bringing the tenants of other estates also, no matter how rack-rented or oppressed, into a similar state of fancied quiet and submissiveness. It is surely high time to dissipate this strange and dangerous delusion on his part, and the course recently taken in that direction by the bulk of his Tipperary tenants is very likely to produce that most desirable result.'

The archbishop concluded by saying that if Mr. Smith-Barry refused to accede to the demands about to be made by the deputation of tenants:—

'It may become the duty of his tenants to consider what further steps, if any, it will be right and advisable for them to take in order to prevent the continuance of his irritating



interference in other people's affairs, and cause him to direct his attention in future solely or principally to the just and judicious management of his own property.'

On the 30th of June, 1889, Mr. O'Brien endeavoured to carry the war into Mr. Smith-Barry's Cork property also, and delivered a speech at Clonakilty, for which he was prosecuted and convicted of conspiracy to induce Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants not to pay their rents. On the 3rd of July a deputation from Mr. Smith-Barry's Cork and Tipperary tenants waited upon him to demand that he should withdraw his assistance from Mr. Ponsonby. This he declined to do, pointing out at the same time that it was wholly incorrect to say that a settlement had been almost arrived at on the Ponsonby Estate when he intervened, and assuring the deputation that even if they succeeded in ruining him, the situation as regarded the Ponsonby tenants would be absolutely unchanged.

The deputation.

The 10th of July had been appointed by Mr. Townsend for receiving Mr. Smith-Barry's rents, but Mr. William O'Brien arrived at Tipperary the same day and held a convention of the tenants, with the result that no rents were paid. On the 9th of August Mr. O'Brien again attended at Tipperary and held another convention of the tenants in private; and after he had presumably worked them up to the sticking point, a resolution was passed whereby they resolved to 'tax' themselves to the extent of ten per cent. on the poor law valuation of their holdings for the benefit of the Ponsonby tenants, and that

Resolution of the tenants.

'Owing to the additional burden thus forced upon us, we demand an abatement of 25 per cent. of the gale of rent now due.'



Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants had received an abatement of 15 per cent. the year before. Consequently by this resolution they made the **preposterous demand**

that he should allow them a further abatement of 10 per cent., to enable them to supply the Ponsonby tenants with the means of carrying on the Plan of Campaign against their landlord, whom Mr. Smith-Barry was assisting; in other words, that Mr. Smith-Barry should, through his Tipperary tenants, contribute the sinews of war for the Plan of Campaign on the Ponsonby estate.

Legal proceedings.

Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants having thus refused to pay their rents, proceedings were taken against them. A sale of the tenants' interest in five holdings was announced by the sub-sheriff for the 24th of August, 1889; and on the previous day a resolution was passed at a meeting in Tipperary that

**the tenants should not buy in their holdings;**

after which Mr. John Cullinane, who has been throughout in charge of Tipperary as National League organizer, exclaimed, 'let Tipperary now do its duty.' (*Tipperary Nationalist*, August 28, 1889.) Nevertheless at the sale on the following day

**four of the tenants bought in their holdings,** paying all rent and costs, while the sale of the fifth holding was adjourned.

The sensation caused among the agitators by this collapse may be gathered from an article in



the *Cork Daily Herald* of August 26, 1889, which declared that—

‘A fierce and almost ungovernable feeling of indignation possessed the breasts of the stalwart Tipperary men, who on Saturday trooped out of Thurles Courthouse after witnessing Arnold Power’s execution sale of the farms belonging to the first Smith-Barry tenants against whom proceedings have been taken.’

Canon Cahill, at a meeting of the Tipperary National League, on the Sunday following the sales, said that—

‘The result looked disappointing and discouraging to his mind; yet, if they still stood together to assert their rights by constitutional means, and without breaking the law, they would soon bring Smith-Barry to his knees.’ (*Tipperary Nationalist*, August 28, 1889.)

The same journal referred to the men who had bought in their holdings as

‘black and rotten sheep,’ who subordinated  
‘patriotism to pelf,’

and declared that—

‘William O’Brien, whose word is as good as a millionaire’s bond, has pledged them as a nation’s sheet anchor, and has guaranteed those who manfully brave the insidious assaults of Lord Barrymore that they shall escape harmless.’

On the 29th of August, 1889, the sale of the tenants’ interest in twenty other holdings was announced to take place on the 4th of September, and a resolution was immediately passed that the tenants should not buy in their holdings. At a meeting of the local branch of the National League, on Sunday, September 1, Dr. O’Ryan, in the course of a lengthy address, said:—

League  
meetings.

‘The men of Tipperary, the Tipperary tenants of Mr. Smith-Barry, can do much for the country, and for the cause



of William O'Brien, and if they do not do that, should Mr. O'Brien die in gaol, or after coming out of gaol, he (Dr. O'Ryan) would lay his death at the door of the men of Tipperary.' (*Tipperary Nationalist*, September 4, 1889.)

A further meeting was held on the evening of the 3rd of September, and attended by Messrs. J. E. Redmond, M.P., T. P. Gill, M.P., and T. Condon, M.P., at which a resolution was passed to the effect that the tenants 'deciding solemnly on their own responsibility,' would 'stand firm,' and let their holdings be sold,

'Rather than submit to Mr. Smith-Barry's exactions, or betray the trust reposed in us by Mr. William O'Brien.' (*Cork Daily Herald*, September 4, 1889.)

According to a report in *United Ireland* of the 7th September, 1889,

'The Members of Parliament present assured the tenants that the promises of support held out to them by Mr. William O'Brien would be carried out to the letter by Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party.'

Sale of hold-  
ings.

At the sale at Thurles on the day following this meeting, no less than thirteen holdings were

**bought in by the tenants,**

six were allowed to go to the landlord's representative, and one case was adjourned. The three Members of Parliament already mentioned were present at the sale, 'to ratify their pledges of support.' Those who had allowed their holdings to be sold were met at the station, on their return to Tipperary, by a band and a crowd of corner boys, who attacked the houses of the shopkeepers who had bought in their holdings,

Riots in  
Tipperary.



and broke their windows, the police force then in the town being quite unable to cope with the disorder. Those who had bought in their holdings were rigidly boycotted, spies were placed opposite their shops, and if anyone entered, their purchases were taken from them and destroyed.

The *Tipperary Nationalist* of the 7th of September published the names of those who had bought in their holdings in a

‘black list,’

and referring to what it termed their ‘recreancy,’ observed that :—

‘The action of these tenants whatever be the circumstances of the case, is undoubtedly held to have been cowardly in the extreme, and whether justifiably or not, every man of them is looked upon as a traitor to the cause, a renegade to the professions they made, and a recreant to the resolutions they pledged themselves to abide by.’

The same paper described the windows of Mr. O’Neill’s establishment, he being one of the tenants who had bought in their holdings, as ‘literally pigeon-holed with stones,’ and announced that he had left the town, as also Mr. John Ryan, ‘at whose house,’ it said, ‘a blast of powder, constructed in bombshell shape, was thrown on Thursday night.’

Between the 5th of September and the 15th of October, no less than four bombs were thrown in the town; one into Mr. Smith-Barry’s rent office; one into the back yard of Edmond Fitzgerald, publican, who had bought in his holding; one into the back bedroom of John Heffernan, a publican, who was alleged to have dealt with

Boycotting  
and intimidation.

Outrages.



Fitzgerald, while the fourth was thrown over the wall of the Bridewell, which was occupied by the police.

Mr. J. J. Clancy, M.P., speaking at a meeting of the National League in Dublin on the 22nd of April, 1890, said that 'these "bombs" were only squibs which boys were in the habit of firing off at times of rejoicing;' and, on the 9th of June, 1890, in the House of Commons, Mr. Dillon, M.P., described them in a similar manner; but some of these 'squibs' consisted of the metal axle-boxes of cart wheels, filled with powder, and plugged at either end, a small hole having been made for the insertion of the fuse. The fragments of them are to be seen at the police barrack, and the metal is three-fourths of an inch thick. They exploded just like shells, and would doubtless have done great damage but for their clumsy construction.

Nationalist  
testimony to  
intimidation  
and outrage.

Although it has been repeatedly alleged by the Parnellites that the movement at Tipperary has been characterized by an entire absence of intimidation and outrage, the existence of both has been sufficiently testified to in the Nationalist Press. Thus the following description of the state of the town appeared in the *Cork Herald*, a Nationalist paper, of September 6, 1889:—

'Unabated excitement prevails in the town, here, since the sales at Thurles yesterday . . . Last night the windows of three shops in the town, belonging to tenants who settled with the landlord by paying full rent and costs, were smashed in, and in one of these cases about £40 worth of plate glass has been destroyed. To-day not a glazier could be found in the whole town to put in new glass . . . Were it not for the timely exhortation of Father Hanly, C.C., last evening, the



houses of all the tenants in the town who paid their rents at Thurles yesterday would have been wrecked. Two of the country tenants who bought in their holdings, when leaving town last evening had to seek shelter in the outskirts of the town, but only after one of them had been assaulted by an immense crowd of men, women, and children, who marched up and down the streets cheering for the tenants who allowed themselves to be sold out, and groaning Mr. Smith-Barry and the tenants who purchased their farms. . . . To-day also, a party of bailiffs doing duty out toward Emly, were recognized, and driven through the main street, and some of them sought shelter in the police barracks. One of the number, Richard Kane, of Thurles, was knocked down opposite the Munster Bank, and badly beaten by some young lads. A load of straw drawn from an evicted farm beyond Lattin, was seized in Henry-street on to-day, the animal taken from the car, and the straw set fire to, and the whole burnt. Two more bailiffs from Clonmel went from house to house in the town to get something to eat or drink, but being watched and followed, were everywhere refused. Altogether the town is in a state of confusion and consternation, and it will give quite enough to do to the one hundred extra policemen who arrived here this evening to preserve anything like order. As I write window-smashing has just commenced in the main street.'

According to the *Wexford People* of September 14, 1889, Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., who had held a meeting at Tipperary on the 8th of September, while passing through New Ross, gave a special interview to a representative of that paper, in which he is reported to have said :—

'I have never seen such excitement in my life as there is in Tipperary at this moment. The houses of the men who paid their rents there are left alone by everyone. The houses of these men have been nearly wrecked, and there cannot be got in the county of Tipperary a glazier to repair the windows, which have been smashed to pieces. The combination of the Smith-Barry tenants is one of the best in Ireland.'\*

---

\* This was quoted by Mr. Balfour in the House of



On the 14th of September, 1889, Mr. T. M. Healy addressed a meeting at Tipperary in which, after referring to those who had allowed their holdings to be sold, he said :—

‘Some few men—misled and misguided men—some few men took another course. Well, they had suffered—some people in the town thought more than their sin deserved. But undoubtedly their sin was a very grave one, because if they had succeeded, and if their example had been imitated, they would have entirely smashed up the Smith-Barry combination, and perhaps have broken the heart of William O’Brien.’ (*Freeman's Journal*, September 16th, 1889.)

Recantation  
of tenants.

By the 17th of October, 1889, the tenants who had bought in their holdings were reduced to submission, and signed an apology, expressing regret and promising to act in future with their fellow-tenants.

Further out-  
rages.

Nevertheless the outrages still continued. On the 29th of November a leaden pipe loaded with powder was thrown into the office of Mr. Nolan, Mr. Smith-Barry's solicitor, at seven o'clock in the evening. On the 2nd of December another explosive was thrown at a police patrol, which damaged the eaves of a roof, and smashed the metal part of a gas lamp; and on the 6th of December, a bottle full of blasting powder was placed under the wall of the house of Patrick

---

Commons on the 23rd of May, 1890; whereupon Mr. Redmond denied, in a letter published in the *Freeman's Journal* of May 26th, and copied into the *Wexford People*, the journal in which the interview appeared, that he ever made any such statement. On the 10th of June Mr. Redmond stated in the House of Commons that he had not even granted the interview referred to.



Hanrahan, Mr. Smith-Barry's clerk of works, in which a policeman's wife was lying, who had been confined only two days before. The fuse went out before the powder ignited, and the police saw a man running away, but failed to catch him. On the 20th of the same month the house of a tenant named Quinlan, who was supposed to have paid his rent, was fired into. The window was shattered, and a bullet found in the wall opposite. Just before this outrage several tenants who intended to pay their rents had applied for particulars of the amounts due from them, but after such an occurrence they were afraid to pay.

As the result of the terrorism established by such means, a certain number of shopkeepers have been induced either to abandon their business premises in the centre of the town, or to submit to eviction from them. Some have gone into houses in other parts of the town, and a few have taken up their abode in what has been well described as

'New Tipperary.'

**'That singular structure called New Tipperary.'**

'New Tipperary' consists of two rows of wooden houses, twenty-six in number, with two small rooms on the ground floor, and three still smaller ones above. These are designed for the people who are to occupy the twenty-six stalls in the new mart. There is also a row of sixteen slightly-built brick houses, with shops in front, in course of construction. These three rows of houses are built in a field just outside the old



town, with no thoroughfare passing through it, and are altogether out of the way, and

**unsuitable for business purposes.**

They are not even built in regular lines. The whole thing possesses neither form nor shape, and to describe it as a new town is the very height of absurdity.

The new  
mart.

Close by is the new mart or 'William O'Brien Arcade,' a structure about 200 feet long, and 80 feet wide, with 13 stalls on each side. The stalls are only 20 feet by 15, and are far too small for shops, while there is no storage room whatever. The centre of the mart is to be used as a Butter Market, for which it is quite unsuitable, butter being much too delicate a substance to be subjected to the contamination of such things as butchers' meat, vegetables, paint, tobacco, and so forth, the effluvia of which will permeate the building from the stalls at either side. Moreover, the roof is of glass and iron, and the mart has already proved too hot for the butter, which requires above all things a cool and pure atmosphere. It is built on the site of an old garden, and the garden walls are ill calculated to support the weight which has been placed upon them.

On a different site, but also outside the town, seven small wooden houses, were built some months ago, but only three of them have been occupied; and at the lower end of the town a number of wooden huts have been constructed for weekly tenants and labourers.



Those who have gone into possession of the new premises are anything but satisfied. They do not appreciate living in wooden huts at all ; while they find them small and cold, too far from the business part of the town, and without accommodation for storing goods. These buildings are, moreover, at present devoid of all sanitary arrangements, and proceedings have been taken to compel the authorities to interfere.

It is stated in Tipperary that a very large sum of money has already been expended in the erection of ' New Tipperary,' and that the weekly labour bill has amounted for some months to a considerable total. But there is extremely little to show for the outlay, and complaints are freely made as to the manner in which the money is being expended. The following letter, which appeared in the *Irish Times* of March 25th, 1890, is an indication of what is being said in Tipperary on this subject :—

The Cost of  
' New Tip-  
perary.'

' SIR,

' I ask you to give me space in your paper to state a few simple facts in connection with the condition of affairs in town here, especially with the treatment of evicted tenants on the Smith-Barry estate. At the commencement of this business the people here were told again and again that no man would suffer a penny loss, and that the evicted tenants would be well provided for by being given houses and shops equal at least to what they had ; but I am an evicted tenant, and for a considerable time past have been out of my house and premises, but I have not been provided with a shop or a house, and, more than that, since the day I was put out by the sheriff, no man came to me to see if I wanted for anything, or to know had I the means of providing bread for my children, and no one seems to care whether myself or my



family live or starve. My case is not the only one, for there are plenty of evicted tenants complaining as I do. I have no means or money, and I had very little when evicted.

‘When the Members of Parliament and the leaders come to town, they are met at the railway station and elsewhere by the leaders here, who tell them that everything is going on grandly, and that the evicted tenants are snugly provided for. But let any of the Members meet the evicted tenants in a body, and the truth will come out.

‘Yours, &c.,

‘AN EVICTED TENANT.

‘TIPPERARY, 24th March, 1890.’

Some of the victims.

One man who is endeavouring to carry on business in the ‘new town’ formerly occupied fine premises in a central position, where he had a spacious workshop, with a steam engine, lathes, and every requisite for a whitesmith’s trade. Now he has a small shed, quite out of the way, in which he cannot set up his machinery or carry on his work.

The finest business premises in the town were those of Mr. O’Neill—a large building of three flats, with handsome stone-cut facings and plate-glass windows, in which he carried on an extensive drapery and general business, employing thirty hands. He was one of those who bought in their holdings, and subsequently signed the recantation. He has now closed his shop and migrated to

**a miserable store**

on the outskirts of the town, in which, as the *Freeman’s Journal* of April 8th truly observed, he



has 'not much more room than suffices to turn round in.' He has not been evicted, Mr. Smith-Barry having secured his rent by other means, and there was no necessity for him to leave his premises, which he had himself built at a cost of some thousands of pounds, unless in deference to popular clamour. The good will in his business has been estimated at £10,000.

There is scarcely one of those who have left their houses who does not feel that he has acted most foolishly. Those who have given up their businesses were told that they would suffer no monetary loss, but these promises have not been fulfilled.

'An Evicted Shopkeeper,' writing from Tipperary to the *Irish Times* of the 12th May, 1890, says:—

'But what about the promise that was made to me over and over, that I would not suffer one penny's loss in the whole transaction. I would like to know who is to compensate me?

'I will pay my rent, and if I am boycotted for it, I will show to the civilised world, and wherever the English tongue is spoken, that no one is to be blamed for not parting with his house, and home, and trade, and walking about idle with a poorhouse staring him in the face. As I said, I never made any promise to do this, but the promises that were most solemnly made to me were not kept.'

It has been represented that the town of Tipperary has been left desolate, but this is by no means the case. Considerably more than half the shopkeepers on Mr. Smith-Barry's property, and all those who hold under other landlords, are still in occupation of their premises in the old town.



On the 27th April, 1890, a printed notice was extensively posted in the locality, boycotting some of the principal tradesmen who have refused to give up their shops at the dictation of the League. The Notice ran thus :—

The following are aiding and assisting the Exterminator in Tipperary :—

JOSEPH F. DUGGAN,  
Hardware Merchant, &c., Tipperary. Boycott!

E. H. M'CUAIG,  
Grocer, Tipperary, Cahir, and Clonmel. Boycott!

MRS. B. M. GREENE,  
Grocer, &c., Tipperary. Boycott!

JOHN HARNEY,  
Tobacconist, &c., Tipperary. Boycott!

GEO. RUTHERFORD & SONS,  
Flour and Meal Merchants, Tipperary. Boycott!

CHARLEY PEARE,  
Watchmaker and Jeweller, Tipperary. Boycott!

JAMES GODFREY,  
Tobacconist, &c., Tipperary. Boycott!

JAMES SHAW,  
Publican, St. Michael street, Tipperary. Boycott!

DANIEL BUCKLEY,  
Publican, St. Michael street, Tipperary. Boycott!

JOHN FANNING,  
Farmer, Lacken, Tipperary. Boycott!

JOHN QUINLAN,  
Farmer, Carron, Tipperary. Boycott!

—

MORE TO FOLLOW!!



There are only

**Four Protestants**

engaged in business in Tipperary, and

**Three out of the Four**

appear upon this list. Trade-jealousy has, no doubt, had a good deal to do with the boycotting in Tipperary as elsewhere; but the result is nearly as bad for those who are not boycotted as for those who are. The country people are afraid to enter the town at all, and are going elsewhere for their supplies, and

**trade has been driven from the town  
altogether.**

A farm of 300 acres has been taken for the accommodation of the agricultural tenants, who have been evicted owing to non-payment of rent. There are several families in occupation of the house and offices on this farm. Their cattle are all mixed up together on the land, and if report speaks truly they are not living very harmoniously together.

It is pretended that the action of those who have abandoned their valuable premises has been entirely voluntary, but there could not be a more gross misrepresentation. Some of those who have left their houses have

**actually paid their rents.**

Others have begged that they might be sued. One man who had paid half a year's rent offered to forfeit it so that he might be sued for a year's



rent: 'If not,' he wrote, 'issue for the amount due, half a year's rent, but I would rather you would go for a year's rent.' The following letter was addressed to Mr. Smith-Barry's agent by another tenant:—

'Private.]

'TIPPERARY, *December 11th*, 1889.

'SIR,

'I hope you will not ask me to pay rent at present. I would pay, as I always did, but dare not just now. You know the rent is perfectly secure. I ask you, therefore, not to expose me to risk a second time—at least until the winter is past.

'Yours, &c.,

'H. H. TOWNSEND, ESQ., J. P.

'I have marked this private, and am not posting it here. You will understand the necessity for this precaution on my part. If writing, will you please use the envelope enclosed, and it might be safer to have it not posted here.

'I do not presume to suggest anything, but I say it would be a mercy if anything could be done to settle this unfortunate business, for the state of the country is dreadful.'

The following extract is taken from a letter written by Mr. Edward Phillips, a Protestant tenant on the Smith-Barry estate in Tipperary:—

'I have been a tenant on Mr. Smith-Barry's estate for over 25 years, holding 270 acres Irish, equal to 438 statute, at a rent of £340 per year. Have always been on the most friendly terms with my landlord, his agent, and all the rest of the tenants, never had a disagreement with any of them, until called upon some weeks ago to sign a resolution condemning Mr. Smith-Barry's action on the Ponsonby estate, and binding myself to oppose and harm him in every way; in fact, join the Land League in their present fight against him. This I refused to do, also my next neighbour, who is an Englishman. The remaining tenants, 27 in number, have cleared everything off their farms, roots, hay, straw, implements, and stopped all work and await eviction. We



are proclaimed, boycotted, by the National League at a meeting publicly held in the town of Cashel. We can neither buy nor sell any farm produce, or stock, unless going to a great distance ; even then are watched and followed, if known. We are refused all the common necessities of life in the neighbouring town, so much so that the chemist was afraid to give me medicine ordered by the doctor, who was attending me for a bad cold and cough. I feel quite certain that the very people who refuse to supply or buy from me, also the tenants who with the exception of two, are all well-to-do thriving men, are sorry from their hearts that this ever has occurred, but are so cowed by the League, and the power of boycotting, that they dare not say so. I have been told by several of them that such is the case.'

Several complaints have been made of the 'shadowing' of the local nationalist leaders and League organizers by the police in Tipperary, but it is absolutely necessary where such a system of intimidation and boycotting has been established, that those chiefly responsible should have their power for mischief curtailed as much as possible by the watchfulness of the police. It has been stated, among other things, that the funeral of Mr. O'Dwyer, the late secretary of the Tipperary branch of the National League was 'proclaimed.' It is scarcely necessary to say that this is not so, but the resident magistrate having received information that Mr. William O'Brien was coming to attend the funeral, accompanied by a number of reporters, he considered it necessary to proclaim any meeting that might be held, and placed a reporter under the protection of the police in the graveyard, with the result that Mr. O'Brien's remarks were of a perfectly harmless description.

The Nationalists have complained of this as an outrage ; the *Freeman's Journal* of January 25,

Complaints  
against the  
police.



1890, declaring that 'if there is a religious sentiment more deeply rooted than another in the Irish breast, it is respect for the dead.' Nevertheless, on the 28th of November, when a police constable's child was being buried in Tipperary, about 200 boys and girls from 10 to 20 years of age collected and booed at the funeral procession, calling the police 'Balfour's murderers.' They also threw a shower of stones, some of which actually fell on the coffin as the grave was being filled in. This has been denied by the Nationalists, but it can be testified to by the constable in question, and also by several of his comrades.

There can be no doubt whatever, judging from the results which have followed from the previous meetings held by Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., in Tipperary, that it was absolutely necessary for the Government to proclaim the meeting which he and Mr. Dillon attempted to hold there on the 24th of May, 1890.

An attempt has been made to injure Mr. Smith-Barry by disturbing the Tipperary Fairs and Markets, of which he is the owner. Payment of the tolls at the fairs has been evaded, and at the instance of the Town Commissioners a rival Weigh-house and Market-yard have been established. Legal proceedings are now pending against the Town Commissioners, at the suit of Mr. Smith-Barry, for disturbance of the Fairs and Markets.

---

The controversy with regard to Tipperary is an extremely simple one, and practically resolves



itself into the question of whether or not Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants were justified in withholding their rents, in consequence of his action in reference to the Ponsonby Estate. Although the points at issue are very few, it may be useful to set forth the principal allegations which have been made, and the answers thereto, in parallel columns:—

## ALLEGATIONS.

1. That a settlement of the dispute on the Ponsonby Estate had almost been arrived at, the difference between the parties being only one of about £5000, when Mr. Smith-Barry and others intervened for the purpose of preventing it:—

—(*Mr. Parnell at Liverpool, 'The Times,' Dec. 20th, 1889; Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., and Canon Keller at Manchester, 'Manchester Guardian,' February 5th, 1890*).

2. That Mr. Smith-Barry and others intervened for the purpose of 'exterminating' the Ponsonby tenants.

—(*Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., same report*).

3. That the action of Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants has been purely voluntary.

## ANSWERS.

1. This is untrue. The difference between the parties was one of over £20,000.

The net sum which Mr. Ponsonby would have received, had he accepted Canon Keller's last offer, was £88,500; whereas the net sum which he was willing to accept was £110,000.

2. That this is not so is proved by the fact that on the 5th of April, 1890, after Mr. Smith-Barry's intervention, and at his instance, an offer was made to the Ponsonby tenants, which Mr. Justice Gibson described at the Wicklow Assizes, in July, 1889, as 'most liberal,' and 'almost extravagantly generous.'

3. This is a gross misrepresentation. Mr. Smith-Barry's tenants only took action at the instance of Mr. William O'Brien, M.P.; and such of them as refused to quarrel with a landlord, against whom they had no grievances, are now boycotted.



## ALLEGATIONS.

4. That the combination among Mr. Smith Barry's tenants is 'as legal a trade strike as ever was conducted upon trade union principles.'

—(Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M. P.,  
'*Freeman's Journal*, May  
27th, 1890).

5. That 'there has not been one single act of violence, or resistance against the law,' in connection with the movement.

—(Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P.,  
*same speech*).

## ANSWERS.

4. There is no analogy whatever between a trade union strike and the refusal to pay rents legally due.

5. The windows of those shopkeepers who bought in their holdings were smashed on the 4th of September, 1889; and a number of bombs have been thrown into houses in the town. On the 20th of December, 1889, the house of a tenant, named Quinlan, who was supposed to have paid his rent, was fired into.

Such is, in brief outline, the story of the latest achievement of the Parnellite party in Ireland. Those who interfered between Mr. Smith-Barry and his tenants have failed to avert the eviction of the Ponsonby tenants, have failed to ruin Mr. Smith-Barry, and have only succeeded in destroying the trade of a prosperous town, and the prospects of a flourishing and contented set of tenants. A greater piece of madness than the movement at Tipperary it would be impossible to conceive.







