

Great Massingham Historical Society

PETITION

In the matter of the proposed union of the
Benefices of Great Massingham and Little
Massingham

Transcribed by Geoff Randall
June 2016

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL

TO:

THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY IN COUNCIL.

IN THE MATTER of A SCHEME framed by the ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND under the UNION OF BENEFICES ACT 1919 and THE UNION OF BENEFICES MEASURE 1923

- and -

IN THE MATTER of the PROPOSED UNION of the BENEFICES of GREAT MASSINGHAM and LITTLE MASSINGHAM in the COUNTY OF NORFOLK and DIOCESE OF NORWICH.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF:-

(1) FRANCIS LLOYD BRERETON Rector and Patron of Little Massingham Benefice;

(2) THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL of the Parish of Little Massingham;

(3) REGINALD BARROW of Lynton, 32 Clothorn Road, Didsbury in the County of Lancashire, Patron of the Living of Great Massingham.

(4) OLIVER BIRKBECK for himself and on behalf of the Tithe Payers in both Parishes of Great and Little Massingham aforesaid

SHEWETH : -

1 . THAT YOUR PETITIONER the Reverend Francis Lloyd Brereton (hereinafter called the said F.L.Brereton) is and has been since the year 1901 the Patron of the said Benefice of Little Massingham, and is and has been since the year 1924 Rector of the said Benefice.

2. THAT YOUR PETITIONERS the Parochial Church Council of the Parish of Little Massingham (hereinafter called the Parochial Council) are a corporate body established under the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act 1919 (9 & 10 Geo v. Cap. 76) and the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measures 1921 (11 & 12 Geo. v. No. I).

3. THAT YOUR PETITIONER, Reginald Barrow (hereinafter called the said R. Barrow) is and has been since the Year 1927 the Patron of the said Benefice of Great Massingham.

4. THAT YOUR PETITIONER, Oliver Birkbeck, (hereinafter called the said O Birkbeck) is and has been for some years past the Lord of the Manor and chief land owner of the said Parish of Little Massingham, and a communicant member of the Church of England and Churchwarden of Little Massingham and also a tithe payer and is herein named as the representative of all the chief tithe payers of both the said Parishes of Great and Little Massingham.

5. THAT on or about the 15th September 1928, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by letters and circulars of that date addressed to the Patron of the said two Parishes of Great and Little Massingham and to each of the Parish Church Councils of the said Parishes respectively informed the said persons that a Commission of Inquiry was to be appointed to hear evidence in favour of or against the proposed union of the said two Parishes and that such public enquiry would be held upon due notice and under the conditions and terms contained in the said circular. A copy of such circular is attached hereto and marked "A".

6. THAT a meeting of the Parochial Church Council of the said Great Massingham was called and duly held on the 24th September 1928 at the Rectory, Great Massingham, at which twenty-four councillors were present. The subject of the said proposed union was discussed, but the Rector (the Reverend Canon McAnally) alone supported and recommended the said proposal. A motion was proposed and seconded in favour of the preservation of the present state of affairs; whereupon the said Rector proposed an amendment advocating the said union of the said Benefices; this was seconded formally in order that a vote might be taken. The said amendment was lost, only the said Rector and the seconder voting in its favour. Upon the original proposal against the said union being put to the meeting it was carried by 22 votes to 2.

7. THAT a meeting of the parochial Church Council of Little Massingham was duly called, and was held at the

Parish Room on the 27th September 1928, at which ten councillors were present , when the proposal for union fully discussed and explained. Upon a vote being taken a resolution opposing the said union was passed unanimously. Thereupon a meeting of the adult parishioners of the said Parish was duly summoned and was held on the 9th October 1928 at the Little Massingham Parish Room. At such meeting which was crowded, after the said proposal for union had been fully explained and discussed, a resolution was passed unanimously opposing the said union of the said benefices.

8. THAT in or about the month of November 1928 , the Lord Bishop of Norwich appointed a Commission pursuant to the Union of Benefices Act 1919 aforesaid and the Union of Benefices Measure 1921, and the Union of Benefices Measure 1923 aforesaid to enquire into and report to him upon the desirability of uniting the said Benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

9. THAT formal Notice dated the 1st December 1928 was given to Your Petitioners that the said Commission would hold a public inquiry at the Village Hall , Great Massingham on the 15th December 1928 in accordance with the said Notice . A copy of the said Notice is hereto attached and marked "B".

10. THAT the said Commissioners held a public inquiry pursuant to the said Acts and rules made thereunder at the Village Hall Great Massingham on the 15th December 1928 at which Meeting there was a large attendance of the Parishioners of both the said Parishes and an overwhelming expression of opinion against the said proposed union was voiced by those present both on their own behalf and on that of those who were unable to attend the said Meeting, many of the Parishioners from both Parishes not having an opportunity of being heard in consequence of the abrupt termination of the said inquiry . At such public inquiry the only statement made in favour of the proposed union was made by t he said Rector of Great Massingham, who said that he supposed that he was the only parishioner of either parish who recommended the proposed union. The strongest opposition was felt and

voiced by the Parishioners present against the said union.

11. THAT notwithstanding the aforesaid strongly expressed opposition to the said union the said Commissioners or a majority of them made a report to the said Lord Bishop of Norwich recommending the union of the said Benefices AND the Lord Bishop approved the said Report and transmitted it to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners who duly prepared a draft scheme.

12. THAT the first written announcement by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that the Commissioners who had conducted the said public inquiry had reported in favour of the said proposed union, was received by Your Petitioner, the said F.L.Brereton on or about the 14th May 1929.

13. THAT on the 17th May 1929, a Meeting of the West Norfolk Clerical Society was held at which a resolution was unanimously passed against the said union and was duly sent to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners . who duly acknowledged the same, and such matters are hereinafter referred to in Document "E" hereto attached .

14. THAT on or about the 25th May 1929, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners transmitted copies of the aforesaid draft Scheme to the two Patrons of the said Benefices and to the respective Parochial Church Councils.

15. THAT on the 10th June 1929, a second Meeting of the said West Norfolk Clerical Society was held at which a definite statement of Objections was drawn up and forwarded to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners against the said draft scheme, on the suggestion of the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The said Meetings of the said West Norfolk Clerical Society were attended by about 27 clergy of whom five were Rural Deans.

A copy of the said draft Scheme is hereto attached marked "C".

16. THAT the four Churchwardens of the said two Benefices thereupon duly called a Meeting of the whole of the Parishioners of both the said Benefices which was held at the Village Hall, Great Massingham aforesaid, on the 10th June 1929, to consider the said draft Scheme.

Such Meeting was fully attended, to the utmost limits of the said Hall, and after a full discussion of its terms a Resolution proposed by Your Petitioner, Oliver Birkbeck, and seconded by one A.C.Cracknell, a communicant Member of the Church of England was unanimously carried protest-ing against the said draft Scheme . The said Resolution, signed by a large number of Parishioners was directed to be sent to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which was duly done .

A copy of the said Resolution and the covering letter are attached hereto and marked "D" .

17 . THAT YOUR PETITIONERS the said F.L.Brereton, the said Parochial Church Council of Little Massingham, the said R. Barrow, and the said O. Birkbeck and a large number of Tithe Payers of both Parishes duly lodged Objections to the said proposed draft Scheme and such Objections are contained in 17 documents of which one is dated the 23rd May 1929 the second the 6th June 1929, the third the 12th June 1929 the fourth is the 13th June 1929 and the fifth is 14th June 1929 ., but notwithstanding such Objections the Ecclesiastical Commissioners subsequently served a notice as hereinafter appears that they had certified the Scheme as amended by them and approved by the said Lord Bishop of Norwich to His Majesty in Council.

Copies of the said Objections and of Your Petitioners as aforesaid are here to attached marked "E".

18. THAT the Churchwardens of Great Massingham wrote to the said Lord Bishop of Norwich and Your Petitioners believe also to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners pointing out that if the proposed union were carried out the effect would be disastrous to the spiritual welfare of the said Benefices concerned .

Copy of such letter to the Lord Bishop of Norwich is attached hereto and marked "F".

19. THAT written and oral endeavours were made previously in the month of June 1929 to get the said Rector of Great Massingham to convene a meeting of the Parochial Church Council of that Parish to consider the Draft Scheme and to enable a Resolution to be proposed to authorise objection to be put forward against the said proposed

Scheme, but although the said Rector of Great Massingham was, so far as can be ascertained, the only member of such Parochial Church council in favour of the said Scheme for union, he steadfastly refused to call such a meeting of that council for that purpose, with the result that no such meeting was held and consequently the said draft Scheme was never submitted to such Parochial Church Council although the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had sent a copy of the said Scheme to the Secretary of such Parochial Church Council for them to consider.

20. THAT under date of the 14th October 1929 , the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by letter notified your Petitioner, the said F.L.Brereton, that after giving full consideration to the Objections submitted to them they had decided to proceed with the proposed union but to alter the said draft Scheme by providing that only £250 out of the combined income of the United Benefice shall be alienated to other Benefices and that such sum as may be necessary, not exceeding £150 per annum of such income of the United Benefice shall be set aside for the provision of clerical or lay assistance in the performance of the duties of the United Benefice.

A Copy of the said letter from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is hereto attached and marked "G".

21. THAT on the 3rd December 1929 , a public meeting was held at King's Lynn, presided over by Lord Leicester a large tithe payer of the said Great Massingham, and attended by a large number of prominent laity and clergy, at which a resolution was passed, without a single dissentient, protesting against the said Amended Scheme and a copy of such Resolution was directed to be sent to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which was done .

A copy of the said Resolution is hereto attached and marked "H".

22. THAT under date the 16th December 1929, Notice was sent to Your Petitioners by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that they had certified to His Majesty in Council a Scheme for effecting the union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham, namely the aforesaid Amended Scheme.

A copy of the said Notice is hereto attached and marked "I".

23. THAT Your Petitioners on the 9th January 1930 gave notice of Appeal to Your Majesty in Council against the said Scheme and that by Order of the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council made on the 27th day of February 1930, it was ordered and directed that the said Appeals should be heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

A Copy of such Notice of Appeal and a copy of such Order and Direction are attached hereto marked "J".

24. THAT up to the present time over 600 adult persons being Parishioners of the said two Parishes out of a total of about 750 have expressed in writing their support of the present appeal .

Copy lists of such Objectors are attached hereto and marked "K".

25. THAT in or about the month of January 1930, the Councillors of the Parochial Church Council of Great Massingham again requested the said Rector of Great Massingham both orally and in writing to call a meeting of their body in order that they might give and record their support of the present Appeal; but the said Rector persistently refused to comply with such request.

26. THAT as at present constituted the Parish of Great Massingham maintains a Rectory for a population which according to the census held in 1921 then numbered 726 but which has since increased owing to the erection of some new houses since the said date . The living is of net yearly value £884 including about 90 acres of glebe and residence, in the gift of the said R. Barrow, Your Petitioner and has been held by the present Rector, the Rev. Charles Mortimer McAnally since 1894 .

There is an early communion each Sunday, morning services at 11.a.m. childrens service at 2.30.p.m. evening service at 6.30.p.m. and during the week a daily morning service at 10 o'clock; the average congregation on Sundays was stated at the Public Inquiry on December 15th 1929 to be twenty to thirty in the morning and about sixty in the evening.

27. THAT as at present constituted the Parish of Little Massingham maintains a Rector for a population which according to the census held in 1921 then numbered 235 but is now estimated to be about 250 owing to four

houses having been built since the last census.
The living is of the net yearly value of £574 including
30 acres of glebe with residence in the gift of the
Rector Your Petitioner Francis Lloyd Brereton who has so
held since the year 1924 .

Holy Communion is administered on the first Sunday in
every month at mid-day and every third Sunday in the Month
at 8 a.m. Every Sunday morning service at 11 o'clock and
evening service at 6.30.p.m. Children's service once a
month at 2.30.p.m.

Pupils are received during the term time at the
Rectory and a morning service held daily at 9 o'clock in
the Church.

The congregation on Sunday is usually between forty
and sixty in the morning and twenty-five to thirty-five
in the evening.

28. THAT a plan shewing the boundaries and dimensions
of the said two Parishes marked is lodged with this
Petition.

29. THAT the acreage of the said Great Massingham is
4242 and that of the said Little Massingham 2289.

30. THAT your Petitioners and almost the entire adult
population of the said two Parishes are unanimous in their
opposition and objection to the said Scheme upon the
following grounds among others and in addition to those
specifically set out in the various Notices of Objections
sent in to the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners (copies
whereof are attached to this Petition and marked D.E.& H.)

(a) That such Scheme if carried out would destroy
the harmony and spirit of the religious educational
and social life and welfare of the respective
parishes affected especially of the said Little
Massingham and would inevitably tend to discourage
the spirit of worship and devotion which for a
long time past has been manifested and exercised therein.

(b) That in providing for the sale of the land
Rectory and premises of Little Massingham the
said Ecclesiastical Commissioners have
entirely overlooked the fact that to adopt such
a course would be to embitter and sadden the
minds of the Parishioners who have all their

lives regarded the said Rectory and its inmates

as the centre of their home life and religious feelings and as inseparable from their associations with a resident Rector and his pastoral activities in and about the said Parish which have been so closely linked up with their daily family life in all its bearings. The said Rectory has a large annexe used for upwards of 60 years past for educational purposes .

- (c) That it would be impossible adequately and efficiently to minister and carry on the work of the said two parishes by reducing the man-power to one person and that person being and residing for the most part in one of the said Parishes that the same number of experienced Clergy would be required if the work hitherto done were still to be done with success and continued satisfaction to the interests of the Parishioners of the said two Parishes and in the interest of religion in General. Whereas if a curate or lay reader were to be employed instead of a resident Rector as at present the inhabitants would feel that their present standing in the Church life would be less attractive real and enduring than it is to-day . For more than 60 years past the resident Rectors at Little Massingham have rendered service educational spiritual and social to the country generally as well as in the said Parish and this has been afforded possible through the nature of the said benefice.
- (d) That the proposed deprivation of the said Parish of Little Massingham of its Rectory and the appropriation of the proceeds of its sale is regarded by the Parishioners as unwarrantable and can have no other result than that of embittering the feelings of such Parishioners against the Church and the authorities responsible for such conduct.
- (e) That neither by the ministry of one incumbent only nor by that of such an incumbent aided by a curate or other appointed lay assistant would the

spiritual work be carried on with that success satisfaction and good to the parishioners of the said two parishes as has been the case heretofore especially in the Pariah of Little Massingham.

- (f) That all persons concerned in both Parishes and especially the tithe payers consider it unfair and inequitable that any part of the funds raised and produced in the said two Parishes for the express and sole purpose of ministering to the needs of the said two Benefices and their Parishes should be diverted and appropriated to any other parishes and more particularly to parishes so distant from the said two Parishes in some cases as from 20 to 50 miles away and/or that if such additional help were in any of such cases needed it would and should be supplied either by union with some Benefice nearer at hand or from some adjoining Benefice with which such local Benefice is more closely associated all of the said five Benefices in question being outside the West Norfolk Area.
- (g) That the houses which have been built of late years in the Parish of Little Massingham are for the most part a mile farther off from Great Massingham Church than from Little Massingham Church.
- (h) That the local feeling both at Great Massingham and at Little Massingham is intense and apprehensive at the proposed Scheme regarding it as a blow against their religious life and liberty and that such Scheme reveals no thought of consideration for the harmful effect that would be done to the spiritual welfare and influence among the Parishioners and people concerned by ruthlessly destroying their religious associations which have existed for centuries. Such feeling and opposition are still spreading and increasing week by week not only in the said Parishes but also throughout the whole of West Norfolk.
- (i) That the provisions of the said Scheme are unfair and inequitable in respect of the right of presentation as meted out between the two said

Benefices and also in respect of the adjustment of stipends,

31. IT is humbly submitted on the facts and for the reasons hereinbefore set out and/or contained in the documents attached hereto and marked "A" to "K" as aforesaid that the proposed union of the said two Benefices ought not to be made that the matters against which Appeal has been made as aforesaid cannot with advantage to the interests of religion in England generally and/or having regard to the circumstances and interests of the said two Parishes concerned be effected under the said Scheme or at all, that no saving of man- power and that no material benefit or saving of expense will be effected by the said Scheme , if the said Scheme be designed to effect any saving of expense and that no real or substantial advantage will be gained by depriving the said Two Benefices of part of their funds and handing the same over to so many or any of the five Benefices designed to receive portions of such sums.

YOUR PETITIONERS therefore most humbly pray Your Majesty in Council that this Appeal may be taken into consideration and that Your Majesty in Council will withhold your approval from the said Scheme and dismiss the same and also that they may be heard by Counsel and that if necessary witnesses may be heard against the said Scheme and that your Petitioners may have such further and other relief in the premises as to Your Majesty in Council may seem meet.
AND YOUR PETI TIONERS as in duty bound will ever pray etc .

SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS hereinbefore referred to: -

- A. Circular giving notice of appointment of Commission of Enquiry.
- B. Notice of public enquiry.
- C. Draft Scheme.
- D. Resolution of meeting of Parishioners of both Benefices Held on 10th June 1929.

- E. Objections to Scheme.
- F. Letters from Churchwardens of Great Massingham to the Bishop of Norwich.
- G. Letter from Ecclesiastical Commissioners dated 14th October 1929 varying proposed Scheme.
- H. Resolution of meeting held at Kings Lynn on the 3rd December 1929 .
- I. Notice from Ecclesiastical Commissioners dated 16th December 1929 .
- J. Notice of Appeal dated 9th January 1930 and Order of Reference to His Majesty in Council dated 27th February 1930 .
- K. Lists of Objectors.

“A”

This Memorandum has been prepared with the view of assisting Those who have to make nominations of Commissioners to constitute Commissions of Inquiry under the Measure by stating in non-technical language some of the more usual points which arise.

UNION OF BENEFICES MEASURE, 1923.

The Measure (copies of which can be obtained through any bookseller or direct from H.M. Stationery Office, Adastral House, Kingsway, London) lays down the procedure under which unions of benefices or ecclesiastical parishes or re-arrangements of their boundaries can be effected by Orders of His Majesty in Council ratifying schemes prepared by the Ecclesiastical Commission Except in certain exceptional cases it is necessary that a Commission of Inquiry should be held. This Commission is appointed by and reports to the Bishop and as a rule consists of four Commissioners.

One nominated by the Bishop of the Diocese,

One (the Chairman) nominated to the Bishop by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Two "Parochial" nominees, one in respect of each benefice affected by the inquiry nominated to the Bishop jointly by the Patron and Parochial Church Council.

Where more than two benefices are affected by the inquiry so that there are more than two parochial nominee one additional Commissioner for every two benefices after the first two is nominated by a Committee of the Diocesan Conference.

Where the Bishop of the Diocese is the patron or part patron of any benefice affected he has no share as patron in the nomination of the parochial nominee.

As to any Benefice where there is no Parochial Church Council the nomination will be made by the Patron alone, but if there is no Parochial Church Council and the Bishop is sole patron there will be no parochial nominee .

If the Patron and the Parochial Church Council fail jointly to nominate a Commissioner within 30 days of being requested by the Bishop to do so the Bishop may, where one of these parties has nominated and the other has not, accept the nomination so made by one, or he may either issue the Commission without any nominee on behalf of that benefice or may request the Diocesan

Committee to make a nomination in lieu of the Patron and Parochial Church Council.

From the date of the issue by the Bishop to the Patron of a request to nominate, the Patron's right of presentation is suspended (unless the Bishop permits a presentation) until the scheme is affirmed, dismissed or withdrawn. The time during which the right of presentation is so suspended will not be taken into account for purposes of lapse.

It is desirable that a special meeting of the Parochial Church Council should be summoned immediately on receipt of a notice requiring the nomination of a Commissioner jointly by the Patron and Parochial Church Council and that in anticipation of such meeting the Chairman of the Parochial Church Council should place himself in communication with the Patron of the benefice.

As the Report which it is the duty of the Commissioners to make to the Bishop should be the result of their examination of the problem in the Inquiry committed to them, it is obviously improper that a Commissioner should be nominated either to "support" or "oppose" in advance proposals which will come before him in a semi-judicial capacity. While therefore it is right that a Commissioner should be able to ensure that the views of those by whom he is nominated are properly put forward he must be under no direction from them as to advocating any particular decision; his own judgment must be unfettered and his mind quite open upon entering into the Inquiry.

After the nominations have been made and the Commission issued the Chairman of the Commission will communicate with the other Commissioners and arrange for the holding of the local inquiry of which a public notice will be given.

The Commissioners' Inquiry will include a public sitting at which all persons interested will be able to tender evidence in support of or against the proposed union or other proposal or as to any of the terms of the union, etc., or generally as to any facts relevant thereto. It is especially desirable that the views of the Parochial Church Council, expressed by resolution, should be before the Commissioners.

In making their report the Measure directs the Commissioners to have full regard to the circumstances and interests of the parishes affected by the inquiry and also to the interests of religion in England generally.

When the Commission has made its report (whether unanimously or by a Majority of votes) to the Bishop, the subsequent

Proceedings for giving effect to it (if a union or other action be recommended) rest with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In the course of these proceedings further opportunity is given for consideration of objections, if any, that may be made.

For further information reference should be made to the Measure above mentioned.

S. E. DOWNING,
Secretary.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION,
1, Millbank,
Westminster.
S.W.1.

“B”

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND.

UNION OF BENEFICES MEASURE, 1923.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Commission has been appointed by the Bishop of Norwich to inquire and report to him upon the desirability of uniting the Benefices of

GREAT MASSINGHAM and LITTLE MASSINGHAM

both in the County of Norfolk and in the Diocese of Norwich and upon all matters affecting such union or connected therewith and the terms thereof.

The Commission will hold a local inquiry, and their public sitting for that purpose will be at the Village Hall, GREAT MASSINGHAM, on SATURDAY, 15th DECEMBER, 1928, at 2.15 p.m. at which all persons desirous of offering any evidence or making any representation in relation to the union or being otherwise interested in the matter are invited to attend.

Dated this 1st day of December, 1928.

J. A. Hay.
Chairman of Bishop's
Commission.

1, Millbank,
Westminster, S.W.1.

“C”

File No. 100930

TO THE KING’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY IN COUNCIL

& 15 Geo V.
2. WE , the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England,
acting in pursuance of the Union of Benefices Measure.
1923, have prepared and now humbly lay before Your Majesty
in Council the following Scheme for effecting the Union of the
Benefice (being a Rectory) of Great Massingham and the benefice
(being a Rectory) of Little Massingham , both of which Benefices
are situate in the County of Norfolk and in the Diocese of
Norwich :

WHEREAS Commissioners appointed at our request by the
Right Reverend Bertram, Bishop of Norwich, pursuant to the
provisions of the said Union of Benefices Measure, 1923 ,
to inquire into and report upon the union of the said two
Benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham duly made
their Report to the said Bishop of Noreich and therein
recommended the union of the said two Benefices and the terms
for effecting the union, and the said Bishop of Norwich
signified in writing his approval of the said Report

AND WHEREAS WE the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners
For England, have prepared this Scheme for the union of the
said two Benefices based upon the terms recommended in the
said Report:

AND WHEREAS both of the said Benefices of Great
Massingham and Little Massingham are now full the Reverend
Canon Charles Mortimer McAnally being the present Incumbent
of the said Benefice of Great Massingham and the Reverend
Francis Lloyd Brereton being the present Incumbent of the
said Benefice of Little Massingham.

NOW, therefore, we, the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners
for England, with the consent of the said Bertram, Bishop of
Norwich, (in testimony whereof he has signed this scheme),
do humbly recommend and propose to Your Majesty as follows,
that is to say : -

1. THAT t he said Benefice of Great Maasingham and
the said Benefice of Little Massingham shall be permanently
united together and form one Benefice with cure of souls under
the style of "The United Benefice of Great Massingham with Little
Massingham" but the Parishes of the said Benefices shall
continue distinct in all respects.

2. THAT if upon the day when any Order of Your Majesty
in Council ratifying this Scheme shall be published in the

London Gazette both of the said two Benefices shall be vacant the union of the same two Benefices shall take effect forthwith , and if the said Benefice of Little Massingham only shall be then vacant the said union shall also take effect forthwith if the Incumbent of the other of the said two Benefices shall consent to become the first Incumbent of the United Benefice, but if he shall not so consent, then the said Union shall take effect upon the then next avoidance of the said Benefice of Great Massingham and the then Incumbent of Little Massingham shall be the first Incumbent of the United Benefice, and if the said Benefice of Great Massingham only shall be then vacant the said union shall take effect upon the next avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham and if neither of the said two Benefices be then vacant, then the said union shall take effect on the next avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham if the Incumbent at that time of the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall have been instituted to Great Massingham subsequently to the date of the publication in the London Gazette of any Order of Your Majesty in Council ratifying this Scheme or if instituted before that date shall consent to become the Incumbent of the United Benefice, but if he shall have been instituted to the said Benefice of Great Massingham before that date and shall not so consent, then the said union shall take effect immediately upon the next vacancy of the said Benefice of Great Massingham following such avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham and the then Incumbent of the said Benefice of Little Massingham shall become the first Incumbent of the United Benefice.

3. THAT upon the said union taking effect the Parsonage House at present belonging to the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall become and be the house of residence for the Incumbent of the United Benefice and so soon as conveniently may be the Parsonage House at present belonging to the said Benefice of Little Massingham and the site and appurtenances thereof and the grounds heretofore usually occupied and enjoyed therewith shall be sold and disposed of by us the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners at such time or times and in such manner in all respects as to us shall seem expedient and that the net proceeds of such sale shall constitute and form part of the Expense Fund established pursuant to the 32nd Section of the said Union of Benefices Measure, 1923 .

3. THAT after the said Union has taken effect the course and succession in which the respective Patrons shall present or nominate to the United Benefice from time to time as the same shall become vacant shall be as follows, that is to say, that in every series of three successive turns of presentation or nomination to be made to the United Benefice after the union the Patron of the said Benefice of Little Massingham shall have the first turn and the Patron of the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall have the second and third turns.

4. THAT all the tithe rent charges, glebe lands and all other endowments belonging to the said united Benefice or which may hereafter belong to the same united Benefice shall be charged and for ever after be chargeable in favour of the Incumbents for the time being of the five Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey, Belaugh, Kenninghall and Roughton, all in the said Diocese of Norwich with the annual sums or yearly rent charges set forth in the Schedule hereto annexed; the same annual sums or yearly rent charges to be as from the dates respectively mentioned in the said Schedule due and payable to the Incumbents of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey, Belaugh, Kenninghall and Roughton respectively, and the said annual sums or yearly rent charges to be apportionable in each case between any outgoing Incumbent of any of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey, Belaugh, Kenninghall and Roughton or his representatives on the one hand and his successor in the same Incumbency on the other hand and to be receivable by the Incumbents in whose favour they are charged as aforesaid by equal half yearly payments on the first day of May and the first day of November in every year and for the recovery of the said yearly rent charges in each case the Incumbents of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey, Belaugh Kenninghall and Roughton and their successors shall have and be entitled to all the powers and remedies provided by Sections 121 and 122 of the Law of Property Act, 1925, in respect of rent charges to which those Sections apply. Provided always that if at any time the Incumbent for the time being of the said United Benefice shall by any deed executed by him under his hand and seal in accordance with the provisions of any statute in that behalf enabling him, grant, convey and annex to the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey,

Belaugh, Kenninghall and Roughton, or any of them, any part or parts of the endowments belonging to the said United Benefice which shall in the opinion of the Bishop of Norwich for the time being be a just and fair equivalent or not less than an equivalent for all or any of the said yearly rent-charges hereby proposed to be created as aforesaid then in every case in which such equivalent provision shall have been made the corresponding annual sum or yearly rent charge shall thereupon and thenceforth cease and be no longer payable.

PROVIDED ALWAYS that nothing herein contained shall prevent us from recommending and proposing any other measures relating to the matters aforesaid, or any of them, in accordance with the provisions of the said Measure, or of any other Measure of the National Assembly of the Church of England, or of any Act of Parliament.

ALL which we do hereby certify and do humbly recommend and propose to Your Majesty in Council.

IN WITNESS whereof we the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England have hereunto set our Common Seal this day of 1929 .

SCHEDULE

Benefices in favour of which Charges are created upon the revenues of the United Benefice.	Annual sums or yearly rentcharges charged on the said revenues.	Dates from which Charges are to take effect.
Blakeney	£ 100	Date of union or date of separation of Benefice of Blakeney from United Benefice of Blakeney with Cockthorpe whichever shall happen later
Horsey	50	Date of union or date of cessation of any pension granted to the present Incumbent of Little Massingham whichever shall happen later .
Belaugh	125	do .
Kenninghall	125	Date of first avoidance of united Benefice.
Roughton	100	do .
	<u>£ 500</u>	

“D”

Little Massingham House,
Little Massingham.
King's Lynn.

Dear Sir,

I am requested to send to you the enclosed resolution which was passed unanimously at a very largely attended joint meeting of the parishioners of Great Massingham and Little Massingham called by the Churchwardens of both parishes at the Great Massingham Village Hall on Monday, the 10th June 1929.

Yours faithfully,
OLIVER BIRKBECK,
Lt. Col.,
Chairman of the Meeting.

The Secretary,
The Ecclesiastical Commission,
1, Millbank .
S .W. 1.

R E S O L U T I O N .

That this joint Meeting of the parishioners of Great and Little Massingham in the County of Norfolk strongly protests against the Union of the two benefices thus depriving the inhabitants of Little Massingham of a resident Rector in their parish; and against the alienation of the income of ancient endowments arising out of the lands in these parishes; and against the resulting injury to the spiritual life and religious work in both parishes; and further this Meeting is unanimously opposed to the virtual destruction of the influence and relationship of an old and greatly respected family in the parish of Little Massingham and its neighbourhood .

Proposed by Col. Oliver Birkbeck D. L.
Little Massingham House,
King's Lynn.

Seconded by Mr . A. C. Cracknell ,
Great Massingham.

"E"

WEST NORFOLK CLERICAL SOCIETY.

May 23. 1829.

Dear Sirs,

At a meeting of the above held on Friday May 17th the following resolution was passed, which I have been asked to submit to you :-

"This Society hears with intense surprise and disapproval of the decision of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to carry into effect the Union of the two Benefices of Great and Little Massingham, and calls upon the Proctor in Convocation to resist any further adoption of similar plans".

Yours faithfully,
W. H. JOHNSON,
Hon. Sec.
S. Raynham Vicarage
Fakenham.

To the Ecclesiastical Commrs .
Millbank.

71 Princess Street,
Manchester,
6th June, 1929.

The Secretary,
Ecclesiastical Commission,
1 Millbank,
Westminster,
London, S.W.1.

Sir,

Union of Benefices Measure 1923
Great Massingham.
File No. 100930 Little Massingham .
Proposed union of benefices.

Our client, Mr. Reginald Barrow of 32 Clethorn Road, Didsebury, Manchester has consulted us as to your Letter of the 26th ultimo to him and the accompanying Draft of the proposed scheme. Our Client feels strongly

that it is contrary to the usual practice and neither reasonable nor fair that the first right of presentation to the United Benefice after the union has taken effect should be vested in the Patron of the Benefice of Little Massingham, seeing that the endowments of that Benefice are considerably less valuable than those of the Benefice of Great Massingham of which he is the Patron. Will you be good enough to let us know the ground on which this provision of the scheme is supported and in the meantime take this letter as formal notice of objection to the scheme by our Client.

We are, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
SLATER HEELIS & CO.

"Rosegarth",
Gt. Massingham,
King's Lynn,
12. 6.29 .

The Secretary,
Ecclesiastical Commission,
London, S. W. 1.

Dear Sir,

With reference to the proposed Union of the Benefices of Great & Little Massingham I am desired to send you a copy of a resolution passed by a large majority at a meeting of the Great Massingham Parochial Church Council held at The Rectory, September 24th 1928.

The Rector of Great Massingham (Canon McAnally)
in the Chair .

"Proposed by C.Dewar Esq . Second by Mr. P .
Platten.

"That there be no change in the present position
of the two Parishes".

An amendment was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Dr. Appleton. "That it is desirable that the two Parishes be united".

On a show of hands the resolution was carried by a large majority.

I am ,
Yours faithfully,
O. L. APPLETON .
Secretary Great Massingham
Parochial Church Council.

Little Massingham,
King's Lynn
Thursday June 13th

To The Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Gentlemen,

As a parishioner of Little Massingham I beg leave to protest very strongly against the proposed union of benefices, for the following reasons.

First, because the spiritual welfare of both parishes will be seriously affected, as it will be impossible for one Rector to consider and minister to the spiritual & Social welfare of the parishioners, as their duties should compel them to, also, Little Massingham being the smaller village, would naturally suffer most, both by the loss of their resident vicar, and judging by other united benefices, the loss of one service on Sunday.

Why should we be deprived of our Rector when Little Massingham produces enough tithe to support a resident clergyman? and why should we be deprived of the time honoured privilege of Sabbath day worship? except at times convenient for the Rector residing at the larger village of Great Massingham.

For a great many years Little Massingham has been known as one of the happiest villages in England; and this reputation has been merited by the great interest that our present Rector and his ancestors, have taken in the Parishioners.

The Breretons have always made it their duty to be personally acquainted with every one in the village, and anything proposed for the benefit of the people, has had their entire support, their departure from Little Massingham would be a very sad blow to the village, this is why the people of both parishes are so hotly opposed to the union, because the Breretons have won their esteem and respect.

Another point of objection is the proposal to take £500 from the tithes of both parishes and distributing

elsewhere, which is very unfair, as money paid to resident clergy, is distributed locally, and such a huge sum taken from the parishes would mean a great loss to the small tradesmen in the village.

Concerning the inquiry held at Great Massingham, to consider the desirability of uniting the benefices, I contend that the inquiry was an absolute farce, and that your representative attended that meeting with a predetermined decision, for, considering that the proposal was strongly opposed by all present, it seems to have been reported to you that the union was desirable. This was, I think, a positive assertion that the opinions of the parishioners were not considered.

Also, with reference to the draft scheme, drawn out by your body, one claim is worded to the effect that, should the Rector of Little Massingham die first, the Rector of Great Massingham will be given the option of taking both livings, but, should the Rector of Great Massingham die first, no option will be given to the Rector of Little Massingham, why should this be; is this a suggestion that our Rector is not capable of filling that capacity.

I beg leave to make this assertion that He, is an Ideal parson, a good speaker, and one who is wholeheartedly devoted to the welfare of Church and people.

I pen these words as one who feels very strongly that such a union will have a considerable effect on the spiritual and social welfare of the villages concerned, and I appeal for you to reconsider your decision and withdraw the proposal.

I am, Sirs ,
Yours respectfully,
HAROLD FREDK. ARTER.

Little Massingham Rectory,
King's Lynn.
June 14th, 1929

Dear Sir,

Proposed Union of Great and Little Massingham
Benefices.

I enclose statements of objections to the draft
Scheme signed respectively : -

- (1) By members of the Little Massingham Parochial
Church Council;
- (2) By Little Massingham Tithepayers with an appended
letter;
- (3) By the Patron and Incumbent of Little Massingham.

I am, Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
F. L. BRERETON.

The Secretary ,
Ecclesiastical Commission,
1 Millbank, Westminster,
London, S. W. 1.

June 14. 1929.

The under signed members of the Parochial Church
Council of Little Massingham, having considered the Draft
Scheme prepared by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for
the union of the benefices of Great and Little Massingham,
desire to lay before the Commission the following grounds
on which they base their objections to the Scheme.

1. The loss of its own Rectory, and of its own
resident Rector will be a very great one in this parish,
which has been for many years in a marked degree united,
with a vigorous religious and social life. We deplore
the proposal to attach it as a smaller appendage to a large

and separately organised parish, of which the pastoral and ecclesiastical needs are by themselves sufficient to occupy a Rector's full activities. There is no indication in the Scheme as to the proper share in the services conducted by the joint Rector which Little Massingham should receive Nor indeed is there any guarantee that services will continue to be held at suitable times in the smaller parish.

2. The growth and development of our parish life and unity has been remarkable throughout a period of more than a century during which the incumbency has been held by the family of which the present Rector and Patron is a member, Successive Rectors have in various ways made their influence felt in social, educational, and other public services both in the parish and in a wider sphere beyond it.

3. Neither the population nor the area of Little Massingham is small enough to warrant the union, especially when the increase of its inhabitants and houses in recent years is taken into account .

4. The policy of depriving small parishes of their independence and endowments, if it is to be adopted at all, should not be carried out by the singling out of particular parishes for such treatment, but through a complete scheme dealing with the diocese or the country as a whole.

5. If, in spite of our last objection, parishes are to be dealt with individually, much weight should be attached to the views and wishes of the Parishioners and, in particular, those of the Parochial Church Council, the Patron, and the Incumbent. In the recent Public Inquiry slight notice appears to have been taken of the remarkable strength and unanimity of the views and wishes then expressed. The Church Council embodies for the parish the great principle of the Representation of the Laity, and we claim that the fullest weight and consideration should be given to the objections then put forward and now repealed. These objections appear to us to confirm our view that the injury which would be inflicted locally by the union would be greater than any benefit that might result elsewhere.

F. L. BRERETON, Chairman.		OLIVER BIRKBECK)	Church-
)	Wardens
		RICHD. DRING)	
EMMA M. HEWITT)	F. MARY DRING)	Members of
ALBERT J. CALLABY)	JOAN BIRKBECK)	The Paro-
CECIL E. GOODSWEN)	MARGARET BRERETON)	Chial
HENRY CHURCH)	GRACE LEWIS)	Church
		ISRAEL LEWIS)	Council

As Tithe payers of Little Massingham, we, the under-signed, wish to lay before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the following objections to the draft Scheme for uniting the two Benefices of Great and Little Massingham :-

1. The abolition of the resident Rector of Little Massingham.
2. The virtual confiscation of the whole of the Little Massingham Benefice.
3. The diversion of the benefaction of the Tithe from its original purpose, namely, the provision of a resident Incumbent.
4. The forcible transfer of the Tithe, which we undertook to pay out of our land, to a distant part of the Diocese . We consider that there is a distinct understanding that this charge on our property will be employed in supporting a Clergyman in the Parish, and that there will be a breach of faith if the income from tithe is now transferred from its original purpose.

We append a letter from one of the principal Tithe payers who is now on a sea voyage.

(Signed) RICH.ARD DRING	OLIVER BIRKBECK
F. M. DRING	HARRY E. BECK
P. H. MORRIS JOHN	GAGE MOUNTAIN
J. D. MORRIS	
E. G. GEORGE	

Appended letter - from H. S. Dixon-Spain Esq. , Tithe payer and a member of Parochial Church Council .

Little Massingham Manor,
King's Lynn,

June 5th 1929.

To the Churchwardens,
Little Massingham.

Dear Sirs,

As I regret I cannot possibly attend the Meeting next week with regard to the union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham, I should like to place on

record my very strong protest against such a step.

Without going in to the question in detail, may I say that I disagree with the idea from every point of View. The Parish has been and is a distinct entity looked after and served devotedly by the Incumbents as few parishes are, and one cannot conceive of any good arising from so drastic a step, especially as the two parishes are so different in temperament and outlook. Would you be good enough to include my protest with the one I am sure will be forthcoming from every one of the Parishioners.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

H. S • DIXON-SPAIN.

PROPOSED UNION of the BENEFICES of GREAT and LITTLE MASSINGHAM - OBJECTIONS submitted by the Rev. F. L. BRERETON as Patron and Rector of Little Massingham.

GROUND OF OBJECTION

1. The History and development of the Parish

Little Massingham has had an independent Parochial existence for at least 600 years.

Its population in the year 1821 was 125, and in the last three Censuses 187, 211, 236 respectively. Since the last Census year (1921) three new houses have been built in the Parish.

In the year 1821 there were 11 inhabited houses: at the present time there are 53. There is still a demand for houses.

The growth in recent years has been mainly due to two events (1) the opening of a Railway Station about 50 years ago (2) the building early in the present Century of two large residences with cottages attached to each. It may be pointed out that with very few exceptions the houses built during the past Century are at as great a distance from Great Massingham Church and Rectory as the mile which separates the two Churches. They are for the most part a mile further from Great Massingham Church than from their own.

The sense of Parochial Unity has been strong and effective in the past and remains so still. There is an intimate connection in some form or other between the Church Rectory and every house in the Parish. It is

customary for practically the whole Parish as represented by its men, its women, its children or its total population to meet together on several occasions every year. Besides possessing its own Church and Rectory, it has its Village Club, its Parish Room and its Annual Flower Show. Though it has no Day School, its Sunday School and childrens Services are attended by practically all the children in the Parish. It is a "live" as well as a united Parish, which values its own independence. It will suffer irreparably from :-

- (1) the reduction of its Services
- (2) the Sale of its Rectory
- (3) the removal of its Rector.

2. Its ancient endowments.

The alienation of £500 a year from the United benefice of Great and Little Massingham (the loss being chiefly at the expense of Little Massingham) is not justified by the circumstances. It is a grave interference with the wishes and designs of original benefactors. The proposal to remove these Tithes not only from the Massinghams, but from West Norfolk, has already aroused strong opposition in the neighbourhood and among Tithe payers in particular.

While neither the populations nor the incomes of the benefices are so small as to make a union necessary, a possible argument in its favour might be that it would provide an opportunity for transferring a part of the endowments elsewhere - a procedure which I maintain would be as unwarrantable as it would be unwise. The endowments are raised entirely in the Parishes; they are largely spent there. They are not the property of the church as a whole, but of Great and Little Massingham, and forcibly to take them away seems a form of compulsory almsgiving, likely to do much more harm in West Norfolk than it will do good in those parts of the County which are to receive the proceeds of the transfer.

3. History of the Patronage.

For several Centuries up to the year 1870 the Patronage was held by the owner of the whole of the land in Little Massingham, who was also Lord of the Manor. My Great Grandfather, Thomas Wilson, purchased the land and the Advowson in the year 1807 from the Mordaunt family, who had held them for several hundreds of years. Under the Wilson Patronage my Grandfather became Rector in 1820 and my Father in 1867. The Wilsons sold all their Little Massingham properties in 1870 but my Father afterwards purchased the Advowson, which had become entirely separated from land property, and the Patronage is now held by myself.

I regard this Patronage as a Trust. It would be weakened and diverted from its original object under the provisions of the Draft Scheme.

4. Little Massingham, a Benefice of a valuable type.

The extinction of a properly endowed though small Benefice, like that of Little Massingham, would be a real loss, not only to the district, but to the Diocese, and to the Church generally. It offers a sphere of activity and influence, suitable for Clergymen of a special type, or working under certain conditions of health or age. Small country benefices have often been centres of Clerical light and leading. They also offer suitable opportunities for less exacting pastoral work to those who may be seeking them.

On the above grounds, both as Patron and Rector, I enter objection to the whole Scheme for uniting the two benefices.

(Signed) F. L. BRERETON,

Little Massingham Rectory .

June 14th 1929.

Castle Acre Vicarage,

King's Lynn,

June 14th 1929 .

Sir,

Union of Benefices, Massingham.

As a person interested in an Estate at Harpley paying Tithe to Little Massingham, I beg to lay before you an objection to the proposal to unite the two benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

I place my objection upon the following grounds :-

(1) I understand that the Tithe payable upon land in a Parish is payable to the Parson of that Parish for his sole use and benefit absolutely.

(2) I should oppose by all means in my power any measure designed to alienate the Tithe or any part of it payable in my Parish for the benefit of the Parson of any other Parish.

(3) There has been a considerable increase within recent years of the population of Little Massingham owing to the erection of two large houses with their accompaniment of servants within and without, and cottages for the same.

(4) Such a family as that of the present Incumbent is a very valuable asset to any district they are all full of good works for the Church generally and locally and have within my memory of the last forty years done much good for the people of our village.

(5) A great part of the existing Rectory house was built and the whole of it has been enormously improved, internally and externally at the expense of the Brereton family.

(6) The house is to be confiscated I am told, to meet the expenses incurred in connection with the proposed union, no compensation whatever being given to the Patron for the loss of his house and two-thirds of his Patronage .

A most unfair proceeding .

(7) My family has been in this County for many generations; alongside , amongst others, our good neighbours the Breretons and their forbears, the family is likely to be banished, by this proposed act, from our neighbourhood for ever.

(8) By the sale of this house and the consequent departure of its inhabitants, a well-established centre of Church life and extremely well and religiously conducted secular education will be removed from our midst .

(9) The departure of the resident Church of England Minister will be the signal for the advent of the Non-Conformist the erection of a Chapel, and a serious blow to the progress of the Church in this diocese.

(10) I am informed by Mr. F. E. Cole of Great Massingham that he applied in writing to the Chairman of the Parochial Council of Great Massingham for a Meeting to consider the draft scheme and that the application was refused. That is to say no opportunity has been given to the Great Massingham Parochial Church Council to consider the draft scheme at all; notwithstanding the fact that they voted unanimously against the proposal to unite the Benefices in the first instance.

I mentioned the proposal to Lord Leicester in a letter written by me to him on another matter adding that

we were much distressed at the prospect involved, and I beg to enclose herewith a copy of his spontaneous and quite unexpected reply.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
ANTHONY H. BECK.

The Secretary,
Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England,
1 Millbank.

Little Massingham Rectory,
King's Lynn,
June 14th 1929.

Dear Sir,
Union of Benefices Measure 1923.
Great Massingham
Little Massingham
Proposed Union of Benefices.

I have been asked to transmit to you the enclosed signatures of persons of adult age supporting the Resolution passed, unanimously by show of hands at a crowded meeting held in Great Massingham Village Hall on June 10th 1929.

I also enclose copies
(a) of the Notice convening that Meeting
(b) of the Resolution passed.

I am, near Sir,
Yours faithfully,
F. L. BRERETON.

The Secretary,
Ecclesiastical Commission,
1 Millbank,
Westminster,
London, S. W. 1.

RESOLUTION

That this joint Meeting of the Parishioners of Great and Little Massingham in the County of Norfolk, strongly protests against the Union of the two benefices, thus depriving the inhabitants of Little Massingham of a resident Rector in their parish; and against the alienation of the income of ancient endowments arising out of the lands in these parishes; and against the resulting injury to the spiritual life and religious work in both parishes; and further this Meeting is unanimously opposed to the virtual destruction of the influence and relationship of an old and greatly respected family in the parish of Little Massingham and its neighbourhood.

Proposed by Col. Oliver Birkbeck, D L
Little Massingham House,
King's Lynn.

Seconded by Mr. A. C. Cracknell,
Great Massingham.

F. E. Cole	Louisa Hazel	Mrs. Ellis
A. M. Vertigan	J. Cole	Mrs. M. Barnes
Jane G. Dewar	N. Cole	N. Leverett
Margaret Brereton	E. Bale	E. Attew
Elizabeth Leverett	Caroline Woodward	J. Hazel
E. Callaby	Laura S. Withers	Mrs. G. Reader
F. Wilson	Eleanor Brereton	Miss Calaby
A. Curry	William Riddell	Mrs. A.G. Hammond
R. Reader	Ethel A. Riddell	Mr. A. G. Hammond
Ellen Reader	Frances H. M. Brereton	Mrs. Broughton
M. Coker	Lily C. Mason	Mr. E. Broughton
G. M. Morris	A. M. Morris	E. M. Collis
M. Hodson	Octavia C. R. Ockley	K. Savery

F. Hodson	F. Mason	J. Savory
F. R. Haws	F. Glaswell	S. Savory
A. Coker	A. Glaswell	D. Wright
Edith Alice Callaby	A. West	K. S. Plattin
M. J. Coker	J. M. West	J. Beales
Mrs. E. Taylor	J. West	N. Softly
Mrs. A. Candler	E. F. Glasswell	W. Softley
Miss A. George	S. Moore	R. Rivett
Mrs. A. Allcock	E. Curry	J. Rivett
	G. Currey	W. Barnes

H. G. New	C. R. Webster
A. Vertigan	H. A. Barnes
W. Sloper	William Bale
H. Jackson	Mrs. Harris
A. Leverett	Mrs. Partridge
B. Shackcloth	W. Partridge
A. Candler	G. Yull
F. Callaby	Mrs. Yull
S. Callaby	Mrs. J. Gibson
M. Bale	Mrs. F. Balders
S. Engledone	Mrs. H. Chilvers
J. W. Leverett	Mrs. Bullivant
W. Roye	Mr. T. Bullivant
J. Howard	Mrs. Gagen
J. Shackcloth	W. Balders
H. Hawes	Edith Mary Hazel
G. Barnes	W. Cole
C. Shackcloth	G. R. Bale
C. Callaby	H. Curry
S. Kettingham	J. H. Callaby
J. Gagen	M. Beales
F. Callaby	E. West
	P. Glasswell

Mrs. D. Bullivant	T. Wild	Mr. F. Balders
Mr. Fred Hurn	M. Neale	Frederick Balders
Mrs. F. Hurn	J. H. Newing	James Galley
Mr. E. J. Cottis	A. L. Callaby	Thomas Marshall
Mr. W. E. Cottis	I. Lewis	M. A. Marshall
E. E. Cottis	E. Brunton	L. Mason
Mrs. Daws	Mrs. Brunton	S. Vouels
B. A. Seaman	Mr. Daws	W. Mason
A. Seaman	Mrs. Daws	J. Benstead
F. A. Mason		M. A. Benstead.
Oliver Birkbeck	H. M. Brereton	
Richard Dring	Wm. Chilvers	
A. C. Cracknell	F. Vertigan	
Chas. Dewar	Mr. J. Gibson	
Alfred vertigan	M. J. Appleton	
Henry Letch	H. M. Shipp	
F. J. Lee	G. H. Leverett	
Mrs. E. Hewitt	Geo. Warnes	
Mrs. F. S. Harvey	E. Alcock	
R. Hendry	L. Page	
A. H. Beck	E. Mason	
F. Moore	S. Elphinstone	
	R. Mason	
	H. Beales	
	R. Beales	

P. M. Shackcloth		
S. Taylor		F. Fooke
R. Shackcloth		C. Leverett
J. G. Mountain		A. Bratten
K. R. Mountain		C. Copeman
Mr. Mrs. H. Reader		G. P. Palgrave
A. Pearce		T. Callaby

N. Taylor
J. W. Taylor
F. Kiddall
C. Fitt
W. Steele
H. Balder
H. Bone
J. Gagen
G. Mason
W. Callaby
W. Gagen
R. Moore
W. Garrett

J. Neale
F. Attew
S. Ketteringham
D. Ketteringham
M. Ketteringham
H. Strangleman
N. Chilvers
C. Goodswen
L. M. Wones
D. E. Beales
W. Ackley
A. J. Savory
S. Coker

J. Rye
R. Carlton
J. Callaby
A. Shinn
H. F. Arter
C. Ware
S. J. Harvey
H. Bullivant
J. Fooke
H. Walden
W. J. Hodson
H. Sillis
H. G. Linford
H. Daws
W. Docking
D. H. Morris
W. G. Seaman
W. T. Seaman

B. Shinn
H. J. Mason
A. H. Berry
J. Boom
A.W. Leverett
H. C. Cawthorne
N. Pearse
H. R. Olley
G. H. Olley
C. Hides
A. M. Reader
E. Brettin
K. Boon
A. Goldsmith
E. Fitt
A. Fitt

J. E. Foster
Arthur Beales
R. Beales
E. Allen
R. Cornwall
C. W. Hodson
M. E. Callaby
W. Drewery
J. H. Moore
J. W. George
John George
B. Beales
J. Coker
B. A. Cawthorne
W. George
D. Daw

R. H. Barnes	H. Fitt	R. M. Bunn
Robert Page	Stavery Hazel	
H. A. Linford	J, Curry	
S. Foster	H. Cole	
G. Earnes	F. B. Leverett	
F. S. Harvey	F. M. Cawthorne	
W. Lillis		
A. H. Ketteringham		W. Seapey
G. Sparrow		Mrs. S. Hooper
J. Manning		A. Shackcloth
G. R. Boon		E. I. B. Mason
A. Callaby		L. Prior
A. Manning		I. Prior
C. Caller		L. Sparrow
G. Shinn		Ivy Partridge
J. D. Softley		M. H. Church
W. H. Rickett		S. Mann
A. Ketteringham		A. Callaby
J. Moors		E. cole
F. Cooper		W. Holsey
J. H. Cooper		R. W. Taylor
G. Long		T. C. Taylor
W. Leverett		L. Taylor
S. Hooper		J. Howard
A. G. Claxton		M. Howard
N. Callaby		N. Taylor
W. Gagen		E. Taylor
E. Seapey		
A. Shackcloth		
Eliza Burton		Mrs. E. Manning
George Burton		G. P. Vertigan
Louis C. Burton		P. M. Vertigan

Mrs. H. Church
E. M. Arter
Fred Baldwin
Mrs. F. Baldwin
William Watts
Ellen May Watts
Margaret Vaughan
S. E. Vaughan
E. K. Linford
I. Brereton
H. Callaby
M. Engledow
E. Hewitt
Mr. John Barnes
R. M. Vertigan
A. E. Webster
L. M. Reeve
V. H. Reeve

Mrs. C. Dennis
Mr. C. Dennis
C. H. Hazel
G. A. Hazel

WE, the undersigned residents in the Parish of Harpley DESIRE to associate ourselves with the residents in Great and Little Massingham who signed the resolution passed at a meeting on June 10th 1929.

Harry E Beck	T. H. Scott	K. Norman
Jessie M Woods		E. Norman
Margaret A Mallett	Agnes C. Porter	E. Woods
C. T. Mountain	Rebecca Willimott	H. Royston
E. M. Mountain	Charles Willimott	W. Dickerson
Jane Beck	B. Howes	E. Dickerson
J. Hammond	M. Chening	M. Hammond
E. R. Hammond	S. Hammond	W. Hammond
C. Blyth	Mr. Raspberry	E. Marshall
M. Blyth	W. Raspberry	S. Gagen
M. Cater	R. Marshall	E. Fake
Mrs. H. Cater	J. Seaman	Edward Fake
Mr. H. Cater	E. Seaman	W. K. Drewery

Eliz. Murfet	S. Marshall	N. Drewery
S. Murfet	Mr. Potter	E. A. Mace
J. W. Murfet	C. Potter	A. R. Mace
M. M. Morton	J. Barnes	B. Harwood
Marjorie Morton	E. Barnes	P. Harwood
Mrs. Baker	S. Raspberry	H. Harrowen
R. Baker	A. G. Harrod	G. Harrowen
B. Codman	A. S. Harrod	A. Johnson
A. Shred		F. Johnson
Alice Hammond		
William Hammon		
Agnes Blackwood		
L. C. Blackwood		
M. E. Steele		
E. A. Steele		
D. Langley		
H. Langley		
M. Arter		
G. Arter		
A. H. E. Chenery		

Station House,
Massingham,
King's Lynn .
June 29/29.

To the Ecclesiastical Commissioners,
1 Millbank,
Westminster S.W.1.

Gentlemen,

The Proposed Union of Great & Little
Massingham Benefices.

Replying to my letter of June 17th the Lord Bishop of Norwich asks me to convey to you the representations I made to him personally, and on behalf of the Parishioners I respectfully beg to draw your attention to this matter, which you will shortly be called upon for adjudication.

With the best interests of the Church before me I write to you, gentlemen, as I have to the Press, to say on behalf of my fellow Parishioners, it will be a sad day

for the Church and us should your decision be adverse to us who oppose this union, and that it is the daily prayer of all that the good God shall so guide you, and lead you to say we in Little Massingham shall retain our present status, our present Peace, and our beloved Rector, who is daily doing Christ's work amongst us, that no injustice shall be imposed upon us, and that Right shall prevail in the two Massinghams.

In conclusion I would respectfully assure you, looking at the matter quite impartially, I can see no reason to advance in the scheme's favor, but, that on the contrary there are very many reasons in favour of withdrawal; which I am quite willing to place at your disposal for your consideration, and which at least will I think, convince you our grievances are genuine, and that our stand is perfectly legitimate and righteous.

I beg to remain, Gentlemen,
Yours very faithfully,
J. E. FOSTER

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Westminster, S. W. 1.
4th July 1929.

Dear Sirs,

I wish to associate myself, most strongly with the resolution forwarded you, protesting against the union of the two benefices, of Great and Little Massingham, King's Lynn, Norfolk.

Yours very truly,

FERMOY.

TO :-

Messrs. Hill & Perks,
Solicitors,
Norwich.

re Proposed Scheme for Union of Benefices
of Great and Little Massingham.

AS TITHE PAYERS in either or both Parishes, we are desirous of uniting with the other Appellants in the proposed Appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council against the above Scheme AND WE JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY authorise and request Messrs. Hill & Perks, 38 Prince of Wales Road Norwich the Solicitors for the other Appellants to represent us also, and to take all necessary steps in the matter of presenting and Conducting such Appeal on our behalf.

DATED this 30th day of January 1930.

SIGNED. Oliver Birkbeck
Richd. Dring
Harry E. Beak
J. G. Mountain
Chas. Dewar
W. Docking
W. Leverett
J. D. Softley
A. M. West
J. Norton
A. Beales
W. Seapey
Henry Overman
P. H. Morris
A. M. Morris
James D. Morris
D. E. Cottis
Alfred Glasswell
F. Eagle-Cole.

"F"

"Rosegarth"

Gt. Massingham,

King's Lynn.

11. 6. 29.

The Lord Bishop of Norwich.

My Lord,

With reference to the proposed scheme of union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham, I feel it my duty to point out that it is exciting a great amount of adverse feeling in the two Parishes amounting to almost bitterness.

This is largely due to the fact that the family of Brereton is of very old standing in the district and universally esteemed and respected and that anything done to diminish their status is greatly resented.

I would therefore strongly advise that the proposed scheme of union if not altogether abandoned be at least left in abeyance for some time.

In the interests of peace and harmony in the parishes concerned I am certain that would be the wisest step.

I am, My Lord,

Yours faithfully.

O. L. APPLETON L.R.C.S.,

L.R.C.P.Ed.

Lt. Col. (Ret).

Secretary Parochial Church Council

Gt. Massingham and Parish Warden.

P.S. I have written to the same effect to the secretary Ecclesiastical Commission.

"ROSEGARTH"

Gt. Massingham,
King's Lynn.
12.06.29.

The Lord Bishop of Norwich.

My Lord,

With reference to the proposed Union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham I am desired to send you a copy of a resolution passed by a large majority at a meeting of the Great Massingham Parochial Church Council held at the Rectory September 24th, 1928. The Rector of Great Massingham (Canon McAnally) in the chair.

Proposed by C. Dewar Esq, seconded by Mr. P. Platten "That there be no change in the present position of the two Parishes".

An amendment was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Dr. Appleton:

"That it is desirable that the two parishes be united"

On a show of hands the resolution was carried by a large majority.

I am, my Lord,

Yours faithfully .

O. L. APPLETON

Secretary Great Massingham
Parochial Church Council.

“G”

Ecclesiastical Commission
1, Millbank, Westminster,
London, S W. 1.

File No, 100930

14th October 1929.

Dear Sir,

Great Massingham and Little Massingham
Proposed Union of Benefices.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have had before them the objections submitted by you, and others, tithe payers, and members of the Parochial Church Council of Little Massingham to the draft Scheme for effecting the above proposed Union of Benefices and I am directed to inform you that after giving full consideration to these objections the Commissioners, notwithstanding such objections have decided to proceed with the proposed union but to alter the draft Scheme by providing that only £250. per annum out of the combined income of the United Benefice shall be alienated to other Benefices and that such sum as may be necessary not exceeding £150, per annum, of the income of the United Benefice shall be set aside for the provision of clerical or lay assistance in the performance of the duties of the United Benefice.

An engrossment of the draft Scheme, so revised will accordingly in due course be certified to His Majesty in Council and Notices of such certification will at the same time be published in a local newspaper and be sent to you and to other prescribed persons.

It will then be competent to any persons who have objected to the draft Scheme to appeal within one month after such publication to His Majesty in Council against the Scheme or any part thereof.

I am, Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
S. E. Downing.

Rev F.L. Brereton,
Little Massingham Rectory,
Kings Lynn.

“H”

CHURCH PROPERTY DEFENCE ASSOCIATION

5, Raymond Buildings,
Gray's Inn, W. C. 1.

5th December 1929.

The Secretary,
The Ecclesiastical Commission,
1, Millbank, S. W. 1.

Dear Sir,

Re Great and Little Massingham, Diocese
of Norwich Union of Benefices Measure 1923.

I am requested to forward the enclosed resolution,
passed unanimously at a well attended Public Meeting at
Kings Lynn, under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon, the
Earl of Leicester G. C. V. O. , C. M. G., the Lord Lieutenant
of Norfolk.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
E. W. I. PETERSON.

RESOLUTION.

That this Meeting, held at King's Lynn, on Tuesday
the 3rd December 1929, with the Right Honourable The Earl
of Leicester in the Chair, deplore the union of the
benefices of Great and Little Massingham, and asks that the
whole proposal be abandoned, as the great harm which will
be done to the parishes affected will not be justified by
the small amount of good which might accrue to the Church
as a whole.

"I"

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND.

UNION OF BENEFICES MEASURE, 1923.

N O T I C E.

IN ACCORDANCE with the provisions of the Union of Benefices Measure, 1923, and the Statutory Rules made thereunder, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England hereby give Notice that they have certified to His Majesty in Council a Scheme for effecting the union of the benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham both situate in the County of Norfolk and in the Diocese of Norwich.

APPEAL may now be made to His Majesty in Council (addressed to "The Clerk of the Council, Privy Council Office Whitehall, S. W. 1.") against the Scheme or any part thereof within the period of one month after the date of the publication of this Notice by any one who stated or transmitted to the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners an objection to the draft Scheme within the prescribed period of 21 days after the 25th May, 1929, being the date upon which copies of such draft Scheme were transmitted to the Patrons and Parochial Church Councils of the Benefices and Parishes affected.

Dated this 16th day of December, 1929.

BY ORDER of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England.

S E. Downing
Secretary

1, Millbank, Westminster, S. W. 1.

“J”

9th Jan. 1930

The Clerk to the Council,
Privy Council Offices,
London, S.W.1.

Dear Sirs

Union of Benefices Acts.
Proposed Union of Benefices.
Little Massingham with Gt. Massingham.

We have been instructed by the Patron of the above Living and others, and expect shortly to receive instructions from the Parochial Church Council of both Little and Great Massingham to represent them in connection with the proposed Appeal against the above Union of Benefices.

Whilst we do not wish to delay, in any way, the hearing of this matter, we shall be greatly obliged if you will kindly extend our time for lodging the necessary Petition of Appeal, and so enable us to obtain the appropriate information for settling the documents to be lodged with you.

We are,

Yours faithfully

[*Hill & Perks*]

AT THE COURT AT BUCKINGHAM PALACE.

The 27th day of February 1930.

PRESENT

THE KING'S MOST EXCEILENT MAJESTY

IN COUNCIL

WHEREAS the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England have in pursuance of the Union of Benefices Measure, 1923, prepared a scheme dated the 12th day of December 1929, for effecting the Union of Benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham both situate in the County of Norfolk and Diocese of Norwich.

AND WHEREAS objection has been made to the said scheme by the Reverend F.L. Brereton (Patron and Rector of Little Massingham) the Parochial Church Council of Little Massingham Mr. Reginald Barron (Patron of Great Massingham) and Mr. Oliver Birkbeck.

AND WHEREAS the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners notwithstanding such objection have certified the said Scheme and the consent thereto in writing of the Lord Bishop of Norwich to His Majesty in Council.

AND WHEREAS the said Reverend F.L. Brereton, the Parochial Church Council of Little Massingham Mr. Reginald Barron and Mr. Oliver Birkbeck have appealed against the said Scheme to His Majesty in Council.

NOW THEREFORE, His Majesty is pleased, in exercise of the powers conferred on Him by the said Measure, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, to order and direct that the said Appeal be heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council who shall make Report to His Majesty in Council thereupon as provided in the said Measure.

M.P. A. Hankey

*Personal note of a coincidence:
Maurice Pascal Alers Hankey, Clerk to the Privy Council
ennobled in 1939 as 1st Baron Hankey of The Chart in the
County of Surrey. His grandson Donald Robin Alers Hankey,
the 3rd Baron, was a business partner of Geoffrey Randall,
author of this document, from 1974 until 1989.*

"K"

We, the undersigned, adult residents, in the parish of Great Massingham, wish to support the Churchwardens and Rector of Little Massingham in appealing to the Privy Council against the scheme for uniting the benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We deprecate the injury which would be done to both parishes by seriously curtailing the spiritual ministrations and religious privileges which in the past their parishioners have enjoyed. One clergyman could not, in our opinion, efficiently fulfil the responsibilities and services hitherto shared by two resident Rectors. The loss to Little Massingham of its Ecclesiastical independence and of its Rectory, as well as the loss to both parishes resulting from the permanent alienation of tithe-income, will we think, be a grievous one.

J. Morton	- . 5. 0.	I. Howard	- . . 3.
Mts. P. Morton	- . 5. 0.	M. Howard	- . . 3.
Mr. J. Wilde	- . 1. 0.	E. Taylor	- . . 3.
Mrs. J. Wilde	- . 1. 0.	R. Taylor	- . . 3.
F. W. Hazel	- . . 6.	A. Skipper	- . . 3.
R. Shackcloth	- . 1. 0.	A. Skipper	- . . 3.
B. Shackcloth	- . . 6.	F. Hazel	- . . 6.
E. H. Coker	- . 1. 0.	N. Hazel	- . . 6.
A. Beales	- . . 6.	R. W. Carlton	- . . 6.
W. Taylor	- . . 6.	E. M. Carlton	- . . 3.
Mrs. W. Taylor	- . . 6.	R. Carlton	- . 1. 0.
Mr. C. Allcock	- . . 6.	George King	- . . 3.
Mrs. M. Allcock	- . . 6.	Arthur King	- . . 3.
Mr. Vealing	- . . 2.	William King	- . . 3.
C. M. Coker	- . . 6.	Helen King	- . . 3.
M. J. Coker	- . 1. 0.	William Dolman	- . . 6.
R. Leverett	- . . 6.	Rose Dolman	- . . 6.
W. Leverett	- . . 3.	Leslie Caller	- . . 6.
M. Leverett	- . . 6.	W. Daw	- . 1. 0.
M. George	- . . 6.	Doris Daw	- . 1. 0.
A. George	- . . 3.	W. Daws	- . . 3.
G. George	- . . 3.	Margaret Daws	- . . 3.
S. Tooke	- . 1. 0.	Leslie Daws	- . . 3.
W. Tooke	- . 1. 0.	E. Green	- . . 3.
		W. Green	- . . 6.

H. Neale	- . - . 6.	J. T. Green	- . - . 3.
A. Neale	- . - . 6.	R. Williamson	- . - . 2.
E. Skipper	- . - . 3.	S. Williamson	- . - . 2.
H. Skipper	- . - . 3.	A. E. Barrett)	
R. Gage	- . - . 3.)	
D. Dawson	- . - . 6.	P. A. Barrett)	- . - . 6.
M. Dawson	- . - . 3.	C. Roye)	
T. Dawson	- . 1. 0.	E. Roye)	- . 3. 0.
L. A. Bird	- . - . 6.	B. Roye)	
A. Bird	- . - . 6.	A. Allcock)	
A. George	- . - . 6.	Dorothy Allcock)	
J. H. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Ruby Allcock)	- . 1. 0.
M. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Jane Bird)	
B. E. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Phyllis Allcock)	
F. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Lilian & Fred. Taylor	- . 1. 0.
Mrs. F. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Mr. & Mrs. Howard	- . 1. 0.
J. Moore	- . 1. 0.	Mr. & Mrs. Shackcloth	- . 2. 0.
C. Warnes	- . - . 6.	Mr. & Mrs. H. Taylor	- . 1. 0.
G. Warnes	- . - . 6.	Mr. Daw	- . 1. 0.
A. Warnes	- . - . 6.	C. Shackcloth)	
G. Warnes	- . - . 6.	A. Shackcloth)	
A. M. West	- . 5. 0.	A. C. Shackcloth)	- . - . 6.
Mrs. West	- . 2. 6.	Mary Shackcloth)	
A. Vertigan	- . 2. 6.	Herbert Daws)	
A. Vertigan	- . 2. 6.)	- . - . 6.
R. Bone	- . - . 6.	Martha Daws)	
F. Moore	- . 1. 0.	W. Roye	- . 1. 0.
A. George	- . 1. 0.	A. Roye	- . 1. 0.
J. Seaman)	- . - . 6.	R. M. Bunn	- . 1. 0.
C. E. Seaman)	- . - . 6.	A. Jarvis	- . 1. 0.
S. C. Chilvers	- . - . 6.	W. Jarvis)	
S. M. Chilvers	- . - . 6.)	- . 1. 0.
C. Skipper	- . 1. 0.	Mrs. W. Jarvis)	
A. Sadler	- . - . 3.	B Jarvis	- . 1. 0.
R. W. Copeman	- . - . 6.	H. Callaby	- . 1. 0.
W. George	- . - . 6.	J. Morris	- . 5. 0.
H. George	- . - . 6.	A. M. Morris	- . 5. 0.
R. Jarvis	- . 1. 0.	E. W. Wilson	- . 1. 0.
		Gertrude Morris	- . 5. 0.
		P. H. Morris	- . 5. 0.
		J. Galley	- . - . 3.

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Great Massingham, wish to support the Churchwarden and Rector of Little Massingham in appealing to the Privy Council against the Scheme for uniting the benefices of Great and Little Massingham. We deprecate the injury which would be done to both Parishes by seriously curtailing the spiritual ministrations and religious privileges which in the past their parishioners have enjoyed. One clergyman could not, in our opinion, efficiently fulfil the responsibilities and services hitherto shared by two resident Rectors. The loss to Little Massingham of its Ecclesiastical independence and of its Rectory, as well as the loss to both parishes resulting from the permanent alienation of tithe income, will we think, be a grievous one.

A. C. Cracknell)	Jack S. Mason)
))
A. Cracknell)	F. Mason)
))
M. Hewer	- . 5. 0.	C. Steel	
C. C. Kidall)	J. Anderson	
)	W. Dawson	
J. Kidall)	E. C. Dawson	
C. Gagen			
E. Porter)	M. Hodson)
))
	- . - . 6.		- . 2. 6.
A. Porter)	C. W. Hodson)
))
W. Grimshaw		J. H. Newing	- . 2. 6.
H. G. New)	M. Copeman	- . - . 6.
)	C. Copeman	- . - . 6.
	- . - . 6.	R. Copeman	- . - . 6.
F. A. New)	A. Copeman	- . - . 6.
H. G. New		Mr. & Mrs. James	
L. New		Beales	- . 5. 0.
H. J. Mason)	C. Cracknell	- . 1. 0.
)	M. A. Benstead)
	- . 2. 6.)
L. C. Mason)		- . 1. 0
)	J. H. Benstead)
M. Coker		Edith M. Hazel)
L. Prior		Stanley W. Hazel)
John Bullivant			- . 2. 6.
M. Page	- . - . 6.	Robert J. Hazel)
R. J. Page	- . - . 6.	Charlotte Rice	- . - . 3.
Hannah George	- . - . 6.	John Goldsmith)
John George	- . - . 6.)
Annie Asker	- . - . 6.	Harry Goldsmith)
George Long	- . - . 6.	Agatha Goldsmith	
Susanah Coker		R. Rivett)
)
		J. Rivett)
			- . 1. 0.

Mrs. H. Bullivant	- . - . 6.	M. Barnes	
Hugh Bullivant	- . - . 6.	J. Le Sage	
Davey Whiting		A. Copeman	- . - . 2.
Irene Whiting	- . - . 3.	M. Copeman	
Fanny Wild		L. Bird)
H. W. Beck	- . - . 3.) - . - . 6.
E. Rowe	- . - . 3.	H. Bird)
F. Walker		R. Bird	
E. Walker		S. Bird	
M. Hedges		R. Goll)
W. Rowe))
) - . - . 6.	A. Goll) - . - . 6.
F. Rowe))
N. Reader	- . - . 1.	W. Goll)
G. Reader	- . - . 1.	W. Holsey	
A. Callaby	- . 2. 0.	M. Holsey	
G. Forster	- . - . 2.	R. Holsey	- . 2. 6.
A. Forster	- . - . 2.	E. Skipper	
E. Caller	- . - . 3.	W. Skipper	
H. Caller		H. M. Shinn	
O. Ockley		E. Shinn	- . - . 6.
M.E. Ockley		E. Wood	
W. L. Ockley		T. Wood	
J. E. Manning	- . - . 6.	J. George)
A. J. Manning)
E. W. Manning		G. George) - . 2. 6.
R. A. Cornwall	- . - . 3.)
R. W. Cornwall	- . - . 3.	E. J. George)
W. J. Cornwall	- . - . 3.	C. E. Rowe)
A. Berry	- . - . 6.) - . - . 3.
A. Berry	- . - . 6.	E. M. Rowe)
J. D. Softley	- . 1. 0.	A. Boyce	
R. F. Softley	- . 1. 0.	J. Manning	
R. Wright	- . - . 6.	J. manning	
J. Coker)	T. Moore	
) - . 1. 0.	E. Moore	- . - . 6.
H. Coker)	M. Yallop	- . - . 6.
N. Chilvers)	W. Yallop	
) - . 1. 0.	W. S. Yallop	- . - . 3.
J. Chilvers)	A. Pearce	- . - . 6.
C. Caller	- . - . 6.	N. Pearce	- . - . 6.
H. Haws	- . 1. 0.	E. Allen	
F. R. Haws	- . 1. 0.	A. Allen	
E. Vince		J. W. George	- . - . 6.
J. Vince			

G. Brunton	- . - . 3.	J. George	- . - . 6.
Mrs. Brunton	- . - . 3.	J. Neale	
Mrs. W. Callaby	- . - . 6.	G. Neale	
Mr. W. Callaby	- . - . 6.	A. Savory)
F. Hooper	- . 1. 0.	A. M. Ewer)
F. N. Hooper		K. Savory) - . 2. 6.
	- . - . 6.	Mrs. J. Savory)
W. J. Hooper			
F. R. Mawood	- . 1. 0.	H. Barn	- . - . 3.
G. Riches	- . 1. 0.	A.J. Sadler	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Great Massingham, wish to support the Churchwardens and the Rector of Little Massingham in appealing to the Privy Council against the Scheme for uniting the benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We deprecate the injury which would be done to both parishes by seriously curtailing the spiritual ministrations and religious privileges which in the past their parishioners have enjoyed. One Clergyman could not, in our opinion, efficiently fulfil the responsibilities and services hitherto shared by two resident Rectors. The loss to Little Massingham of its Ecclesiastical independence, and of its Rectory, as well as the loss to both Parishes resulting from the permanent alienation of Tithe income will, we think, be a grevous one.

N. Appleton, Peoples' Warden, Great Massingham.

Mrs, D. L. Appleton	S. Ketteringham
W. Docking	R. Ketteringham
M. Docking	W. T. Seaman
A. Docking	C. R. Seaman
M. Steel	B. A. Seaman
Mrs. Haws	W. G. Seaman
W. Steel	J. H. Seaman
S. Callaby	T. A. Seaman
F. Callaby	A. L. Morris
A. M. Reader	W. J. Setchell
L. Reader	E. Caller
A. Lynn	Mrs. Caller
J. Loake	E. Harrison
T. Bullivant	V. Joake

M. Bullivant	Elizabeth Mason
J. R. Harvey	Mrs. H. Balders
E. Harvey	Mr. H. Balders
L. Gagen	A. Watson
J. Gagen	W. Jarrett
L. Gagen	Mrs. Bale
C. Gagen	G. R. Bale
F. Attew	A. Ketteringham
E. Attew	S. A. Ketteringham
James Hazel	M. Ketteringham
Louisa Hazel	H. Ketteringham
C. Woodward	E. Fitt
L. S. Withers	H. S. Fitt
J. & J. West	C. N. Fitt
J. M. West	A. Fitt
Mrs. J. W. Leverett	Widow Howard
Mr. J. W. Leverett	Edna May Mason
Mr. J. Taylor	Eliza Mason
Mrs. J. Taylor	W. E. Mason
Mr , J > W. Taylor	Honor Bannell
Mrs. J. W. Taylor	Samuel Harvey
Miss J. Taylor	Elizabeth Harvey
Mr. Reeder	Lucy Francis
Mrs. Reeder	Mary Harvey
Mr. Callaby	Owen Cole
Miss G. Rayner	F. E. Cole
R. E. P. Palmer	N. Cole
E. E. Palmer	Joyce Cole
W. D. Palmer	Mrs. S. Mann
Miss D. M. D. S. Palmer	Mr. S. Mann
Mr. & Mrs. W. J. Cross	A. Bretten
Miss C. Mann	Mrs. Bretten

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the parish of Great Massingham wish to support the Churchwardens and Rector of Little Massingham in appealing to the Privy Council against the Scheme for uniting the benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We deprecate the injury which would be done to both parishes by seriously curtailing the spiritual ministrations and religious privileges which in the past their parishioners have enjoyed. One clergyman could not, in our opinion, efficiently fulfil the responsibilities and services hitherto shared by two resident Rectors. The loss to Little Massingham of its Ecclesiastical independence and of its Rectory, as well as the loss to both parishes resulting from the permanent alienation of tithe income will we think be a grievous one.

Chas Dewer	S. Moore	E. Leverett
James G. Dewar	R. Moore	F. Wilson
Jean Dewar	E. Moore	G. H. Leverett
James Callaby	Mrs. Ellis	A. W. Leverett
Editg A. Callaby	Mrs. Barnes	H. Seapey
M. Bale	Mr. G. Barnes	E. J. Seapey
W. Bale	Mr. G. Ellis	M. Leverett
W. Balders	G. R. Boon	R. Mason
T. Rye	G. R. Boon	Mrs. R. Mason
A. Rye	J. H. Callaby	E. J. Mason
B. Chandler	E. E. Curry	A. J. Leverett
A. Chandler	R. H. Curry	N. Leverett
A. Curry	L. Callaby	E. E. Cottis
J. Curry	W. Callaby	W. E. Cottis
F. Callaby	J. Rhodes	E. M. Cottis
T. Callaby	Kate S. Platten	C. Leverett
W. Callaby	P.J. Platten	
C. Callaby	F. W. Kiddall	
A. M. Leverett	R. Hilton	
E. F. Leverett	K. Hilton	
E. Coe	W. Leverett	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the parish of Great Massingham, wish to support the Churchwardens and Rector of Little Massingham in appealing to the Privy Council against the scheme for uniting the benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We deprecate the injury which would be done to both parishes by seriously curtailing the spiritual ministrations and religious privileges which in the past their parishioners have enjoyed. One clergyman could not, in our opinion, efficiently fulfil the responsibilities and services hitherto shared by two resident Rectors. The loss to Little Massingham of its Ecclesiastical independence and of its Rectory, as well as the loss to both parishes resulting from the permanent alienation of tithe-income will, we think, be a grievous one.

Mr. Noah Daws	Mrs. Toft
Mrs Fanny Daws	Mr. T. Winter
George H. A. Cawthorne	Mr. Balders
Beatrice A. Cawthorne	Mrs. Balders
Emily M. Cawthorne	Mr. F. Balders
Herbert C. Cawthorne	Mr. J. Gibson
W. G. Cottis	Mrs. J. Gibson
E. J. Cottis	Mr. R. Reader
W. J. Hodson	Mrs. R. Reader
F. Hodson	Mrs. H. Callaby
E. J. Hodson	Mr. R. Callaby
R. Hodson	S. Elphinstone
Mrs. Powley	Mr. A. Glasswell
Mr. Powley	E. T. Glasswell
Mrs. A. Beales	F. Glasswell
Mrs. H. Russell	Mr. S. Marshall
P. Beales	Mrs. M. Marshall
Mrs. H. Sillis	J. Marshall
Mr. H. Sillis	D. Marshall
A. Moore	Hannah Rye
Mrs. A. Moore	William Chilvers.
Mrs. R. Edgar	
Mr. J. Wagg	
M. King	
Mr. S. Hare	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Little Massingham, hereby declare our hearty agreement with and earnest support of the Rector and Churchwardens of Little Massingham in their action of appealing to His Majesty in Council against the Scheme for the Union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We believe that the union, if carried out, would for years to come inflict upon the Parish and parishioners and therefore upon the National Church, an injury which would not be compensated by any setting free of a single clergyman for service elsewhere.

Little Massingham has existed for centuries as an independent parish with its own ecclesiastical and social organisation and life. A hundred years ago it had 11 houses with 150 inhabitants. Today it has 50 houses with 250, and is still developing. In its present unity and vigorous life as a community it is held together by the central influences of its Church and Rectory. To be deprived of its Rectory and resident Rector, and of the Tithe-income hitherto raised and received within its area, would be a loss which, being perpetuated through succeeding years, it would be difficult to over-estimate.

Edith Bocking	H. Olley
Thomas Bocking	G. H. Olley
Louisa Jarred	E. Sparrow
John Jarred	Mrs. G. Sparrow
W. Jarred	A. Shinn
W. Partridge	G. M. Shinn
S. Partridge	E. Burton
G. Yull	L. C. Burton
E. Yull	G. Burton
F. Cooper	J. Callaby
J. H. Cooper	F. M. Callaby
H. Cooper	E. M. Callaby
Mrs. Harvey	F. J. Callaby
Mrs. Strangleman	S. J. Harvey
Mr. Strangleman	
Stella Strangleman	
S. Gibson	
J. Gibson	
Mrs. Waters	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Little Massingham, hereby declare our hearty agreement with and earnest support of the Rector and Churchwardens of Little Massingham in their action of appealing to His Majesty in Council against the Scheme for the Union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We believe that the union, if carried out, would for years to come inflict upon the Parish and parishioners and therefore upon the National Church, an injury which would not be compensated by any setting free of a single clergyman for service elsewhere.

Little Massingham has existed for centuries as an independent parish with its own ecclesiastical and social organisation and life. A hundred years ago it had 11 houses with 125 inhabitants. Today it has 50 houses with 250 and is still developing. In its present unity and vigorous life as a community it is held together by the central influences of its Church and Rectory. To be deprived of its Rectory and resident Rector, and of the Tithe-income hitherto raised and received within its area, would be a loss which, being perpetuated through succeeding years, it would be difficult to over-estimate.

F. Mary Dring	H. S. Dixon-Spain	
Richard Dring	A. B. Dixon-Spain	
D. Beales	J. A. Bailey	- . 1. 0.
L. M. Wones	H. Letch	- . 1. 0.
G. Langley	M. Letch	- . 1. 0.
M. Callaby	F. S. Robinson	- . 1. 0.
P. Cooper	M. Robinson	- . 1. 0.
G. A. Hazel	H. M. Skeat	- . 1. 0.
C. H. Hazel	F. W. Craske	- . 1. 0.
D. Claxton	A. M. Craske	- . 1. 0.
A. Claxton	H. Callaby	
K. R. Mountain	A. J. Callaby	
J. G. Mountain	E. Coe	
J. Mountain	M. Coe	
J. Sculpher	A. Coe	
S. P. Sculpher	Mrs. May	
J. Lewis	J. Osborne	
E. D. Claxton	Mrs. Osborne	
C. Claxton	Edna Hurn	
Mr. Coe	Fred Hurn	
Mrs. Coe	Mrs. Hurn	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Little Massingham, hereby declare our hearty agreement with and earnest support of the Rector and Churchwardens of Little Massingham in their action of appealing to His Majesty in Council against the Scheme for the Union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We believe that the union, if carried out, would for years to come inflict upon the Parish and parishioners and therefore upon the National Church, an injury which would not be compensated by any setting free of a single clergyman for service elsewhere.

Little Massingham has existed for centuries as an independent parish with its own ecclesiastical and social organisation and life. A hundred years ago it had 11 houses with 125 inhabitants. Today it has 50 houses with 250, and is still developing. In its present unity and vigorous life as a community it is held together by the central influences of its Church and Rectory. To be deprived of its Rectory and Resident Rector, and of the Tithe-income hitherto raised and received within its area, would be a loss which, being perpetuated through succeeding years, it would be difficult to over-estimate.

Joshua Neale	Mr. C. R. Webster
Martha Neale	Mrs. A. E. Webster
John Barnes	Mrs. F. Harvey
Richard Barnes	Mr. F. Harvey
Emma M. Hewitt	Mrs. G. Manning
Eddgar Hewitt	E. Broughton
N. H. Reeve	A. E. Broughton
L. M. Reeve	William Softley
Mr. T. Callaby	N. Softley
Miss E. Callaby	D. Salmons
Mrs. E. Barnes	G. Johnson
G. P. Palgrave	H. A. Linford
R. Hendry	W. H. Linford
W. H. Reckitt	
D. Martin	
Mrs. E. M. Martin	
Frederick J. Lee	
K. M. Hudson	
Albert A. Vertigan	
Fanny Vertigan	
Geo. Vertigan	

We, the undersigned, adult residents in the Parish of Little Massingham, hereby declare our hearty agreement with and earnest support of the Rector and Churchwardens of Little Massingham in their action of appealing to His Majesty in Council against the Scheme for the Union of the Benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

We believe that the union, if carried out, would for years to come inflict upon the Parish and parishioners and therefore upon the National Church, an injury which would not be compensated by any setting free of a single clergyman for service elsewhere.

Little Massingham has existed for centuries as an independent parish with its own ecclesiastical and social organisation and life. A hundred years ago it had 11 houses with 125 inhabitants. Today it has 50 houses with 250, and is still developing. In its present unity and vigorous life as a community it is held together by the central influences of its Church and Rectory. To be deprived of its Rectory and Resident Rector, and of the Tithe-income hitherto raised and received within its area, would be a loss which, being perpetuated through succeeding years, it would be difficult to over-estimate.

S. Engledew	M. Engledew
C. E. Goodswen	H. G. Linford
H. F. Arter	H. A. Linford
W. J. Riddell	E. Linford
E. A. Riddell	F. L. Brereton
Fred. Baldwin	H. M. Brereton
G. Baldwin	J. Brereton
W. Watts	F. H. M. Brereton
E. Watts	A. F. Thompson
S. E. Vaughan	
M. Church	
H. Church	

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

IN THE MATTER of A SCHEME FOR THE
UNION of THE TWO BENEFICES OF GREAT
MASSINGHAM and LITTLE MASSINGHAM in
THE COUNTY OF NORFOLK and IN THE
DIOCESE OF NORWICH

PETITION OF APPEAL

ANSWER to The Appeal
commences on next page.

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of THE UNION of BENEFICES MEASURE 1923

-- and --

IN THE MATTER of a SCHEME framed by THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND for the UNION of the BENEFICES of GREAT MASSINGHAM and LITTLE MASSINGHAM in the COUNTY of NORFOLK and DIOCESE of NORWICH

FRANCIS LLOYD BRERETON, THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL of LITTLE MASSINGHAM, REGINALD BARROW and OLIVER BIRKBECK Appellants

-- and --

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND Respondents

T H E A N S W E R

--of--

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND (hereinafter called "the Ecclesiastical Commissioners") to the PETITION of THE REVD. FRANCIS LLOYD BRERETON, THE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL of LITTLE MASSINGHAM , REGINALD BARROW and OLIVER BIRKBECK.

S H E W E T H :-

1. THE two benefices In question represent two villages to the South West of Fakenham a somewhat thinly populated District in Norfolk. They are shown on the copy 1 inch Ordnance map annexed hereto and marked E. C. 1. Great Massingham being coloured Green thereon and Little Massingham Yellow.
2. THE proposed union of these two benefices has been under consideration since the year 1921. The fact however that the incumbents of Little Massingham have kept up a school for boys and girls on the actual premises of the Rectory has been

considered an obstacle to such a union. By a letter of the 24th August 1928 addressed to the Bishop annexed hereto and marked E. C. 2. the Petitioner the Reverend F. L. Brereton (who had already expressed his desire to purchase the parsonage house) gave as his reason for doing so that the school could then be carried on independently of a change in the incumbency and the question of a union which in such case would avoid the necessity of providing a new parsonage house came again under consideration.

3. THE following Commissioners were appointed:- James Alexander Hay of 11 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at law, nominated by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Frederick Keppel North of Rougham Hall Kings Lynn, Barrister at law and Chancellor of the Diocese, nominated by the Bishop, Alexander Hugh Munro of Holkham House, Dersingham, Kings Lynn, Esquire, nominated by the Patron and Parochial Church Council of Great Massingham, and Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Derick Seymour, D.L. , J. P., of Barwick House, Barwick, Stanhoe, Kings Lynn, nominated by the Patron and Parochial Church Council of Little Massingham. A copy of their Report is annexed hereto and marked E. C. 3.

4. THE said Commissioners were unanimous in recommending (14) That the benefices should be united (17) That Great Massingham House should be the parsonage house of the united benefice, and (20) That an endowment of £1200 per annum net should be appropriated to the united benefice out of the endowments of the separate benefices. The said James Alexander Hay is a Barrister of 40 years standing and has acted as Chairman of similar Commissioners on various other occasions. With an attendance of about fifty persons the Chairman, in keeping the meeting in hand and checking irrelevancies, may well cause offence and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners do not propose to deal further with the allegations in this respect

contained in the Petition and the evidence in support. So far (if at all) as the Incumbent of Great Massingham may have refused to summon a meeting of the Parochial Church Council (as alleged in the Petition) one third of the members of the Council could under the Rules of Procedure scheduled to the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure 1921 have convened a meeting.

5. THE population of Little Massingham is estimated by the Petitioners at 250 persons. The area of the Parish is 2289 acres but the main part of the population is gathered round the Church and the remainder about Massingham station. The income is £560. It would appear therefore to be a parish with a substantial income but not affording adequate sphere of work for one incumbent.

6. Great Massingham has a population of 726 persons and an area of 4422 acres. Much the greater part of the population is grouped round the church and the remainder of the parish largely consists of heath and common. Its endowment is the substantial one of £898. The distance between the two churches is approximately one mile. The two benefices therefore taken together represent a population of about 1000 persons with a combined income of £1458. The Reverend Canon Charles Mortimer McAnnally who is Honorary Canon of Norwich and Rural Dean of the District and has been incumbent of Great Massingham since 1896 gave his opinion at the Meeting that both benefices could be adequately served by a single incumbent. The Scheme provides that the incumbent shall employ such clerical or lay assistance in the performance of the duties as the Bishop may require and that the incumbent shall be liable to provide out of the income of the united benefice such a sum as may be necessary not exceeding £150 in any one year. Such a provision is by way of precaution only and does not imply that the Bishop will necessarily at any time or at all require such employment.

7. IT appeared to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, exercising Their discretion under S. 15 (1) of the Measure, that the total revenue of the united benefice was more than was required to form a competent provision for the united benefice and that it was desirable that the surplus revenue to the extent of £500 per annum should be applied for the benefit of other benefices in the same Diocese and they accordingly recommended by their original scheme that such annual sum should be appropriated as set out in that Scheme a copy whereof is annexed to the petition. By the letter of the 21st May 1929 annexed hereto and marked E. C. 4. the Petitioner Reginald Barrow, as Patron of Great Massingham, approved of the distribution of the £500 and by the letter of the 20th May 1929 annexed hereto and marked E. C. 5. the Petitioner F. L. Brereton as Patron of Little Massingham said he had no representation to make with respect to the disposal of the surplus revenue. After considering however the objections raised by the Petitioners, the Commissioners final Scheme proposed that the sum of £250 per annum only should be appropriated for the augmentation of the three benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall at the dates and in the proportions shewn by the Schedule thereto and that the said provision as to providing £150 per annum for clerical or lay assistance should be added. A copy of the said Scheme is annexed hereto and marked E. C. 6. The deduction of £250 per annum leaves to the united benefice the very adequate income of £1200 per annum recommended by the said Report of the Commission. None of the said three benefices has a competent provision belonging thereto. The income of Blakeney is £350, of Horsey £228 and of Kenninghall £350.

8. THE Petitioners objections to the said Scheme appear to fall into three categories, namely (A) Objections by tithe payers to any part of the tithe rentcharge being allotted to other benefices than those in which they arise (B) Objections

founded on the alleged interference with religious and social life and (C) Objections that the family of Brereton is of very old standing in the district and universally esteemed and respected and that anything done to diminish their status will be greatly resented. There appears to be a separate objection made on behalf of the Petitioner Reginald Barrow, patron of the living of Great Massingham as to the first right of presentation not being vested in him. His letter of the 6th June 1929 to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners raising the said objection is set out on pages 22 and 23 of the Schedule to the Petition but the answer of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to such objection contained in a letter of the 10th June 1929 is not so set out and is annexed hereto and marked E. C. 7.

9. AS to (A) the objections of the tithe payers: Tithe rentcharge is part of the endowments or property of the united benefice expressly authorised by section 15 (1) of the Measure to be appropriated for the augmentation of other benefices. Such appropriations have been authorised ever since the Pluralities Act 1837 (1 & 2 Vict. c. 106 a. 17).
10. AS to (B) The diminution of spiritual life in Little Massingham: As already stated the churches are only about one mile apart and the bulk of the population in both parishes is concentrated within a small area. Both the parochial work and the re-arrangement of services will be easy compared with many other unions and if the Bishop, who is primarily concerned in these matters, considers that the spiritual needs of the parishioners are not adequately provided for, he can insist on further clerical or lay assistance being provided. The incumbent of Great Massingham stated that in his opinion both benefices can be adequately served by a single Incumbent.
11. AS to (C) The alleged diminution of the influence and position of the Brereton family (the beneficent nature of which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are far from desirous of minimising): No change can occur during the life of the

present incumbent of Little Massingham save with his consent. While there can be no assurance in any case of one of that family always holding the incumbency, there is no reason why that family should not continue both the school and its other good work in the parish notwithstanding and in aid of the union.

12. AS to objections raised by outside bodies, although the Ecclesiastical Commissioners do not necessarily shut out from their consideration objections raised by any responsible body, the only objections with which they are concerned under the Measure are those raised by parishioners and the several persons and bodies referred to in section 10 (1) of the Measure. They respectfully submit that evidence by other persons and bodies is not admissible on this Appeal.
13. THE Scheme for this union is based on the propinquity of the two benefices, the scanty population of Little Massingham, and the unusual facilities by reason of the grouping of the population for adequately dealing with them as one benefice. One incumbent would take the place of two and not only is there a fully adequate income assured but there is a surplus income available for three poor benefices in the Diocese. The union will not take place so long as the present incumbent of Little Massingham remains incumbent and the fear which seems to dominate the Petition and the evidence in its support that the union will cause some diminution in the affection and respect in which his family is regarded would appear to be unfounded. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners submit that regard for a single family cannot outweigh the substantial advantages which accrue from the Union. That the reasons given by the tithe payers have no justification in law, and That having regard to the whole of the facts and circumstances of the case, the union will be in the interest of religion in England generally.

DATED this 24th day of November 1930

FRANCIS H. L. ERRINGTON.

E. C. 2.

Little Massingham Rectory,
King's Lynn.
August 24th 1928.

My dear Lord Bishop,

File No. 100, 023

My own idea, and that of my brothers and sisters who are wishing to join with me in the purchase of the existing Rectory, is as you express it - that my "family should still conduct the School, if they please to do so", in this house, and that their continuing to do should not be liable to be suddenly terminated by a change in the incumbency. Future incumbents, whether members of the family or not, would, we should hope, continue to interest themselves very much in the "Rectory School". They would not be prevented from doing so by the facts that they lived in a separate house, and were no longer personally responsible for the School's existence.

I am, my dear Lord Bishop,

Very faithfully and obediently yours,

(Sgd) F. L. BRERETON.

E. C. 3.

UNION OF BENEFICES MEASURE 1923

Proposed Union of

Great Massingham and Little Massingham

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Norwich:

We, the undersigned commissioners appointed by your Lordship to inquire into all the facts and circumstances of the Benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham relevant to the question of their union and after considering the matters under inquiry in their relation to the circumstances and interests of the said Benefices and to the interests of religion in England generally to report to your Lordship whether such union should be made and to make recommendations as to the terms on which any union or other proposal in favour of which we report shall be carried into effect desire to submit to your Lordship the following Report.

(2) We have held a public Inquiry at the Village Hall, Great Massingham, on the 15th December 1928, in accordance with the Union of Benefices Measure, 1923, and the Statutory Rules applicable to proceedings under such Measure.

(3) At such Inquiry all the Commissioners were present. About fifty persons attended.

(4) Evidence

The information and evidence put before us are summarised in this and subsequent paragraphs.

The Parochial Church Councils of both Parishes have met to discuss the proposed union, and in each case a resolution against union was passed .

A Meeting of adult parishioners of Little Massingham

considered the proposal, and passed a resolution adverse to union.

Canon McAnally, Incumbent of Great Massingham, stated that in his opinion both Benefices could be adequately served by a single Incumbent, and he supported the proposal.

Opinions adverse to union were expressed by the Reverend F. L. Brereton, Incumbent of Little Massingham, by Mr. Charles Dewar of Great Massingham one of the Churchwardens, and by Mr. Cracknall, Schoolmaster and Churchwarden.

Mr. P. A. Bainbridge, Solicitor, addressed us on behalf of Mr. Barrow, Patron of Great Massingham.

The main ground of objection appeared to be the very natural fear that an union would involve a diminution of services in each Church, and a loss to each Parish of its individuality and independence in social work and organisation.

The fact that members of Mr. Brereton's family have for some generations held the living of Little Massingham, and have had very happy relations with their parishioners, has no doubt accentuated the feeling of opposition in Little Massingham.

In Great Massingham nearly the whole of the population is grouped round the Church. In Little Massingham the great bulk of the population lies within half a mile of the Church. There is a certain amount of new building going on in each parish, and the tendency of the population is to increase, but the general opinion appeared to be that there is not likely to be any considerable increase in the near future.

Both Parsonage Houses are unusually large and correspondingly expensive to keep up, but the situation of the Great Massingham house renders it the more suitable house for a united Benefice.

Otherwise there is little, if anything, to choose between the two houses.

(5) Populations (Census 1921)

The Populations of the Parishes according to the Census of 1921 was as follows:-

Great Massingham 726 persons

Little Massingham 235 “

and is estimated at present to be rather larger in each case.

(6) Areas

The area of the Parishes is approximately as follows:-

Great Masingham 4242 acres

Little Massingham 2289 “

(7) Incumbents

The Reverend Canon Charles Mortimer McAnally has been Incumbent of Great Massingham since 1896 and the Revd. Francis Lloyd Brereton Incumbent of Little Massingham since 1924.

(8) Church Services and Congregations

Great Massingham

	Normal attendance
Every Sunday	
8 a.m. Early celebration	10 to 12
11 a.m. Morning service	25 to 30
6.30 p.m. Evening service	80 to 100
Sunday School 10 a.m.	
Children's service 2.30 p.m.	40

Little Massingham

8 a.m. Early celebration once a month	8 to 12
<u>Every Sunday</u>	
11 a.m. Morning service	45 to 50
6.30 p.m. Evening service	30 to 35
Sunday School 10 a.m. and 2 p.m.	

(9) Church Accommodation

Great Massingham about 350 sittings

Little Massingham about 150 sittings

(10) Distance between Churches

The distance between the Churches is approximately a mile.

(11) Parsonage Houses

Great Massingham Parsonage House contains 4 Living Rooms, 14 Bed Rooms, Stable and Coachhouse.

Little Massingham Parsonage House contains 4 Living Rooms, 18 Bed Rooms, and other buildings outside the house itself.

Both are said to be too large and expensive.

(12) Endowments

The net annual incomes of the two benefices are approximately: -

Great Massingham £900

Little Massingham £540

(13) Patronage

The patronage of the Benefice of Great Massingham belongs to R. Barrow, Esquire, of No. 32 Clothorn Road, Didsbury.

Manchester and that of the Benefice of Little Massingham to the Reverend F. L. Brereton (the Incumbent).

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend:-

(14) As regards the union of the Benefices:

That the Benefices be united.

(15) AS regards the name of the United Benefice:

That the name be "Great with Little Massingham"

(16) As regards the Union of the Parishes

That the Parishes be not united.

(17) AS regards the Parsonage House of the United Benefice:

That the Great Massingham house be the Parsonage House of the United Benefice.

(18) AS regards the event upon which the union is to take effect:

That the union take effect on the first avoidance of Little Massingham.

(19) AS regards the patronage of the United Benefice for the first and all succeeding turns after the union has taken effect :

That the first turn after union belong to the Patron of Little Massingham and the second and third to the Patron of Great Massingham, and similarly in the case of every three turns thereafter.

(20) AS regards the endowments of the United Benefice:

That an endowment of £1200 per annum net be appropriated to the United Benefice out of the endowments of the separate Benefices.

(Sgd)	J. A. HAY
“	F. K. NORTH
“	C. D. SEYMOUR
“	ALEX. H. MUNRO.

January 1929.

Little Massingham House,
Massingham,
Norfolk.

Dear Mr. Brereton,

I am more than distressed that I am unable to be present at the meeting on Sat. owing to an engagement of long standing. I may be able to get there late and will if I can. I consider that the suggestion to join the 2 Parishes together would do the greatest possible harm to both Villages, and I know that practically the entire Village of L. Massingham thinks as I do. I should be very sorry to see the 2 Livings Joined together as I am sure one man couldn't efficiently carry out the duties of both.

(Sgd) O. BIRDECK.

E. C. 4.

Lynton,
32 Clothorn Road,
Didsbury, Manchester.
May 21st 1929.

Secretary
of Ecclesiastical Commission.

Dear Sir,

File No. 100930

In writing to acknowledge your letter of the 14th concerning the union of Great & Little Massingham I quite approve of your distribution of the £500.

I hope to hear of the scheme as soon as possible.

Yours truly,
(sgd) REGINALD BARROW.

E. C. 5.

Little Massingham Rectory.

King's Lynn.

May 20. 1929.

Dear Sir,

"U. B. "

File No. 100939

I beg to acknowledge the letter of the 14th inst. informing me that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are taking steps to carry into effect the union of the benefices of Great and Little Massingham.

As Patron of Little Massingham I have no representation to make with respect to the disposal of the 'surplus revenue'

I am, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(sgd) F. L. BRERETON

The Secy.

Eccles. Commn.

E. C. 6.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council:

We, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, acting in pursuance of the Union of Benefices Measure 1923, have prepared and now humbly lay before Your Majesty in Council the following Scheme for effecting the union of the Benefice (being a Rectory) of Great Massingham and the Benefice (being a Rectory) of Little Massingham, both of which Benefices are situate in the County of Norfolk and in the Diocese of Norwich

Whereas Commissioners appointed at our request by the Right Reverend Bertram Bishop of Norwich pursuant to the provisions of the said Union of Benefices Measure 1923, to inquire into and report upon the union of the said two Benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham duly made their Report to the said Bishop of Norwich and therein recommended the union of the said two Benefices and the terms for effecting the union, and the said Bishop of Norwich signified in writing his approval of the said Report

And whereas we the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England have prepared this Scheme for the union of the said two Benefices based upon the terms recommended in the said Report

And whereas both of the said Benefices of Great Massingham and Little Massingham are now full the Reverend Canon Charles Mortimer McAnally being the present Incumbent of the said Benefice of Great Massingham and the Reverend Francis Lloyd Brereton being the present Incumbent of the said Benefice of Little Massingham

Now, therefore, we, the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, with the consent of the said Bertram, Bishop of Norwich (in testimony whereof he has signed this Scheme) do Humbly recommend and propose to Your Majesty as follows, that is to say :

1. That the said Benefice of Great Massingham and the said

Benefice of Little Massingham shall be permanently united together and form one Benefice with cure of souls under the style of “The United Benefice of Great Massingham with Little Massingham” but the Parishes of the said Benefices shall continue distinct in all respects.

2. That if upon the day when any Order of Your Majesty in Council ratifying this Scheme shall be published in the London Gazette both of the said two Benefices shall be vacant, the union of the same two Benefices shall take effect forthwith and if the said Benefice of Little Massingham only shall be then vacant the said union shall also take effect forthwith if the Incumbent of the other of the said two Benefices shall consent to become the first Incumbent of the United Benefice, but if he shall not so consent, then the said union shall take effect upon the then next avoidance of the said Benefice of Great Massingham and the then Incumbent of Little Massingham shall be the first Incumbent of the United Benefice, and if the said Benefice of Great Massingham only shall be then vacant the said union shall take effect upon the next avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham and if neither of the said two Benefices be then vacant, then the said union shall take effect on the next avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham if the Incumbent at that time of the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall have been instituted to Great Massingham subsequently to the date of the publication in the London Gazette of any Order of Your Majesty in Council ratifying this Scheme or if instituted before that date shall consent to become the Incumbent of the United Benefice, but if he shall have been instituted to the said Benefice of Great Massingham before that date and shall not so consent, then the said union shall take effect immediately upon the next vacancy of the said Benefice of Great Massingham following such avoidance of the said Benefice of Little Massingham and the then Incumbent of

the said Benefice of Little Massingham shall become the first Incumbent of the United Benefice.

3. That at any time and from time to time after the Union has taken effect the Incumbent of the United Benefice shall employ such clerical or lay assistance in the performance of the duties of the United Benefice as the Bishop may require and towards the remuneration of clergy or lay workers so required to be employed the Incumbent of the United Benefice shall be liable to provide out of the income of the United Benefice such sum as may be necessary not exceeding the sum of £150 in any one year.

4. That upon the said union taking effect the Parsonage House at present belonging to the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall become and be the house of residence for the Incumbent of the United Benefice and so soon as conveniently may be the Parsonage House at present belonging to the said Benefice of Little Massingham and the site and appurtenances thereof and the grounds theretofore usually occupied and enjoyed therewith shall be sold and disposed of by us the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners at such time or times and in such manner in all respects as to us shall seem expedient and that the net proceeds of such sale shall constitute and form part of the Expenses Fund established pursuant to the 32nd Section of the said Union of Benefices Measure 1923.

5. That after the said union has taken effect the course and succession in which the respective Patrons shall present or nominate to the United Benefice from time to time as the same shall become vacant shall be as follows, that is to say, that in every series of three successive turns of presentation or nomination to be made to the United Benefice after the union the Patron of the said Benefice of Little Massingham shall have the first turn and the Patron of the said Benefice of Great Massingham shall have the second and the third turns.

6. That all the tithe rentcharges, glebe lands and all other the endowments belonging to the said United Benefice or which may hereafter belong to the same United Benefice shall be charged and for ever after be chargeable in favour of the Incumbents for the time being of the three Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall, all in the said Diocese of Norwich with the annual sums or yearly rentcharges set forth in the Schedule hereto annexed, the same annual sums or yearly rentcharges to be as from the dates respectively mentioned in the said Schedule due and payable to the Incumbents of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall respectively, and the said annual sums or yearly rentcharges to be apportionable in each case between any outgoing Incumbent of any of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall or his representatives on the one hand and his successor in the same Incumbency on the other hand and to be receivable by the Incumbents in whose favour they are charged as aforesaid by equal half yearly payments on the first day of May and the first day of November in every year and for the recovery of the said yearly rentcharges in each case the Incumbents of the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall and their successors shall have and be entitled to all the powers and remedies provided by Sections 121 and 122 of the Law of Property Act 1925 in respect of rentcharges to which those Sections apply. Provided always that if at any time the Incumbent for the time being of the said United Benefice shall by any deed duly executed by him under his hand and seal in accordance with the provisions of any statute in that behalf enabling him, grant, convey and annex to the said Benefices of Blakeney, Horsey and Kenninghall or any of them, any part or parts of the endowments belonging to the said United Benefice which shall in the opinion of the Bishop of Norwich for the time being be a just and fair equivalent or not less

than an equivalent for all or any of the said yearly rent charges hereby proposes to be created as aforesaid then in every case in which such equivalent provision shall have been made the corresponding annual sum or yearly rentcharge shall thereupon and thenceforth cease and be no longer payable.

Provided always that nothing herein contained shall prevent us from recommending and proposing any other measures relating to the matters aforesaid, or any of them, in accordance with the provisions of the said Measure, or of any other measure of the National Assembly of the Church of England, or of any Act of Parliament.

All which we do hereby certify and do humbly recommend and propose to your Majesty in Council.

In witness whereof we the said Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England have hereunto set out Common Seal this 12th day of December 1929.

SCHEDULE

Benefice in favour of which Charges are created upon the revenues of the United Benefice	Annual sums or yearly rentcharges charged on the said revenues £	Dates from which charges are to take effect
Blakeney	50	Date of Union
Kenninghall	50	do.
Blakeney	50	Date of Union or date of cessation of any pension granted to the present Incumbent of Little Massingham whichever shall happen later
Horsey	25	do.
Kenninghall	75	do.

E. C. 7.

Ecclesiastical Commission,
Millbank, Westminster.
10th June 1929.

Messrs. Slater Heelis & Co.,
71 Princess Street,
Manchester.

Dear Sirs,

File No. 100,930
Great Massingham
Little Massingham
Proposed Union of Benefices

I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th inst. which shall be submitted to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners as an objection to their draft Scheme in this case.

The proposals as to the exercise of the patronage of the United Benefices are in accordance with the general practice adopted in cases of similar circumstances; the Patron of Great Massingham being awarded two out of every three turns of presentation on account of the greater value of Great Massingham, and the Patron of Little Massingham having the first turn of presentation, because the nominee of the patron of Great Massingham will, under the terms of the Scheme, become the first Incumbent of the United Benefices.

I am, dear Sirs,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd) S. E. DOWNING.

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of THE UNION of
BENEFICES MEASURE 1923

-- and --

IN THE MATTER of a SCHEME framed
by THE ECCLESIASTICAL
COMMISSIONERS for ENGLAND
for the UNION of the BENEFICES
of GREAT MASSINGHAM and LITTLE
MASSINGHAM in the COUNTY of
NORFOLK and DIOCESE of NORWICH

FRANCIS LLOYD BRERETON and Others
Appellants

-- and --

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS
FOR ENGLAND Respondents

A N S W E R

--of--

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS
FOR ENGLAND.