

**THE WEEDON HISTORY GROUP**  
**PRESENTS**  
**COPING WITH POVERTY AND**  
**PAUPERISM**  
**1700 -1850**  
**A PARISH PERSPECTIVE**

**12<sup>th</sup> November 2010**  
**Weedon Methodist Chapel**  
**7 for 7.30pm**

**Light Refreshments.**

**Raffle**

**Proceeds to be shared between the Methodist Church,  
Weedon and St Mary's, Hardwick.**

**Researched and written by Julie Gibbs with the help of the cast.**

## **Coping with poverty and pauperism 1700 – 1850 a parish perspective.**

**Narrator** - Welcome ladies and gentlemen, ratepayers, paupers and occasional relief recipients. Your programme will tell you who you are! This meeting starts in the year 1819 and what a serious subject we have to discuss! All of you will be aware that as a country we need to reduce the expenditure on relieving the poor. Of course, how you feel about the various proposals will depend on which of the above mentioned categories you fall in.

Wherever your sympathies lie, Whig or Tory, you have to acknowledge that costs have soared over the last 40 years or so. Why in 1776, Hardwick spent a mere £35 on its poor and Weedon £45. That seemed high enough at the time, but just a few years later in the mid 1780's, expenditure had more than doubled to £73 for Hardwick and £177 for Weedon. Now, even that seems quite reasonable, when compared to this year's figures, that is, Hardwick £345 and Weedon £664. It's the ratepayers who have to foot the bill and when there are so few of us, it is a very heavy burden, don't you agree? Why it is estimated that just a third of a typical parish will be ratepayers.

As you all know Weedon only recently went through the upheaval of enclosing the open fields, authorized by the Act of 1801. Many of you are still struggling with the associated costs and repayments of loans. Since the end of the war with France in 1815, prices have fallen, causing an agricultural depression. Many small to middling sized farms have failed. Returning militia men have added to the numbers looking for work. It is not just the traditional poor needing help now.

The current system for looking after the poor has been in place since Elizabeth the first's reign and is plainly no longer able to cope. No doubt there will be poor amongst us always and occasionally they come in useful as extra labour, but there is a limit to how many we can support, especially as each parish, or in our case each village, is responsible for looking after its own poor. Those of you who do not come from Weedon please note the emphasis on the word own. We also need to bear in mind that in these difficult economic times anyone including myself could end up needing help.

Let me introduce the officials who (or their predecessors), have administered the poor law in Weedon for the last two hundred years. First

we have a typical overseer of the poor who like me comes from the more elite of the tenant farmers.

**Typical overseer** - Good evening. I represent a typical overseer of the poor elected from the ratepayers for a term of one year. Hardwick elect their own. My role is to set and collect the rates, relieve those unable to work, either in kind or with money, to set to work those able to do so, but who cannot find employment and place pauper children as apprentices. My annual accounts are audited by my fellow parishioners and approved by the local magistrate. If I am negligent and fail to hold a meeting once a month I will be fined 20s.

The post is unpaid, but I can claim my expenses. As you can imagine the job is onerous especially in Weedon, but I do rather enjoy the power and authority that the role gives me over anyone claiming assistance. Obviously I am related to a number of you, some quite distantly I hasten to add, and well known to everyone. Does this fact deter you from asking for help?

Does my position affect your attitude to me? I like to think it does, in a positive way of course. Just remember I do have considerable discretion as to how I distribute the poor rate.

A brief look at Edmund Seamons account, of 1700, will give you an idea of the type of person receiving help, in the good old days. Several widows were paid a weekly pension of 1s 6d, with some acting as servants to others in the village; a number of men earned 8d per day, working in Stockwellway; Richard Price received 15s 4d for digging gravel for twenty three days; Francis Sired received 1s for shouting at the crows; Widow Sired nursed Edward Turpin's child for eleven weeks for £1 2s. and when the poor child died, 4s was expended on the burial. About £42 was spent that year out of a total collected of £44 14s 4d, not so different from the expenditure of 1776. You will understand that to keep expenditure under control, it is essential to distinguish the deserving poor from those just too idle to work. It is accepted that those too old or infirm or temporarily incapacitated should receive a little help. We do however; have to make sure that anyone receiving poor relief is not better off than someone working for a wage.

I am aided in my duties by the churchwarden and by the parish constable. It is often thought that the constables are selected from the lesser tenants, but it is possible that they come from a similar position in society as the overseers. You can judge for yourself. You do wonder who would want to be one though. Here is a typical parish constable.

**Typical constable** - Good evening. I would say that I am definitely of the same standing as the overseers. Why back in 1709 and for the following ten years, members of the Duncombe family, gentlemen of Hardwick, acted as constables.

My post is also unpaid and lasts for a year. My immediate superior is the High or Chief Constable of the Cottesloe Hundred. Much of my time is spent acting as a servant to the justices of the peace, executing their warrants, obeying their orders and attending them at the Petty and Quarter Session. I have to take an oath of office and will be replaced if deemed unsuitable or if I become impoverished. My attendance is required at each Quarter Sessions where I have to give details pertaining to the keeping of the peace, the state of the poor and the condition of the roads and I will be fined if I do not do so. Alexander Duncombe, constable of Hardwick and Richard Burgess of Weedon were both indicted in 1709 for not bringing in their presentments, but were excused due to some emergent occasion and sickness. So you can get away with it, if you can think of a good reason.

The constables, in those long ago days, were busy catching swearers. Yes believe it or not, two people were caught swearing in Weedon in 1703, Thomas Flitt, victualler and Henry Rayner. It was the same year that Thomas Watkins was indicted for buying and selling butter, cheese and other dead victuals without a licence. Somehow or other he managed to be discharged. Weedon inhabitants were indicted for not repairing the road from Winslow to Aylesbury (1704 on the east side of Lamas Close between Blunts Corner and Weedon Windmill) and the Hardwick inhabitants for not scouring the Hardwick Brook. It is worth noting that in 1715, the constable of Hardwick was allowed 14s 6d for expenses in providing wagons and horses for carriage of soldiers baggage belonging to his Majesty's Regiment of Foot commanded by Colonel Dort. Of course you get the petty squabbles. In 1719, Fairford Price of Hardwick, tailor, broke the window of Richard Bishop, also a tailor. William Symonds, a labourer of Weedon, had to be of good behaviour towards Elizabeth, his wife, in 1727. Just normal village goings on.

Much of my time is spent looking out for vagabonds, travellers and others without means of support, trying to sneak into Weedon, maybe from Hardwick or further afield and moving them on as quickly as possible. Now let me introduce a typical magistrate.

**Typical magistrate** - 'Good evening. As a landed gentleman, I have the time, the resources, the inclination and the education to act as a Magistrate. I, too, am unpaid, but can claim expenses. I should point out

that the Lord Lieutenant of the County chooses the JPs. To act as a JP you need to have a freehold or copyhold of £100 per year. They always tend to be leading landowners. Dissenters and Roman Catholics are excluded. Political beliefs are an important part. A big problem has occurred in that too many eligible people are not wanting to be JPs, preferring the pleasures of the field more. To increase numbers, they have turned to the clergy. They are deemed to be suitable because they often live where the gentry are thin on the ground. They understand public business and are politically loyal. The disadvantage is that they tend to be conservative and anti-reform when it is needed. This is detrimental to their role as a Parson. A Magistrate does have a great deal of power, but that, of course, is not my motivation.

I believe in doing my duty for the country, why it is the magistrates that virtually run the place! Locally we are responsible for regulating prices, wages, taxes, overseeing repair of roads and bridges, prisons, licenses, crime and poverty. Supervising the administration of the poor relief and keeping these parish officials on their toes is a major task. We have to settle rating disputes within the parish and give orders for relief to individuals. Anyone feeling they have been wrongly denied relief can come to me and I'll question the overseer about his decision.

There have been at least two rating disputes in Weedon. In 1694, the overseer, Edward Shepperd, was accused of refusing to make a rate at various vestry meetings which were attended by the parishioners. He eventually produced a rate without their knowledge, under which William Shepperd, his brother, was not assessed at all on his part of Lilies Farm, but the assessments of Michael Batson and five others, who held the rest of the farm, were increased. A few years later he was declared, by the providence of God, to be a lunatic. Even in more recent times, the rates have caused disagreements. Joseph Brooks was very aggrieved by the assessment of John Seamons in 1778. Several people were omitted, including a Mrs. Seamons.

The question of which parish or village is responsible for a particular pauper causes regular disputes which have to be resolved at the Court of Quarter Sessions. There was the day in January 1719, when a travelling woman appeared in Weedon.

**Travelling woman** - Can you help me please; I'm looking for the overseer?

**Overseer of Weedon, William Brooks** - I am William Brooks, the overseer of Weedon. What can I do for you?

**Travelling woman** - First I must sit down; I have walked all the way from Hardwick. (Sit down) That's better. My name is Anne Brind and I am from St James, Westminster. I am only 26 years old. I am trying to catch up with my husband. I was taken ill passing through Hardwick and the overseer there kindly looked after me for a few days and he was sure that you would do the same.

**Overseer of Weedon, William Brooks** - We'll have to see about that. Who is your husband and where is he? What does he do?

**Travelling woman** - My husband's name is William Brind, junior. He is a brick maker and turner. He left me and has gone to Marlborough to find work. I'm trying to find him, but it is such a long way to go. I do hope that you people of Weedon will be as kind to me as those of Hardwick.

**Overseer of Weedon, William Brooks** - Does your husband know that you are following him?

**Travelling woman** - Of course he does! He is expecting me.

**Overseer of Weedon, William Brooks** - Let me ask the ratepayers. What do you think? Should we help her? Hands up if you think we should. Don't forget this will be an additional cost and we don't know how long she will expect to stay here?

I've decided that we cannot afford it. You see I like to keep a tight control over our finances. That allows me to look after our own deserving poor. Constable, please take this woman by horse to Aylesbury and set her down near the sign of the Chequer. No doubt, someone there will take care of you; they have much more money than we do.

**Magistrate** - This case appeared before me at the Court of Quarter Session in January 1719. Weedon was ordered to indemnify Aylesbury for the removal of Anne Brind. The order was addressed to several people listed as overseers of Weedon, John Simond, John Simons junior, William Brooks, John Wise, John Humphrey to name a few, quite why so many, I'm not sure. Weedon did not necessarily escape incurring a cost in the case of Anne Brind.

Weedon villagers also travelled. John Emmerton described as rogue and vagabond, in 1756, was apprehended in Puttenham, Surrey, for wandering

and begging. Apparently he had been a soldier.

Back to the present, the increase in expenditure of poor relief over the last few years is indeed worrying. I do wonder whether the local overseers are being overly generous and relieving people who do not deserve it. Obviously I wish to make sure that the labourers on my estates are looked after during the winter months when work might be in short supply, so that they are fit and well for the busier months but we do need to be selective.

I'll pass you back to one of the parish officials who will explain who qualifies for relief in Weedon and Hardwick.

**Parish Official** - It is recognized that labourers do sometimes need to move from parish to parish to find work, but we do not want somebody coming into the village who later becomes a liability. So, if any of you are thinking of moving to Weedon, you need to know how to obtain a settlement, other than by birth. If you can afford it, renting a house for £10 or more per year will give you a settlement; or becoming a parish officer; paying the parish rate; being bound as an apprentice to a parishioner or if single, serving a year in service. If it is feared that you may become chargeable, a complaint to the justices has to be made within 40 days of your arrival in the village. If reported in time, two justices of the peace can remove you.

If however, you come with a Settlement Certificate issued by your own parish, signed by the overseer and church warden, attested by two witnesses and approved by two magistrates, you will be allowed to stay, as this document confirms that your parish will take responsibility for you. I am sure that you appreciate that such a valuable document needs to be looked after. You may have noticed that one family Peter and Jean Kent and their 6 children, late of Aston Abbots, now of Bletchley are often seen in Weedon. Do not be concerned we do have a copy of their Settlement Certificate.

Women take their husband's settlement on marriage, so please, no marriages of convenience!

A rather delicate matter concerns children born out of wedlock, which since the 1750s has become much more common. This is probably due to the overcrowded cottages that labourers live in, with the loss of the old moral constraints. A child born more than a month after marriage is considered legitimate and will usually take the father's place of settlement whereas an illegitimate child will take the mother's. We parish officials do our best to compel a pregnant unmarried woman to get married. For some

years, it has been possible to force the woman to name the father. A man charged on oath with being the father of a bastard child can be apprehended and committed to gaol unless he gives security to indemnify the parish. Be warned.

I hope that is clear.

**Parish Official** - You can see that by being diligent and hard- working we have managed to look after our poor over the years, but what are we to do now, in the early 1800s, to cope with the ever increasing expenditure. The charities help a little. Barkers and the Poor Lands charities provide bread to the needy of Hardwick and Weedon respectively. Playstead's provides clothes for three deserving widows, that is a gown, petticoat, flannel waistcoat and two pairs of stockings. All the respectable widows of the parish receive the charity in rotation. All widows receive parish relief. Bridles helps with the education of a number of boys. But more is needed.

Parishes have or are trying different remedies. Since 1795, for example, Speenhamland, in Berkshire, have paid an allowance in aid of wages, proportionate to the ruling price of bread. When the gallon loaf made of 'second flour' cost 1s, labourers are entitled to 3s per week either from his own labour or from an allowance from the poor rate and each dependent is given the equivalent of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  –  $1\frac{1}{2}$  gallon loaf. It is believed by some that this system encourages the labourers to have more children, as for each child they could receive an extra 1s 6d to 2s 6d per week.

One solution is to levy a rate to cover the relief of the able bodied unemployed. Each labourer's service has a price set on it and a ratepayer chooses to employ the labourers at an appropriate wage or pay the rate. There is always competition for the best workers. An alternative is to send the paupers on the rounds, that is, they are offered employment in turn by the farmer ratepayers, the latter pay part of their wages and the parish the rest.

Here we have two typical paupers. So ratepayers, what would you prefer? Would you be prepared to employ them and pay them an agreed wage or would you rather pay a special rate to avoid employing them? Hands up pay the rate. Hands up employ them. Where are the remaining paupers in the audience? You will need to negotiate with the ratepayers direct.

**Narrator** - Some parishes make use of a workhouse, for example Aylesbury, Whitchurch and Winslow. The houses all vary in size. Some small establishments will contain idiots, children, sick, the poor, unmarried mothers and unemployed altogether, whereas others will house just the sick, infirm aged and young children. In 1803, forty-two Buckinghamshire



parishes maintained all or part of their poor in workhouses, but most people prefer relief in their own home.

We have three visitors, one from Foscott, one from Thornton and one from Wing, and each will briefly describe the situation in their village.

**Foscott representative** - I live in Foscott. In my parish it is usual to divide the number of labouring poor in proportion as near as may be, to the size of each farm, and each occupier employs such proportion whether young or old, in some kind of husbandry business and pays them, as wages, sufficient for their support. The poor are not sent on the Round, nor is any part of their maintenance taken out of the Poor Rate, unless on occasion of illness or immediate infirmity. The old people are supported by the persons to whom they are allotted and to whom they afford such labour as they are able. By these means the rates of this parish are much lower than those in many other parishes.

**Narrator** - Thank you. Do you think the poor of Foscott consider the amount they receive in wages sufficient for their needs? What about the 'old people', do they appreciate being allotted to someone for their support? Are there any 'old people' here tonight? If yes, shall we allocate you to some of the younger villagers?

**Thornton representative** - I am from Thornton. If a labourer wants work in this parish, he is sent, by the overseer to the farmers in turn, from whom he receives his full wages, and does not receive anything from the overseer. In the neighbouring parishes, most of the labourers are sent, what is called the Rounds. They are paid from 6d to 9d by the overseer and from 4d to 9d by the farmer, which plan much increases the Poor Rate.

**Wing representative** - I am from Wing. Here it has been agreed that those whose rents are £60 or more per year will employ one man for each £60 of rent. Unemployed labourers are balloted for, by the parishioners, to make up their assessed rate. Any surplus labourers are set to work by the Surveyor of the Roads, to dig gravel. He must pay such men out of the Road Rate and not the Poor Rate. Some clever labourer is put in charge of those performing this work. Any refusing to work will be denied relief and should they apply to the justices, the surveyor will attend to explain the reason why!

**Narrator** - Thank you gentlemen. Again it would be useful to hear from the labourers themselves.

As has already been mentioned parishes regularly dispute who is responsible for a particular pauper. We now join the Court of Quarter Sessions to hear

three such cases of chargeability, the first in 1818. It is not always easy to decide which parish or village is responsible or to understand the court's decision. Listen carefully and using your knowledge of the laws of settlement, you can guess the outcome.

William Watkins and his wife Sarah, of Weedon, had been removed and conveyed from and out of the Hamlet of Weedon to the parish of Wotton Underwood by a Removal Order dated 17 September 1818 signed by two Justices of the Peace. Wotton Underwood has appealed against the decision. This case is entitled 'hiring and services in Wotton Underwood'. While each village had its own representative to question the witnesses, we have just one court voice.

**Court Voice** - Mr. Watkins, please tell the court where you have been working for the past few years.

**William Watkins, pauper** - I went to live with Mr. John Symonds in Wotton Underwood for the first time, a fortnight after Michaelmas and stayed till Michaelmas Day. Mr. Symonds had a brother, Richard, living in the House, who asked me if I had any objection to stop again and I said no. Mr. Richard Symonds told me not to let myself but I was not settled there. I received my wages for the first hiring on Michaelmas Day and went home to see my friend for 2 days and returned on the 13 October. I agreed to work for 8 Guineas, but no time was mentioned. I went on working in that service. Two days before Michaelmas at the end of second year, Master said he and I must part. I said very well. Master paid the full wages of 8 Guineas and I went away the next day, one day before Michaelmas. I came back to Master, 3 or 4 days after. Master did not tell me to come back. The Master then hired me again. If Master had stopped any of my wages the first time I should not have liked it.

**Court Voice** - Let me get this straight, when was the first hiring?

**Pauper** - The first hiring was a fortnight after Michaelmas until Michaelmas Day. I left 2 days after Michaelmas.

**Court Voice** - Here is a memo in respect of the Hiring signed by the Pauper. When did the second hiring begin?

**Pauper** - I started work again on the 13<sup>th</sup> October and I went away after the second hiring when Master said he did not need me anymore. I went to my friends.

**Court Voice** - And the third hiring, when did that start?

**Pauper** - I went back to Master 3 or 4 days after Michaelmas and I went away at the end of the third hiring, 3 or 4 days before Michaelmas.

**Court Voice** - Did you regard Richard Symonds as Master and did you discuss your wages with him?

**Pauper** - I could not call him Master. No wages were agreed upon between me and Richard Symonds.

**Court Voice** - Call Mr. Richard Symonds. Mr. Symonds, do you consider yourself Master when your brother is not there and did you ever discuss wages with the pauper?

**Richard Symonds** - I was Master when my brother was out. My brother hired the pauper, the first time. The papers were signed not when the pauper was hired but at the time of receiving his wages. He did not sign the paper at the second hiring but when he received his wages. No time of service was mentioned at the second hiring.

**Court Voice** - Can you remember when you signed a paper and how many you signed?

**Pauper** - I did not sign a paper at either hiring. No paper was signed at the second hiring. I signed these papers at the end of the year, I never signed but one paper. I went home to my own place after the second hiring. I took my clothes to a neighbour in Wotton Parish. I did not consider myself at liberty while at home after the first service, to hire myself to another Master. I was hired the second time for 8 guineas. No time was mentioned, 5 shillings was stopped out of the last hiring for 51 weeks. I can't recollect which year it was stopped from.

**Court Voice** - The counsel for Wotton Underwood believes it is quite clear that there was no hiring for a year, for any of the 3 years. I will now question Mr. John Symonds.

**Mr. John Symonds** - Unlike some farmers I was not under agreement to forfeit £10 for bringing in a Pauper, so any decisions taken by me were not influenced by this thought.

The Pauper was hired on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Saturday after Michaelmas Day, 24 or 25 October, until Michaelmas next. He was paid his wages and he went away. On 13 October I sent for the Pauper & hired him till 8 October. I made a memorandum of hiring, for the second year, which you have seen.

The pauper signed this memo at the time of the second hiring. The wages for the second hiring were 8 guineas. The pauper stopped till 5 October. I paid him £8 3s. On 12 Oct the Pauper came for the third time for 51 weeks. My brother was not concerned in business with me.

**Court Voice** - Are you positive that your brother had no say in your business?

**Mr. John Symonds** - My brother arranged business when I was out. I gave no authority to my brother to hire the pauper for the second time. There was no understanding with the pauper between hirings. My brother did not tell me he had hired the pauper for the second time.

**Court Voice** - It is most unhelpful that the two brothers cannot agree between them. Which one do you believe John or Richard?

The pauper cannot remember when he signed the paper nor how long the second hiring was for. He does however seem convinced that he was not free between hirings to go elsewhere. Have you noticed that Mr. John Symonds did his utmost to make sure the hirings did not last a year? Do you think William Watkins, the pauper, gained a settlement in Wotton Underwood or should he be sent back to Weedon? Weedon? Or Wotton Underwood?

The court having heard the appeals of the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor and Inhabitants of Wotton Underwood against the order and considered the merits of the matter at large as put by the Counsel on both sides has decided that the original order be confirmed and the opinion of the Bench is unanimous. The pauper has been delivered back to Weedon, although Wotton Underwood has been found to be his place of settlement. They have been given respite from their responsibility for the time being.

**Narrator** - Now to the Epiphany session of 1819 and the case of the pauper John Fleet of Weedon and Thomas Batson, a farmer of Hardwick. John Fleet, his wife Jane and their son William, aged 8 months, were conveyed from and out of the township of Hardwick to the hamlet of Weedon in December 1818. Weedon is appealing against the order and Hardwick are responding to that appeal. Again we will just have the court voice rather than the two counsels.

**Court Voice** - Firstly we need to establish the birth settlement of the pauper, John Fleet. I call the witness Thomas Batson.

**Thomas Batson** - Fleet the pauper is my nephew and he was born in

Weedon. The pauper's mother is my sister. My sister is now living, I saw her when with child and I have known the pauper all his life. I have seen the pauper in my sister's presence and she has acknowledged him to be her child.

**Court Voice** - That would appear to prove conclusively that the pauper's birth settlement is Weedon. We now need to consider the settlement by 'hiring & service' to the pauper's uncle, Mr. Thomas Batson. I call the first witness, John Fleet, pauper.

When did you first go to live with your uncle and what work did you do for him?

**John Fleet** - I lived with my Uncle a good many years. I was 12 or 13 when I went first. I used to do any jobs but did not plough then. The second and third years I was with him, I was a shepherd. During those 3 years my Uncle gave me my victuals, some old things whatever he thought, sometimes sixpence also. I went on so, all the while, with 6d now and then.

When I was about 15, I was first hired into service. My uncle asked me if I would stay on as I was. I said I had rather go to service. He said if I had rather go to service he would try and hire me. I said I should be hired if I stayed with him. He agreed to give me 5 guineas. I was to milk that year and do any sort of work. He never mentioned any time I was to stay for the 5 guineas. I was hired a week before old Michaelmas and I stayed until new Michaelmas. When I went away my Uncle paid me and told me he had done with me.

**Court Voice** - Did you consider yourself to be your uncle's servant before your first hiring?

**John Fleet pauper** - No, I was not my Uncles servant before hiring.

**Court Voice** - Did your uncle hire you again?

**John Fleet pauper** - It was a week before old Michaelmas, when I was first hired. I was hired 3 more times after that. I was away 3 years between. When I came back after 3 years I was hired for 51 weeks and then twice more for 51 weeks. After the first 51 weeks he paid me and told me I was my own master. The first hiring was a week before old Michaelmas or 6 days, I don't know which. It was not more than 7 days before. On new Michaelmas day, my Uncle paid me my full wages & told me he had done with me. I then went home to my friends and was hired again at Aylesbury Fair the day after Old Michaelmas. Uncle then hired me again. I was free while I was away.

**Court Voice** - The counsel for Hardwick considered that there had been no service for a year. What do you think? Which village was responsible for him, Weedon or Hardwick?

The judgment of the court was that the order was confirmed on the grounds of Dissolution, as the Bench was divided in Opinion. I am not surprised. Weedon was found to be his place of settlement. Despite all the time he had spent helping his uncle for little remuneration, it was not considered enough to earn a settlement in Hardwick.

**Narrator** - Not a good advert for working for a farmer in Hardwick, especially if he is an uncle! (John, an agricultural labourer, his wife and 3 children were still living in Weedon in 1841.)

We will hear the third case after the interval. Refreshments will now be served.

## INTERVAL

**Narrator** - The next case concerns the villages of Weedon and Bierton and George Fincher, a run away husband. Although he originated from Weedon he had been working in Bierton parish. As wives take their husband's settlement, it was particularly important for Weedon to establish whether George had gained a settlement in Bierton. The family had already appeared before the court in early January 1821, after Weedon had been ordered to maintain George Fincher. Weedon appealed and the order was quashed as he had not become chargeable. Ann was removed from Bierton to Weedon on the 5 May 1821. An appeal from the Weedon Churchwarden and Overseer of the Poor was heard at both the Midsummer and Michaelmas Quarter Sessions. With the consent of the Counsels of both parishes, it was agreed that the case be 'respite'd' until the next court. Perhaps the Fincher family was happy to help out. We pick up the story at the Epiphany session in 1822.

**Court Voice** - I call Ann Fincher. When did your husband run away?

**Ann Fincher** - George ran away about 12 months ago, only a few months after our marriage which took place at Bierton, in October 1820. Our little boy, Thomas, who was baptized in April 1821, was just 5 weeks old when he and I were removed to Weedon.

**Court Voice** - When did you last see your husband?

**Ann Fincher** - George has been back recently to the area and Mr. White the

overseer of Bierton knows it, but I do not know where he is now.

**Court Voice** - Please give the court a description of your husband, so that everyone can look out for him?

**Ann Fincher** - He is about 22 years old, 5ft 8 ½ins tall, has brown hair, hazel eyes, a ruddy complexion and no distinguishing marks. He can read and write, so he is quite clever. He seemed such a catch at the time. If anyone does see him I would like to get my hands on him too! I don't really mind where I live but I don't want to be moved backwards and forwards between the two villages.

**Court Voice** - This is what the court needs to determine, your place of settlement and this depends on whether your husband obtained a settlement in Bierton as a result of his service there. I call the first witness, Mr. White, overseer of Bierton. What do you know about Fincher?

**White Overseer of Bierton.** - Fincher ran away about a fortnight after the Epiphany Session in 1821 when it was found that he was not chargeable. I have heard he has been back to our parish but I have never seen him. In an hour or two after he was gone, I heard he was gone and was a soldier. George Fincher lived with me. I hired him the 12 October and paid him away on March 19.

**Court Voice** - Where did he go next?

**White Overseer of Bierton** - He went sometime after to live with Mr. Fisher in Bierton parish. Fisher is dead.

**Court Voice** - When did you hear that Fincher was again in the parish?

**White Overseer of Bierton** - Sometime in December last, I heard Fincher had been here.

**Court Voice** - I now call witness James Reed. What do you know of George Fincher's work record?

**James Reed, White's servant** - I am White's servant. I lived with Mr. Fisher of Bierton, 3 years ago. George Fincher lived there as well. I lived there 12 months almost and Fincher was there when I went. I don't know how long he had been there. I went there a day after Michaelmas. I saw him there in hay time before I went. Hay time is a month or 2 before Michaelmas. Fincher quitted Fisher's service a week before Michaelmas following my going to live with Fisher. He used to do the cows and slept in

the house. He slept in the house the night I went there. Before I went there, I can't say how many times I saw Fincher at work at Fishers. I have seen him every other night at work at Fishers in the garden and such as that. The hay time was the first time I saw him at Fishers but I cannot tell the month I saw him.

**Court Voice** - Let's try to make this a little simpler. When did you first see Fincher at Fisher's?

**James Reed** - Fincher was at Fishers in the hay time as a servant, that is the hay time before I started working there.

**Court Voice** - Did he sleep there the first night you went there, that is the day before Michaelmas?

**James Reed** - Yes he did and he slept there till he went away a week before the following Michaelmas. I saw Fincher at work at Fishers in the corn harvest I don't know whether he worked by the week or was a hired servant. I did see Fincher during the corn harvest but I don't know whether he slept at Fishers in the corn harvest. I am a relation of Fincher, he married my sister, but I don't know what his wages were. I saw Fincher at work at Fishers during the corn harvest.

**Court Voice Ask the audience** - What do you think? It seems certain that Fincher was at Fishers during the corn harvest! Can we rely on Reed's evidence? Don't forget he is Fincher's brother-in-law and Fincher has deserted his sister? Do you think Fincher gained a settlement through working for the now deceased Mr. Fisher? Yes or no? The court did and the order against Weedon was quashed.

**George Fincher** - Why would I want to stay round Bierton and Weedon with so little work available and a wife and baby to look after? What would you choose a life of poverty or the red coats of the Grenadier Guards? Maybe I'd had a bit too much to drink when I joined up, maybe I hadn't, but I found myself with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Battalion based in London. Much of my time was spent guarding the Tower of London and the like.

I found none of the excitement that I had hoped for. The years rolled by and I had had enough by ??? and deserted. I managed to 'lose' various pieces of equipment – a pair of stockings, a razor, a kettle and bag, 1 plume, 1 button brush and a leather case. Unfortunately I was recaptured. Can you guess what my sentence was? Transportation as a felon for 14 years. For some reason I was given another chance and this order was remitted by HRH The Commander in Chief (probably the Duke of York).



It did not stop me from trying again. I left my quarters on 29th December 1825. Maybe I intended to see my wife, maybe I did not. I have several pieces of equipment with me that I would like to get rid of, for a fair price of course, 1 great coat, 1 knapsack, 1 shako cap, 1 shirt, 1 pair of stockings, 1 pair of drawers, very warm and not too worn, 1 pair of half boots, 6 brushes, 1 leather case with small articles, 1 razor and soap box, 2 pairs of grey trousers, 1 pair of white, 1 red coat and 1 stock and clasp. Any takers?

As it happened I did manage to get rid of everything but was found and brought back by Escort on the 27th January 1826. I was court martialled yet again at Buckingham House Barracks (Buckingham Palace) in February 1826 and sentenced as a felon to transportation to Australia for life this time. I could be considered lucky as deserters sometimes received 500 lashes. I travelled on the convict ship 'England', in Spring 1826, to New South Wales. During the journey, many of the convicts escaped from their irons; they were a violent bunch. Some were flogged for stealing and assaulting other convicts. It was not a good place to be.

On board was a professor of Phrenology who measured the heads of each of us convicts. He was able to determine our character from the shape of our heads and to identify those who were likely to be violent, much to the relief of the captain. It seemed he was accurate in almost every case. Maybe it was the shape of my head that determined that I should be one of the cooks for the journey!

I was given a ticket of leave in 1834, which allowed me to work for myself in a specified area and a conditional pardon in 1845, which gave me my freedom, but I was not allowed to leave the colony. I may have corresponded with my wife, I may have not.

**Ann Fincher** - So that's where he got to! He couldn't cook before he left home. I did eventually go back to Berton and spent the rest of my days there

**Narrator** - A common enough case, I can assure you, but no doubt you good folk are relieved that Berton had to bear the costs of maintaining Ann and Thomas and not Weedon.

Illegitimate children. I am afraid to say that a few local men have been found guilty of producing a few. The last thing Weedon ratepayers need is to become responsible for illegitimate offspring. Take the case of John Ming, a labourer of Weedon, who got Jane Goldney of Wendover, a single woman, with child. The boy was born in December 1806, at the house of William Terry in Wendover, a shoemaker. It was not until six years later, in June 1814, that Jane gave the name of the father as John Ming, while being

questioned by the Justice of the Peace. John was ordered to pay £50 as security to the overseers of Wendover. Being a mere labourer and unable to raise this amount, he persuaded Michael Batson, a farmer of Weedon, to put down some of the money for him. John was also required to pay 2s weekly for the maintenance and education of the child, until he turned 14 years old or until he was able to maintain himself. This agreement was to become null and void if John Ming died, unless there were arrears due.

It was in the same year of 1806, that Thomas Bone of Weedon got Elizabeth Miller, a single woman of Hardwick, with child. To ensure that Thomas Bone turned up in court he and Bernard Bone had to put down £40 each. At the Midsummer hearing, the case was postponed on account of small pox. At the Michaelmas session, the court found that upon the complaint of the churchwarden and overseer of the Parish of Hardwick and upon the oath of Elizabeth Miller that on the 20<sup>th</sup> March last, she was delivered of a male bastard child in Hardwick and that Thomas Bone of the Hamlet of Weedon was the father. Thomas was unable to show sufficient cause why he should not be adjudged the father. The court ordered that Thomas should pay £5 2s 6d to the Churchwarden and Overseer of Hardwick for the expenses which the parish hath been put to on account of the lying in of Elizabeth Miller and for the maintenance of the child to date and a further sum of 2s 6d weekly for so long as the child remain chargeable. It was further ordered that Elizabeth should pay 6d weekly unless she should nurse the child herself.

**Parish Official** - Do you think poverty is ever an excuse for stealing or committing a crime? In November 1822 William Thorn, a farmer of Weedon had 3 hens and a cock stolen from his roosting house. A few days later he saw them in the possession of the constable of Wingrave. Thorn swore they were his. They were found under the stairs in the house of a Mrs. Faulkner and her two sons. The sons along with a Mr. Giltrow were accused of stealing them, one son confessed and the other was found to be innocent. Giltrow swore he had bought them from Leighton market. What punishment do you think they deserved? The guilty son received 4 months hard labour. Giltrow received 6 months hard labour and one public whipping.

In the same month John Batson, a farmer of Hardwick, had a number of fowls stolen from his Cow House in Weedon Field. He found them in Aylesbury, at the Black Swan Inn, upon a Mr. Seabrook. He had bought them from a Mr. Bonnick, who had bought them from two men, a William Kirby and a John Smith. These two were found guilty and given 6 months hard labour. The accused may have been desperate or just criminally minded, but punishments had to be severe to discourage others. These are

minor incidents compared to what happened in some villages.

**Captain Swing Riots, 1830** - Have any of the farmers here bought any farm machinery recently and possibly laid off labour. I hope not as if you have, you may receive a letter from Captain Swing, followed by a visit from a gang who will burn down your barns, demand higher wages and break up your new machinery. Such activities started this summer in Kent, and have spread to most southern counties. In Buckinghamshire, the main targets have been the paper mills at High Wycombe, and farm machinery in Stone, Long Crendon and Waddesdon, places not far from here.

The Yeomanry has been mobilized and special constables sworn in, with landowners organizing their own forces of tenants and servants. A special commission has been set up to deal with the worst affected counties including Buckinghamshire. The Assize Court and Court of Quarter Sessions have been very busy, but despite the trials, the riots continued until 1831.

Many of the men involved are not criminals and feel forced to do something drastic because of the conditions they find themselves and their families, in. This fact has been recognized by many, and petitions have been organized by inhabitants of numerous town and villages throughout the country in an attempt to save those sentenced to death or to plead for a reduction in sentence. Over 480 were transported but were treated better than the usual criminals and after a year or so of labour, many were able to bring their families over. In 1835, 264 machine breakers were pardoned and more in following years. Some even came back to England.

While there was some sympathy to the plight of the labourers the social and political unrest brought a profound reaction to the poor.

**Narrator** - Meanwhile the Whig government was still exploring ways of reducing costs. They wished to do away with the old system and make it harder for the able bodied unemployed to receive relief in their own home. In 1832-33, a parliamentary enquiry into the administration and operation of the poor law was carried out by his majesty's commissioners. The answer of Mr. Brath, Churchwarden of Stone, illustrates one particular attitude.

**Mr. Robert Brath, Churchwarden of Stone** - All the cottages have gardens. Dr Lee offers the labourers as much land as they choose to take, paying a full rent. There are a few who have as much as two acres, these are principally occupied in cultivating their land, and do no work for the farmers, but generally come on the parish for a few days in the winter. The parish officers do not enquire what return they get from their land, but relieve them

as labourers out of work without further enquiry, when very likely they have two or three pigs in the sty. You see, totally indiscriminate giving!

**Magistrate** - 'A number of us had different political views on the Poor Law Amendment Bill before Parliament, and these were expressed in articles and letters in the Bucks Herald. We would have liked to have given you an account of these, but were told time would not permit. As one of the local Magistrates, I am able to present a summary of the main points put forward discussing the pros and cons, including some gems of comments.'

At this point, we would have liked to have given you an account of the political debate leading up to the reforms brought in by the Poor Law Amendment Bill, but time does not permit. However, the Bucks Herald contained articles and letters discussing the pros and cons of the existing law and the proposed amendments. I will give you a brief summary of the main points, with some gems from the comments.

A report by Commissioners appointed by the Whig Government recommended all relief to able-bodied persons and their families (other than medical) should be available in well-regulated workhouses, where they would be set to work. Any other relief will be unlawful. 'Quite right too!' said one correspondent.

Tories protested about the proposals whereby all control would be taken once and for ever from the parishes and become the responsibility of a centralised Government department. 'No better than the despotic system in France, with its Central Boards, District Judges, Gens d'armes and police spies - wholly opposed to the boasted freedom of the Englishman and the spirit of the British Constitution'.

When some paupers protested in Aylesbury about the cut-backs to their allowances and a riot ensued, another writer said it was essential to bring sturdy paupers, who could earn if they wanted to but chose not to, to their senses. To teach them that it was not a right for all, regardless, but a provision for those who could not earn sufficient for the actual support of their families or who were past labour. It was essential to weed out the able-bodied idle who would rather take the Parish Aid than depend on the results of honest industry.

Whigs responded that it was obvious the old system was not working, with spiralling costs, with local Poor Relief officials handing out relief, often regardless of the circumstances. This encouraged idleness and, with child allowances, also encouraged an increase in the number of births. It was

essential to have workhouses for the able-bodied unemployed, rather than providing relief in the comfort of their own home. As one clergyman, of all people, Rev. Millman, said in 1832, ‘The workhouse should be a place of hardship, or coarse fare, of degradation and humility. It should be administered with strictness, with severity. It should be as repulsive as is consistent with humanity’.

A Radical, the Ken Livingstone of his day, protested that neither the so-called reforming Whigs nor the Tories could be trusted to look after the interests of the poor. The problems were not due to improvidence and reckless fecundity, encouraged by the weight of the bread allowances, but lack of employment opportunities. The labourers were unable to earn a living wage, no matter how hard they worked, and there were genuine needs of the elderly and the sick. Employers cheated over hirings, as we have already heard, where they were commonly hired for a year less a day, to prevent settlement. Apart from the costs of building and maintaining more workhouses, how would it be possible to make conditions worse in them than labourers were already experiencing in their own cottages, where they barely had enough food to eat or a sound roof over their heads.

42 out of 45 rate-payers in Wingrave forwarded a petition to Lord Chandos to present to the House of Commons, praying against many of the clauses in the Bill. They concluded that the intended changes would be oppressive to the poor man and no relief to the rate-payer.

If you had a choice of keeping the old system in the hands of local people who knew your circumstances, or a centralised Government system which would probe your circumstances and which would have to be funded by central taxation, how would you vote? Let’s ask the rate-payers first - Old, or New? Now the paupers. Old, or New?

**Narrator** - The Bill became an Act in August 1834. Hardwick and Weedon, along with 38 other parishes, came under the Aylesbury Union, administered by a Board of Guardians made up of Magistrates and Members elected from property owners and rate-payers of the constituent parishes. The Board was supervised by the Commissioners in London, to make sure the Union was administered properly.

The Aylesbury Union was divided into 4 Districts; each district had a paid Relieving Officer responsible for the initial examination of claims and distribution of relief, together with a Medical Officer. Other salaried officers included clerks, auditors and treasurers. Doctors had to pay for

the medicines themselves, so they would generally prescribe the cheapest. Heaven help you if you lived far away, as they had to cover a large area.

I'd like to introduce William Rolls, a Guardian from Weedon.

**William Rolls** - Good evening. I attended the first meeting of the Board of Guardians in July 1835 along with William Batson of Hardwick. For the time being we are going to continue using the recently erected parish workhouse, standing in the Oxford Road, (on the site of St Mary's School and Mount Road), but we will eventually need a larger one.

But there is still a great deal to sort out. We advertised for relieving officers, in two county papers, at a salary of between £80 -£100 per year; for tenders to supply 4lb loaves of 'best second bread'; 100 iron beds, flock beds and bolsters and bedding, and groceries, coffins and shrouds.

There were 10 applicants for the posts of relieving officer, but only one was suitably qualified and we needed 4. We were forced to re- advertise, this time in two London papers, the Times and the Globe. We were of course competing with Unions all round the country for good quality applicants, for what was effectively a new profession. Eventually 3 of the original interviewees were taken on, who while not being considered good enough at the start, were better than the rest.

Each parish has to send in a list of all able bodied persons likely to be out of work and dependent on relief during the next winter and provide the number of infirm and sick. From August the payment of relief will be transferred from the overseers to the Relieving Officers. The aged and infirm who are relieved out of the workhouse, will receive money, but the rest will receive one third of any relief in bread.

The parish is still responsible for the cost of its poor whether in or out of the workhouse, including establishment and building costs. This is not so good if you have a large number of poor in proportion to the number of ratepayers. Looking at the expenses for the quarter ending 24 June 1836, Hardwick had 3 paupers in the workhouse at a cost of nearly £3 and 17 outdoor paupers at a cost of £27. Total costs including establishment costs came to £35 10s 11d. The amount levied by order of the guardians was £65, thereby resulting in a surplus for the Board. Weedon had no one in the workhouse and relieved 33 paupers outdoors at a total cost £74, but where rated at £122, likewise producing a surplus.

**Narrator** -Thank you Mr. Rolls

We had hoped to have the Master and Matron of Aylesbury workhouse here tonight, unfortunately they were unable to attend, however I am delighted to introduce Mr. and Chubb who run the Winslow workhouse.

**Mr. and Mrs. Chubb** - Good evening. Careful Mrs. Chubb.

**Mr. Chubb** - Mrs. Chubb and I have been running the parish workhouse at Winslow for some time and have agreed to stay on as Master and Matron under the new system for 12s per week. The Union is very lucky to have such experienced staff, aren't they my dear. We are responsible to the Union and to the Poor Law Commissioners for the proper running and administration of the workhouse. We are also required to be "a friend and protector of the inmates". (Horrible grins!) What a pity that we will not see any of you, because you will go to Aylesbury of course.

To become a workhouse Master you have to be at least 21 years old, able to keep accounts, and be "a person of sufficient education, strength of will, and firmness of purpose, while being considerate and gentle in your bearing, without servility or disrespect to the guardians and the higher officers, and without intolerance or laxity to the other officers or inmates." You also have to "have due control over yourself, and never exhibit or allow others to exhibit, violence of temper, or use profane or irritating language." The post which is for life was made for me.

**Mrs. Chubb** - Like Aylesbury, the Board had a great deal to consider. A new workhouse is going to be built to accommodate 250 persons at a cost of around £5000. This sum of money will be borrowed from Central Government and repaid by charging the poor rate of the parishes in the Union. The paupers will be divided into 7 classes – aged or infirm men, aged or infirm women, able bodied men and youths over 13, able bodied women and girls above 16, children under 7, girls 8 – 16 and boys 7 – 13. Yes, families will be separated and may not be able to communicate with each other. It was agreed to add a story for infectious cases. You have to be so careful. There was an outbreak of small pox in North Marston recently, (April 1836) and the medical officer agreed to vaccinate the paupers at 1s a time. Whether you would want to trust the vaccine is another matter.

Paupers are admitted by an Order of the Board of Guardians, or by a provisional order in writing signed by the overseer, churchwarden or relieving officer or by the Master, in cases of sudden emergency.

On arrival paupers are stripped, searched and washed and issued with a uniform. Once they have been seen by the medical officer of the workhouse, they will be classified.

Work is found for all able paupers, quite often on the land. The London and

Birmingham Railway Company have also been contacted for work opportunities. Or we encourage families to move away, to Manchester, for example.

**Mr. Chubb** - We contracted with Joseph Watkins of Hardwick to supply bread at 4d per 4lb loaf, being the lowest tender. It was subject to him finding two sureties of £100 for due performance of contract. He was to be paid monthly. A few months later, he was replaced by a baker charging only 3¾d per loaf. A month later, action was commenced against this baker, as the bread was deficient in weight and inferior in quality, but we still continued to use him.

In 1836, our salary was increased by a shilling a week to provide beer for Mrs. Chubb and myself, an essential item. You must wonder how we manage on a remuneration of 13s per week. There are ways and means. One useful method is to accept meat of a different quality than that contracted for and rather than prosecute as we did with the bread, pocket the difference. Its little tricks like this that you learn with experience.

Will you excuse us a moment, we have a couple of letters which we have not had time to read.

**Mrs. Chubb opens first one** - Oh Mr. Chubb, we have been reported to the Commissioners in London and we have been sacked. What shall we do?

**Mr. Chubb** - Sacked that can't be right, Mrs. Chubb. Not us, let me have a look. Oh! We are to be suspended from the workhouse as soon as proper persons can be selected to replace us, in consequence of us having permitted meat to be brought in to the house for consumption of a different quality from that contracted for and having been found guilty of other acts of misconduct. I wonder what they have in mind. A report has been sent to the Poor Law Commissioners.

**Mrs. Chubb** - The other letter comes from London. Oh, I fear the worst. You open it Mr. Chubb.

**Mr. Chubb** - Don't upset yourself Mrs. Chubb. The Board apparently had no criticism of our character for honesty and general good behaviour and therefore we can resign at the end of quarter. I am sure we will soon find another job. I think we should be getting back to Winslow.

**Narrator** - Well thank you Mr. and Mrs. Chubb. I am sorry that their visit has been curtailed but I think you will have gained some understanding of



what life in their workhouse would be like.

The Vicar of Wendover, one of the Guardians of the Poor in 1835, approved the new system as it induced many who have hitherto been paupers into industrious, sober and provident labourers. Do you think it did?

## **Summary**

In 1833 a commission was set up to encourage those of good character, aged under 40 with agricultural or domestic skill to emigrate to the Britain's colonies. Those in the workhouse were excluded. Provision was included in the Poor Law Act of 1834 for the poor to emigrate with the cost borne by the home parish. In 1844 the Winslow Union offered to pay the following rates for those going to Australia, 30s to every man and wife, 5s to every child and 20s to every single person. A copy of the 1841 census for Weedon held by New College, Oxford has Australia written by a number of families.

Large scale unemployment caused by trade depressions meant that the numbers claiming relief were too large to be housed in the workhouse. Outdoor relief had to be given in many cases. It was not until the twentieth century that politicians looked for a more humane way of dealing with the poor. The term pauper was officially abolished in 1929 when the responsibility for the poor was transferred from the Guardians to the county authorities.

Until the 1865 Chargeability Act, each parish had to bear the responsibility for the cost of relieving its own poor. Therefore parishes with large numbers of poor found it difficult to collect the rate. The Act redressed the differences between rich and poor parishes but not between rich and poor Unions.

As a result of the Poor Law Removal Act of 1846, non- settled poor became irremovable by virtue of 5 years residence. By 1865 this was reduced to 1 year.

Straw -plaiting and lacing- making engaged in by many of the women and children to supplement the wages of the agricultural labourers helped keep poverty at bay. The 1851 census records only a few on parish relief, these being aged 60 or over or young children.

The Rev Erle, in 1867, recorded that in many cases the cottages were defective, old and dilapidated. They ranged in size from 2 to 4 rooms and were let at a rent of 1s to 1s 6d per week. He noted that 12 new cottages

were in the course of erection, which although small, was an improvement on the older ones. (Probably Providence Place).

A Meeting of the Board of Guardians of July 1865 was recorded in the Bucks Advertiser and the Aylesbury News. One case discussed was that of a Mr. Rayner of Weedon who possessed a freehold cottage was lying in a state of paralysis and was destitute.

One board member thought that they could not refuse relief despite the fact he owned his own property. Others felt that he should be made to sell his house. Mr. Rayner wanted to keep it for his son. Mr. T Bell, a local farmer, pointed out that there were 5 or 6 more in the parish in a similar situation who would need providing for if they gave relief in this case. It was resolved to grant out-relief for 2 weeks only and as soon as Mr. Rayner was able to be removed, that he should be offered the workhouse.

Do some of the issues seem familiar?

## CAST

Narrator	Ralph Followell
Typical overseer of the poor	Geoff Ball
Typical parish constable	Mike Nagele
Typical magistrate	Stephen Sidebotham
Travelling woman	Peggy Sidebotham
William Brooks, overseer of Weedon	Geoff Ball
Parish official	Mike Nagele
Parish official	Geoff Ball
Two typical paupers	Judy Nagele & Peggy Sidebotham
Representatives from Foscott	Glyn Thomas
Representatives from Thornton	Mike Moore
Representatives from Wing	Andrew Shaw
Court Voice	Stephen Sidebotham
William Watkins, pauper of Weedon	Judy Nagele
Richard Symonds, farmer of Wotton Underwood	Mike Nagele
John Symonds, farmer of Wotton Underwood	Geoff Ball
Thomas Batson, farmer of Hardwick	Geoff Ball
John Fleet, pauper of Weedon	Peggy Sidebotham

## **Interval**

Ann Fincher, pauper of Bierton	Judy Nagele
White, overseer of Bierton	Geoff Ball
James Reed, White's servant	Peggy Sidebotham
George Fincher of Weedon	Mike Nagele
Parish Official	Geoff Ball
Spokesperson on the 1830 Riots	Peggy Sidebotham
Mr. Robert Brath, Churchwarden of Stone	Carol Lindley
Magistrate	Stephen Sidebotham
William Rolls, Poor Law Guardian	Peggy Sidebotham
Mr. & Mrs. Chubb, Master & Matron of Winslow workhouse	Mike & Judy Nagele

