

folio 98b

[Handbill, 22 July 1854. Results of polling regarding filling up Deddington Pool]

PARISH OF DEDDINGTON.

The Polling, regarding the Pool, took place on the following questions last evening at the Town Hall, between the hours of Four and Eight o'clock:-

No. 1. - Motion made by Mr. Calcutt, seconded by Mr. C.D. Faulkner - "That the Pool be filled up, and a well dug within it, and enclosed over, with an opening for a Fire Plug."

No. 2. - Amendment proposed by Mr. Gibbard, seconded by Mr. Hatten, - "That the Pool remain as it is."

No. 3 - Amendment made by Mr. Samman, seconded by Mr. Scroggs - "That the Pool be filled up altogether, and be made a good Highway."

Poll demanded by Mr. C.D. Faulkner.

The Numbers were -

For Mr. Samman's Amendment	-	-	0!!!
For Mr. Gibbard's Amendment	-	-	71
For Mr. Calcutt's Proposition	-	-	67
Majority against Mr. Calcutt's Proposition	-	-	4

The following is the correct List of the Voting:-

	Calcutt.	Gibbard.	Samman.
Mr. AUSTIN	0	5	0
Mr. F. AUSTIN	0	4	0
Mr. PETER BENNETT	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN BAKER	1	0	0
Mr. JAMES BEACH	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN CALCUTT	6	0	0
Mr. CLEAVER	1	0	0
Mr. COGGINS	1	0	0
Mr. CHATER	1	0	0
Mr. CHARLES CHURCHILL	1	0	0

	Calcutt.	Gibbard.	Samman.
Mr. JOSEPH CHURCHILL	1	0	0
Mr. W. DEAN	0	6	0
Mr. H. DEAN	0	6	0
Mr. C. DAVIS	1	0	0
Mr. ROBERT EAST	1	0	0
Mr. W. EAST	1	0	0
Mr. FREEMAN	1	0	0
Mr. H. FRANKLIN	1	0	0
Mr. W. FRENCH	1	0	0
Mr. W. FRENCH	4	0	0
Mr. FIELD	0	1	0
Mr. C. FAULKNER	1	0	0
Mr. FRENCH	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN FORTNUM	1	0	0
Mr. C.D. FAULKNER	1	0	0
Mr. RICHARD GARDNER	1	0	0
Mr. GIBBS	1	0	0
Mr. JOSEPH GIBBS	1	0	0
Mr. GULLIVER	0	6	0
Mr. GIBBARD	0	6	0
Mr. JOSEPH GARDNER	0	3	0
Mr. HATTEN	0	3	0
Mr. HIRON	0	1	0
Mr. THOMAS HALL	1	0	0
Mr. JAMES HOPCRAFT	1	0	0
Mr. RICHARD HOPCRAFT	1	0	0
Mr. W. HERITAGE	1	0	0

[Second column]

Mr. JOHN HOPCRAFT	1	0	0
Mr. JONES	1	0	0

	Calcutt.	Gibbard.	Samman.
Mr. T.E. KINCH	1	0	0
Mr. LAMBERT	1	0	0
Mr. MULLIS	0	1	0
Mr. MARGETTS	0	1	0
Mr. THOMAS MATTHEWS	1	0	0
Mr. WILLIAM MALINGS, Jun.	0	5	0
Mr. J. MASON	1	0	0
Mr. S. MASON	1	0	0
Mr. W. MASON	1	0	0
Mr. MITCHELL	1	0	0
Mr. H. MARGETTS	1	0	0
Mr. PARISH	0	4	0
Mr. JOHN PARISH	2	0	0
Mr. G.E. PETTY	0	1	0
Mr. THOMAS PETTY	1	0	0
Mr. POWERS	1	0	0
Mr. J. ROSE	1	0	0
Mr. ROBINSON	0	4	0
Mr. ROGERS	0	1	0
Mr. SAMMAN	1	0	0
Mr. SCROGGS	1	0	0
Mr. JAMES SMITH	1	0	0
Mr. S. SIMPSON	0	1	0
Mr. Z. STILGOE	0	3	0
Mr. SLATTER	0	6	0
Mr. SPIERS	1	0	0
Mr. T.W. TURNER	0	3	0
Mr. JOHN TIMMS	1	0	0
Mr. WOOLGROVE	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN WILSDON	1	0	0

	Calcutt.	Gibbard.	Samman.
Mr. R. WHETTON	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN WOOLGROVE	1	0	0
Mr. HENRY WILLIAMS	1	0	0
Mr. JOHN WHETTON	6	0	0
Mr. W. WILLIAMS	1	0	0

An Inhabitant intimidated one of the Overseers to give up to him the Rate Receipt Book, upon which some objections were raised against the chief Rate Payers of the Parish by Mr. Calcutt, that they had not paid their Rates; while *Six* Rate Payers who had not paid their Rates, were permitted to Vote without objection in favour of Mr. Calcutt's Proposition. -
Deddington, 22nd July, 1854.

[HIRON, PRINTER.]

folio 98d

[Poster, 24 July 1854 regarding Deddington Pool]

TO THE INHABITANTS OF DEDDINGTON,
Who possess Honesty and Common Sense.

FELLOW TOWNSMEN, you were, many of you, in no doubt surprised *yesterday morning*, to find that some of your neighbours, who love darkness rather than light for doing their deeds in this Parish, had employed themselves in the night of Saturday, or *the morning of Sunday*, in sticking papers on your doors or premises. It is not to be wondered at, that the parties who did this were ashamed of being seen (for a certain degree of shame may generally be found even in the most shameless), when we read the *false* assertions put forth at the close of this, otherwise "correct" document. But the best answer to these will be given by the scrutiny, the "correct" part of the paper is all we will call to your attention to now.

This public statement of the doings of a Deddington Vestry, is, in more ways than one, a most useful declaration. We only wish that the same publicity had been given to many other Parish Transactions which have preceded it, then, pounds which have long since been squandered away, might have been, at the present moment, in the pockets of the rate-payers.

This document shows, in the first place, the class of the individuals, and the very small number, who rule this large Parish, and manage its enormous expenditure. In the next, it shows that a public improvement to the principal Street in the Town has been proposed, and that *Fifty Three* of the Inhabitants vote *for* its being carried out, and that only *Twenty One* persons vote against it; and yet these *Twenty One*, if they could succeed in their opposition (some of whom do not even reside in the Town, but are "wiseacres" from Clifton, Hempton, Ilbury, and Adderbury), would prevent the *Fifty Three* Inhabitants of Deddington, from turning a stagnant pool, which for years has been a place of danger, and a public nuisance, into what might be converted into a useful Reservoir, and a great preventative to the spread of Fire. But to the uninitiated in Deddington Vestry Meetings, it will be asked how *Twenty One* out-vote *Fifty Three*, as that gives a majority of *Thirty Two*, *for*?

Now this Majority is reversed in the polling paper, in very large type, and we are told that the few who voted in opposition have a majority of *Four* (surely the three notes of admiration should have been left out after the **0**, and placed after this **4**). This anomaly may be thus explained. The *Twenty One*, or most of them, make up for their want of intellectual capacity, by the quantity of acres they cultivate; and this, under what is commonly known by the name of "Sturges Bourne's Act," entitles many of them to Five or Six votes each.

In a work published last year "by J.T. SMITH, of Lincoln's Inn, Esquire, Barrister at Law;" this Act is described as "a most iniquitous encroachment which first created the system of plurality of votes. Its sole object was to 'give to him that hath, and to take away from him that hath not even that which he hath' - namely, the power of self-protection. It was an encroachment without a shadow of justification; - without a colour of excuse. It was a pure revolutionary measure. It was in blank defiance of that Common Right which the law of England had recognized and guaranteed through ages."

"The stake a man has in the country, or in his parish, is not to be measured by his hoarded wealth. It is best measured by the energy expended, either by hand or head, in obtaining the means of livings - and so the most strongly felt as needing guarantees for its free exercise and disposition. The man who has earned, and looks forward to earning in the future, his 20s. a week, has at least as real a stake in the country, and the parish, and in the maintenance of the peace and welfare of both, as the man who has inherited his twenty thousand pounds a year. And he is full as much interested in judging, and qualified to judge, of all the matters that concern him as a member of the social community. But this iniquitous and revolutionary measure robbed the poor man, who most needed it, of his right and means of protection, to give it, six-fold, to the rich man, who from his various factitious advantages, least of all needs any such additional advantage."

The Deddington proceedings under this act, bring to our recollection an anecdote we remember reading of Franklin, the celebrated American. He was once a Member of an Association, when it was proposed that only those Members should vote who had property worth 40s. Franklin objected to this, and supported his objection by the following reasoning. - A man has a Jackass worth 40s., consequently he would be entitled to vote. Time rolls on, the man gains knowledge and experience, and he is again called on to vote. This, he would be more capable of doing than at an earlier period of his life, but,

his Jackass is dead! and the man cannot vote! In which then ought the right of voting to rest, the man or the Jackass ?

Enough has been said on the subject of the Deddington manœuvres, and although the falsehoods contained at the end of the hand-bill put forth in the night of Saturday, or the morning of Sunday, will be settled at the scrutiny, yet we cannot help adding the following:-

"In the paper issued on the '22nd July, 1854,' on 'the Polling regarding the Pool,' it is stated,- 'An inhabitant intimidated one of the Overseers to give up to him the Rate Receipt Book.' I beg to state that I was the Overseer who *lent* the Rate Receipt Book to the 'Inhabitant,' and that no kind of intimidation was used."

Signed, WILLIAM FREEMAN.

So much for the nocturnal bill stickers' regard to truth.

ADIEU.

Deddington, Monday, July 24, 1854.

After the Scrutiny has taken place, a corrected list of the Votes shall be given to the Public, at present legally the matter stands thus:---

For Mr. Gibbard's Amendment - - 71 Votes,
of which it appears 14 were illegal, reducing the actual
number to - - 57.

For Mr. Calcutt's Proposition - - 67 Votes,
of which it appears 4 were illegal, reducing the actual
number to - - 63.

► MAJORITY IN FAVOUR OF MR. CALCUTT'S PROPOSITION - - 6.

folio 98f

[Handbill, 26 July 1854]

DEDDINGTON POOL.

**The following Correspondence is Published for the
information of the Rate Payers of Deddington, by**

**Their faithful Servant,
JAMES BROGDEN, M.A., VICAR.**

Vicarage, Deddington

26th July, 1854.

REV. SIR,

Would you oblige me by writing a line stating at what time it would be convenient for me and two or three more to wait on you, in order to know your determination with respect to the mode of instituting a proper enquiry into the legality of the Votes given on both sides at the late Polling of the Parish, and the settlement of the now open question - upon whose motion the majority of the legal Votes was given - as such step was required to be taken at the end of the Polling; or whether you refuse to make any settlement on the subject? or if you make any statement, what such statement is?

I am, REV. SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN CALCUTT.

TO THE

REV. J. BROGDEN.

July 26th, 1854.

SIR,

I have nothing to add to what I stated on Friday Evening last, at the Vestry, - namely, that I should take the earliest

opportunity of referring the Questions at issue, which you have raised, to Legal advice and a Court of Law.

I have striven, on all occasions, to promote good will in this Parish, and I will undertake no uncalled for responsibility in doing so.

You have thought proper to canvass this Parish, not only in your own name, but in that of my predecessor, the late Vicar, Mr. Risley.

You will have the kindness to remember likewise, that you disputed, at the [*two words missing*] [to] possession of the Rate Book, on that Evening, and stated that you would not call at my house to inspect that Book, but insisted on the Overseer having it in his possession for your inspection.

I consented to your demand, although I was not obliged to do so.

Under these circumstances, I cannot see that you can reasonably expect me to receive you, or a deputation on your behalf, on this subject.

I have the honour to be, SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES BROGDEN.

Vicarage, Deddington

26th July, 1854.

TO MR. CALCUTT,

DEDDINGTON.

HIRON, PRINTER.

folio 98h

[Handbill (undated)]

DEDDINGTON POOL.

TO THE RATE-PAYERS OF DEDDINGTON who Voted in support of my motion;-

FELLOW-TOWNSMEN, you will see by the hand-bill issued and headed "DEDDINGTON POOL. - CLOSE OF THE CORRESPONDENCE," that the Vicar of Deddington who was Chairman at the Meeting when you voted to remove a *public nuisance*, refuses to give anything like a straight-forward answer to questions concerning which I will leave you to judge of their fitness. - If I have done anything wrong in the matter, I most readily submit to that rebuke which the MEN of Deddington who voted with me, may think fit to inflict, because I believe they will judge fairly and speak their minds, although an attempt has been made to shut their mouths.

The Vicar of Deddington, *Chairman of the Parish Vestry by Law*, has in his first letter to me stated that I asked my Neighbours what they intended to do in reference to the Pool, - and that I made use of Mr. Risley's name, - and that I disputed his (the Chairman's) right to another man's property, - **MARVELLOUS!!!** and gives these as reasons for refusing to see two or three of his parishioners to talk over the matter in reference to the Scrutiny of the votes that was legally demanded at the close of the Poll, and that a just settlement of the question might take place.

In the second letter the Chairman instead of answering a few simple questions, informs me, to my great surprise, that I have assumed "the functions of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench." This quite bewilders me, - I know nothing of the place or its proceedings, if I have been found there I had missed my way, for I have no business there, or ever had. The Chairman tells us it is a nice place - that courtesy always prevails there; this information however is not [sufficiently enticing] to lead me to try it; therefore I beg to leave all matters connected with the "Queen's Bench," to the Vicar of Deddington, *who I doubt not perfectly understands its working.*

The authorised Minister of the Parish of Deddington says he respects me in my position as a Protestant Dissenter of

this Parish - that he has ever done so, and shall continue that good feeling now - for this expression of good will towards me I beg sincerely to thank him, and hope I may never justly forfeit the good-will of my neighbours.

Now the scene changes, and the Vicar of Deddington tries his hand at a little fun, by calling me the "Sham Officer of the Pope" and "Grand Inquisitor of Deddington," he then adds that I am as ridiculous "as that Long-eared Animal, clad in a Lion's skin." This must have been a rich treat for the Vicar's small party. I have no doubt it was quite amusing and very edifying to them to see the great Show-man exhibiting the Animal with long ears, and describing it with all that master-mind which he is supposed to possess. I dare-say the Vicar of Deddington thinks he has a right to ridicule, and hopes thereby to silence those he cannot answer. No doubt the Vicar of Deddington thinks I merit this at his hands, - Nevertheless, I think there would have been a far better reason for saying that I made myself as ridiculous "as that Long-eared Animal, clad in a Lion's skin," if I had squandered away a Princely Fortune, and subjected my family to want, so as to be obliged to live by begging letters, and by inserting appeals in Newspapers.

The Vicar of Deddington says he means no offence by the use of low and uncourteous expressions and comparisons which I have quoted, may I ask, then, what he does mean, - of course what he does must be right.

All this, however, has nothing to do with the question at issue, that, all along has been entirely evaded by the Chairman, who states that he is not responsible for his conduct to me, but I, it seems, foolishly thought he was not at liberty to set aside that which was legal and right.

N.B. - By 58 Geo. 3. cap. 69. sec. 4, and 59 Geo. 3. cap. 85. sec. 2, - No person is entitled to vote who shall have neglected or refused to pay any rate for the relief of the Poor, which may be due and shall have been demanded from him, nor is he entitled to be present at any Vestry Meeting, until he shall have paid the same. - Is this law, then, to be set aside by a Deddington Vestry ?

On this ground several votes were objected to by me, and Mr. Brogden, the Chairman, objected to one, until the receipt was produced. All I asked for was - a scrutiny of the whole of the votes, that we might know on which side the majority was;- this scrutiny the Chairman said was not legal, although the

Law as above cited is quite clear, and was so stated by Mr. Churchill, at the time.

I am, for the present,

FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

Respectfully Your's,

JOHN CALCUTT.

T. CALCUTT, PRINTER, DEDDINGTON.

[Second letter from Vicar referred to not in scrapbooks.]