

NOTES ON PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION IN SURREY.

BY

H. E. MALDEN, M.A.

BY the Act 8 H. VI, Cap. 7, passed in 1429, the County franchise was restricted to freeholders of 40s. annual value, living in the County. It is complained that a mixed multitude present at the County Court had voted, many of them people of no substance, and, we may certainly infer, not freeholders. The suitors at the County Court would normally include the Reeve and four men from the townships, who would be tenants in villenage. The Act has been described as a reactionary measure, designed to make the representation less popular, and to throw influence into the hands of the great lords. It is open to argument whether the exclusion of villein voters would not decrease the influence of the lords of manors. It is also arguable that the practical change did not amount to very much, and that the returns, before and after the Act, were really determined by the few leading people whose names appeared on the indentures with the writ returned. It has seemed to me worth while to examine the actual returns of Knights of the Shire for Surrey, just before and just after the Act. My conclusion is that, before and after, men of the same class, of the same family, sometimes identical men, were returned, if not for the county on each occasion, yet for boroughs in the county. No class is excluded, no new class brought in.

In 1425 John Ferriby sat for the County. A John Ferriby, King's Clerk, received the reversion of Witley manor for life in 1422, and a John Ferriby married Margery Berners, daughter and heiress of Richard Berners of West Horsley, and held his first court of the manor of West Horsley in 1420. He died

in 1441. As a married man he was not the same as the King's Clerk of Witley. He was Knight of the Shire in 1429 and 1433, before and after the Act.

The other member in 1425 was John Wyntereshulle. He also sat in 1433. Whereas Ferriby¹ was probably a new-comer into Surrey, Wyntereshulle belonged to a family seated between Guildford and Godalming for many generations. They became of less note about Elizabeth's time, not without suspicion of Catholic recusancy as a cause. This man represented the County again in 1433, Thomas Wyntereshulle was member in 1435. The relationship of the Wyntereshulles is hard to disentangle, but Robert Wyntereshulle was member for Guildford in 1429 and 1433, Francis Wyntereshulle for the same in 1431. They were a parliamentary family. A Thomas Wyntereshulle had sat for the County in 1398 and a John Wyntereshulle had sat several times in Henry IV's reign. They do not appear again after Thomas's election in 1435.

In 1426 the Knights of the Shire were John Clipsham and William Otteworth. The former had been member in 1414, 1417, 1421, 1423, and again in 1427. He does not reappear after the disfranchising Act.

The latter had been member in 1421, and after the Act in 1432 and 1437. The family were named from a small manor which they held of Bramley, in Cranleigh and Wonersh.

In 1427 the members were John Clipsham (see above) and John Weston. The latter was of the family who held at West Clandon, Albury and elsewhere, not to be confounded with the later Westons of Sutton Place. John Weston was again Knight of the Shire in 1431, after the Act, and in 1435. The family had represented the county under Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V. On occasions they had sat for Guildford. William Weston, son of John, was Knight of the Shire in 1447. There is no indication that the parliamentary fortunes of the house were made or marred by the legislation of 1429. It may be significant of the influence of the landed gentry that William Weston and Francis Wyntereshulle were burgesses for Guildford in 1431.

In 1429 John Ferriby, *vide supra*, was one County member, and Richard Terell was the other. Terell had been elected

¹ There is a place Ferriby in Yorkshire, and another in Lincolnshire.

before, in 1422. His name does not occur after the Act, but he was *Armiger*, and there is no ground for thinking him to have been a member outside the usual class of gentlemen.

In 1431 we have John Weston, mentioned above, and John Gaynesford. The latter's name is the first appearance in the lists of that of an influential family who had first acquired Crowhurst in East Surrey in 1338, and continued to be a leading house during the rest of the fifteenth century, after this election in 1431. They furnished County members, also members for Blechingley, and occasionally were Sheriffs, down to the sixteenth century. Then they became less noted, though the family held Crowhurst in the male line, down to the seventeenth century, and in the female line later. If there is any difference in the position of John Gaynesford compared with the other members so far it is that his family belonged to East Surrey. The previous members were West Surrey men, unless John Ferriby of West Horsley be accounted a Mid-Surrey man. The election was of course held at Guildford, and it is possible that an Act which excluded a casual collection of voters, who would largely belong to the neighbourhood of the County Court, may have been more favourable to candidates from a distance.

In the next election, 1432, with William Otteworth, or Utteworth (see above), we have William Uvedale, of Titsey and elsewhere in Surrey, Kent and Hampshire, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1429, and a man of influence beyond Surrey. A Thomas de Uvedale had sat for the County in 1361 and in 1365. In 1433 John Ferriby and John Wyntereshulle were members (*vide supra*). John Gaynesford *Junior* sat for Blechingley, and Robert Wyntereshulle for Guildford, in the same parliament. In 1435 we have John Weston and Thomas Wyntereshulle.

I submit that in the *personnel* of the Knights of the Shire for Surrey, immediately before and after the disfranchising Act, we have no evidence of any sweeping change, nor of any change at all, I may say, in the character of the representation. Before the Tudors several families seem to be prominent for some generations together, Dabernon, Burstowe, Codyngton, Hadresham, Loxley, Hayton, in earlier centuries, Westons very constantly. A Carew appears for the first time in

1360, for the last time in 1529, and seldom between¹ except from 1393 to 1398. But the families were all of the same class, landed gentry, of respectable but not of the highest importance.

THE MORE FAMILY IN PARLIAMENT

Sir Christopher More	Knt. of the Shire	1547
William More, Gent.	Reigate	do.
do. do. Esq.	Guildford	1554
do. do. do.	do.	1555
do. do. do.	Knt. of the Shire	1563
do. do. do.	Guildford	1572
Sir William More	Knt. of the Shire	1584
George More.	Guildford	do.
Sir William More	Knt. of the Shire	1586
George More.	Guildford	do.
Sir William More }	do.	1589
George More }		
Sir William More	Knt. of the Shire	1593
George More.	Guildford	do.
George More, Esq.	Knt. of the Shire	1597
Sir William More	Guildford	do.
Sir George More	Knt. of the Shire	1601
Robert More	Guildford	do.
Sir Robert More	Knt. of the Shire	1604
Sir George More	Guildford	do.
do. do.	Knt. of the Shire	1614
Sir Robert More	Guildford	do.
Sir George More	Knt. of the Shire	1621
Sir Robert More	Guildford	do.
² { do. do.	Knt. of the Shire	1624
{ Sir George More.	Guildford	do.
{ Poynings More	Haslemere	do.
² { Sir George More.	Knt. of the Shire	1625
{ Sir Robert More.	Guildford	do.
{ Poynings More	Haslemere	do.
Sir George More	Knt. of the Shire	1626
Poynings More	Haslemere	do.
"Poynings" More.	Guildford	1628
Sir "Poynings" More, Knt. and Bt. (Long Parl., ob. 1649)	Haslemere	1640
Sir William More, Bt.	Haslemere, <i>vice</i> Thomas Morrice, dcd. . .	1675
do. do.	Haslemere	1679
do. do.	do. do.	1681

¹ Francis Carewe sat for Haslemere, with a More, in 1626, and Sir Nicholas Carew in 1714.

² Three generations in each of these Parliaments.

THE MORE FAMILY RECORD

Christopher More, b. — ? Knt. 1532. Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex 1532, 1539. King's Remembrancer of the Exchequer 1545. Died 1549.

William More, b. 1520. Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex 1558 and 1559, and again in 1580. Knt. 1576. Deputy Lieutenant of Surrey 1569. Vice-Admiral of Sussex, before July 31, 1561, Constable of Farnham Castle and Keeper of the Parks for life, December 24, 1565 (with reversion to his son George). Died 1600.

George More, b. 1553. Knt. 1597. Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex 1598. Lieutenant of the Tower 1615-17. Deputy Lieutenant of Surrey 1596. Died 1632.

Robert More, b. 1581. Knt. 1621. Died 1626.

Poynings More, b. 1606. Baronet 1642. Died 1649.

William More, b. 1643. Sheriff 1669. Died 1684.

Christopher More (Knt.)

b. ? d. 1549.

|

William More (Knt.)

b. 1520. d. 1600.

|

George More (Knt.)

b. 1553. d. 1632.

|

Robert More (Knt.)

b. 1581. d. 1626 v.p.

|

Poynings More (Knt. and Baronet)

b. 1606. d. 1649.

|

William More (Knt. and Baronet)

b. 1643. d. 1684. S. pr. M.

Whether or no elections under the Lancastrians had been influenced by leading men, there is no doubt that under the Tudors, especially at critical times, "My Lords of the Council" had something to say to them. At the end of 1558 the very important elections to the first parliament of Elizabeth were pending. The question of the restoration of the Royal *vice* the Papal Supremacy was in the air, and it was by no means certain what line freely elected members would take. William More was Sheriff, a safe supporter of the Queen's Government. It is clear that he had already himself written to Thomas Browne of Betchworth on the subject of his becoming a candidate for the County. There are several letters among the Loseley MSS. about the matter. The one common feature is the evident conviction of all the writers that if they can win

the approval of the Sheriff, the returning officer, they or their friends are secure of election. Sir Thomas Copley was first in the field and wrote December 7th asking for More's support of his candidature. Copley was always possessed with a high idea of his own importance. He had a pocket borough of his own, Gatton, for which he had sat under Mary, and which he represented again in Elizabeth's second parliament. He was distantly related to the Queen through her mother, but he was not a safe royal supporter. He ultimately became an avowed Catholic Recusant, and died abroad. Nevertheless he had his backing now. On December 14th Thomas Browne wrote to the Sheriff declining his proffered support for himself, on the grounds of inexperience and ill-health, but recommending Copley as a friend of Sir Thomas Cawarden, a safe courtier. On 16th December Sir William Fitzwilliam wrote to More, asking him to defer his acceptance of Browne's refusal, to whom he had apparently written himself. Whether Fitzwilliam's advice was the additional cause or not, Browne changed his mind, and wrote to More on December 18th saying that he had done so, on the advice of his father, and that he wished to stand. December 20th the powerful voice of Lord William Howard (Lord Howard of Effingham, the Queen's mother's uncle) recommends his eldest son Charles Howard.¹ On the 27th Mr. Richard Bydon recommended Sir Thomas Copley and Mr. Browne. Sir Henry Weston, of Sutton, recommended himself, to More and to Mr. Bydon who seems to have possessed some influence with More. He was unacceptable for the same reason as Copley, undoubted Popish connexions. Sir Thomas Cawarden and Mr. Browne were elected. Sir Thomas had sat in the Parliament which restored Papal Supremacy, but he had been colourably suspected of intending to join Sir Thomas Wyatt, his arms had been seized on that account, he was an occupant of Abbey lands, and a quite safe government man. When he died the next year

¹ For the present, in spite of the relationship to the Queen, the Howard interest might appear to be doubtfully in favour of the desired Royal Supremacy. Lord Howard of Effingham had been a trusted minister of Queen Mary: one of the few honest and able members of her government. Subsequently he and his son Charles completely accepted the Elizabethan settlement. That the latter was a Roman Catholic when he defeated the Armada is a baseless invention.

Parliament had just been dissolved. Charles Howard and More himself sat in the next Parliament, for the County. In 1597, when Charles was earl of Nottingham, his eldest son William, who had been representing the County, was called to the Upper House, and the earl wrote to Sir George More, who was Sheriff, recommending his second son, Charles, who was returned accordingly.

In 1586 the Government wished to nominate the members *en bloc*. The Council wrote to the Sheriff desiring him to associate with himself two or three well-affected gentlemen, to call the chief people from each constituency before them, and to ask them to choose if possible the same members who had represented them in the previous Parliament, as these had proved themselves to be "wise and well-affected gentlemen."¹ The constituencies were generally amenable to persuasion. Thomas Copley's widow, the only voter for Gatton, was not consulted, not because she was a woman but because she was a notorious recusant. The Justices were told by the Council to nominate for Gatton two loyal members, which they did.²

CERTAIN MEMBERS, AND BOROUGHES

The earliest extant returns are of Roland de Acstede and William Ambesas, in 1290, for the Shire.

The former was of the old family of Acstede (Oxstede). He died the next year, seised of the manor of Oxted, his co-heiresses being five daughters.

William Ambesas acquired the manor of Carshalton in 1302, but was in the neighbourhood before. He witnessed an undated deed in Ewell about 1290-1300.

In 1295, one of the members for Guildford was Andrew the Constable. This is Sir Andrew of Calais (not yet an English possession), a Frenchman, an officer of the King, and by no means a popular representative. He was burgess for Guildford in 1301, 1302, 1307, 1309, 1313, 1315, 1322, not continuously therefore but generally, representing the King rather than the town. In 1324 John the Constable appears, again twice in 1330 (March and November), twice in 1332 (March and September), in 1334 and 1336. Hereafter the

¹ Letter in Loseley MSS., 19th Sept., 1586.

² *Ibid.*, 27th Sept., 1586.

obviously royal representation ceases, though it may be suspected in some other cases, as of John Pykard in 1336, 1346, 1351, 1352, 1354, 1355, and Andrew at Park the same year, and in 1360, and John Mareschal in 1358. The Pykard family were lawyers, and the two latter names suggest officers of the royal manor. Thomas Brocas (Guildford, 1390, 1395) was of a family of Gascon origin, royal servants.

Blechingley was obviously created as a de Clare borough. William le Welsch, in 1298, suggests a de Clare tenant from the Welsh Marches, where the Earls of Gloucester were a sort of local kings.

It was as expedient for the smooth conduct of parliamentary business that nominees of the greater Barons should sit in the Commons, as it was in the eighteenth century that dependants of the great Whig houses should be there. As necessary, one may add, as it is that members now should be followers of known political leaders, not free-lances.

Reigate may have been originally a Warenne stronghold, but the local family of Skinner established a prescriptive right to the representation which prevailed longer than most local connexions. John Skynnere was member in 1351, and the same name occurs in 1354, 1360, 1361, 1363, 1372, 1383 (Feb.), 1383 (Oct.), 1384, 1395, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1414, 1415, 1420, 1450, 1467, 1472, 1478, 1529, 1543 (*bis*), 1554, 1559, 1572. There are no returns 1478-1529. In 1555 and 1558, John Skinner, who had sat for Reigate, with his father, in 1542, sat for the County. In early days a Chaunce had often shared the Reigate representation. The Skinners were connected at least with Catholic recusancy, which may explain their sitting for the County in 1554 and 1558, and their disappearance from the lists after the first Parliament of Elizabeth, except in 1572.

Among Surrey Boroughs Kingston was represented in 1311, 1313, and 1373; on the first occasion by Adam le Templer, and John de Cruce (de la Croix), a country gentleman, not a tradesman of Kingston.¹ On the third occasion Hugh le

¹ Adam le Templer was not probably a Knight of the Temple. They had been all arrested in England three years before 1311. Peter le Templer appears in Fines in Kingston in 32nd Henry III.

Geoffrey de la Croix was a landholder near or in Kingston Hundred,

Taverner is pretty obviously one of the latter class. Tradition has it that the inhabitants petitioned successfully to be relieved of the burden of paying members, but the petition is not extant.

Farnham returned members in 1311 and in 1460. They must have really represented the Bishops of Winchester.

Haslemere was created as a Borough by Elizabeth, to strengthen Crown influence. When the Royal Hundred of Godalming was granted to the Mores of Loseley, this borough passed into an equally safe Government interest. In 1601 in the first Parliament after the grant of the Hundred of Godalming to Sir George More, Francis Wolley, his nephew, was elected for Haslemere.

Gatton was a rotten Borough from its birth, in 1450. It was no doubt given representation to gratify John Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, under whom it was held by John Tymperly. The latter did not at first represent Gatton, but sat for Reigate in 1453 and 1460; but John Tymperley, Senior, sat for Gatton in 1472. Reigate was also little better than a pocket-Borough of the Duke of Norfolk's.

Sir William More began his long parliamentary career as a member for Reigate in 1547. By that time the Dukedom of Norfolk had passed to the Howards, and was for the present extinguished under attainder. The Howard interest had, however, been strengthened in Reigate in another way, by the grant, at the dissolution, of Reigate Priory to Lord William Howard, later Lord Howard of Effingham. Various Howards sat for Reigate after this, but it is interesting to note that in 1555, under Lord William's influence, one member was Walter Haddon, the distinguished Civilian, then Professor of Civil Law in Oxford, but who had been for a few months of 1552 Master of Trinity Hall, Lord William's own college in Cambridge. Was the powerful Lord Admiral gratifying an old college don of his acquaintance?

whose name is inserted in a forged charter of Chertsey Abbey in the thirteenth century. The name de Cruce also appears in Fines of Henry III and Edward I's reigns, and is in Testa de Nevill.

SURREY MEMBERS OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT, AND OF THE
PARLIAMENTS OF THE INTERREGNUM

The Long Parliament

THE COUNTY { Sir Richard Onslow, Knt.
 { Sir Ambrose Browne, Bart.

The same two had sat for the County in 1628, before the long cessation of Parliament. Sir Richard Onslow, as Deputy Lieutenant for the Earl of Nottingham, was in command of the Surrey Militia for the Parliament at the opening of the Civil War. He continued in command of the local military forces during the war. He was, probably falsely, accused of being dilatory in taking them to Worcester in 1651. He was excluded from the House by Pride's Purge, in 1648, but sat in the first Protectorate Parliament of 1654, and in that of 1656, and was made a member of Cromwell's House of Lords that year. He represented Guildford in the Convention of 1660, and in the Restoration Parliament of 1661. He died in 1664.

Sir Ambrose Browne, who had been Sheriff in 1625, and was created a Baronet in 1627, was a moderate Parliamentarian. He continued to sit at Westminster after the Civil War began, but ceased to take any active part in the House before the trial of the King. He was not in the Parliaments of the Interregnum, and died in 1661, when his son Adam was representing the County in the Restoration Parliament.

BLECHINGLEY { John Evelyn.
 { Edward Bysshe.

The former was Sir John Evelyn of Godstone, Knight before 1637; member for Blechingley 1628, sat in the Short Parliament of 1640. An active opponent of the King in the Long Parliament. Commissioner of the Admiralty, 1645. Perhaps sat for Blechingley in the Convention of 1660, but not in the Restoration Parliament of 1661.

Edward Bysshe, Junior, was of Smallfield Place, he was Garter, and then Clarenceux, King at Arms. His father, not he, had been member in 1625, 1626, 1628, 1640, perhaps in 1624, when the name Edward Rich is in the printed returns.

The son sat for Reigate in Cromwell's first Parliament, 1654, for Gatton in Richard Cromwell's Parliament in 1659, and for Blechingley again in 1661. He died in 1679.

GATTON { Sir Samuel Owlfield.
Thomas Sandys.

The former had sat in all the Parliaments from 1624. He was lord of the manor of Upper Gatton. He died in 1645 and was succeeded by his son William Owlfield. William Owlfield sat in the Convention and the first Restoration Parliament.

The latter may have been Thomas Sandys of Pachevesham Parva and Randalls in Letherhead, born 1601. In the year of his birth Richard Sandys had been member for Gatton—his father I think.

GUILDFORD { Sir Robert Parkhurst, Knt.
George Abbott.

The former was son of another Sir Robert Parkhurst, Lord Mayor of London, d. 1637. The younger Sir Robert had represented Guildford in all the previous Parliaments of the reign. He died in 1651. The family had acquired the manor of Pirford in Surrey. They were Surrey folk by origin, but had acquired wealth and position by trade in London.

George Abbott was son of Sir Maurice Abbott, who was Lord Mayor and brother of the late Archbishop of Canterbury. George sat also in the Short Parliament. He died in 1645, when Nicholas Stoughton, of Stoughton near Guildford, of a well known Puritan family, was elected.

HASLEMERE { Sir John Jaques, Bt.
Sir Poynings More, Kt. & Bt.

Sir John Jaques was a Gentleman Pensioner of the King, created a Baronet in 1628. He represented Haslemere in the Short Parliament also, and was resident there in 1641, and perhaps before his election. His property in Haslemere was bought by Sir Poynings More, his fellow member, in 1643. He died in January, 1661.

Sir Poynings More, of the well known political family of Loseley, had sat for Haslemere in 1624, 1625, 1626, and for Guildford in 1628. He was not in the Short Parliament. His name is not among those excluded by Pride's Purge in 1648,

but he had withdrawn from active work in Parliament, and died in April 1649. He was not a man of the force of character of his grandfather Sir George, nor his great-grandfather Sir William.

There is some uncertainty about the representation of Haslemere. The returns as printed for the House of Commons, in 1878, are as above; Poynings More and Jaques. But Rushworth gives John Goodwyn instead of Jaques. In June 1649, after the death of More, the House admitted Carey Rawleigh, son of Sir Walter, as member for Haslemere. Goodwyn was an ardent Parliamentary supporter, who sat in the Protectorate and Convention Parliaments, for Blechingley on the latter occasion, but was not elected in 1661. He got into financial trouble after the Restoration by having bought the estates of the bishopric of Winchester.

REIGATE { William Viscount Mounson (Irish Peer).
 { Sir Thomas Bludder, Knt.

Sir William Monson, created an Irish Peer 1628, Knt. 1633, was an Independent. He was owner of Reigate Castle. He had sat for Reigate in 1625. He was one of the Judges of the King, but ceased to attend before the end of the trial. He narrowly escaped with his life at the Restoration, and died in prison.

Sir Thomas Bludder had been in the Parliament of 1621 for Gatton, of 1624 for Reigate, and again in 1625, 1626, and 1628, and in the Short Parliament. He was the only one of the Surrey members of the Long Parliament who was a consistent Royalist. He went to Oxford, and sat in the King's Parliament there. He was consequently disabled at Westminster. He was of the family originally of Mile End, who acquired Flanchford in Reigate. He was succeeded by Sir Francis Howard, of the family of the Earls of Nottingham, of Eastwick, Great Bookham, the husband of Lord Monson's sister, or by George Evelyn, of the Godstone family.

There is some uncertainty about the representation. Two names seem given to replace the disabled member, Bludder.

SOUTHWARK { Edward Bagshawe.
 { John White.

In 1645 John White was deceased, and Edward Bagshawe had "resorted to Oxford."

George Thompson and George Snellings were elected. Bagshawe was not a Southwark tradesman, but an Oxford man by education, and a member of the Middle Temple. Curiously, he is said to have entertained Calvinistic opinions, despite his defection to Oxford.

The Interregnum.

In the Long Parliament the old influential class, not families, were represented. During the subsequent period some change in the class of representatives is apparent, but scarcely what we can call a democratic element, unless in the Barebones Parliament.

The Assembly of Nominees (Barebone's Parliament) 1653. For Surrey: Samuel Highland and Lawrence Marsh. The latter as J.P. attested marriages under the Act of this Parliament. He, or his family, were afterwards attached to the Quakers, who were strong in the Dorking neighbourhood. S. Heigland (Hyland) sat for Southwark the next year.

Under the Instrument of Government, 1654. Six members sat for the whole County, not for any districts in it, elected *en bloc* by the method called in France *scrutin de liste*. They were—Sir Richard Onslow, Major-General John Lambert, Arthur Onslow, Francis Drake, Robert Holman, and Robert Wood. I do not know of any connexion of General Lambert with Surrey, but the others were of the usual type of parliamentary representatives. The Onslows, of course. Francis Drake of Merstham, seems to have been the grandson of an Equerry of Queen Elizabeth, who had by rather equivocal means acquired the manor of Esher Episcopi from the See of Winchester. They were distant kinsmen of the navigator. Robert Holman was Gentleman of Pendhill, Blechingley, and Robert Wood, Gentleman, of Kingston. Three boroughs: For Guildford, Richard Hillier sat; for Reigate, Edward Bysshe (as above); for Southwark, Samuel Hyland and Robert Warrcupp.

In 1656 the first four of the members above were re-elected for the County,¹ with George Duncombe of Albury, and John Blackwell, Junior. Duncombe was the son of the founder of

¹ The Onslow papers give Sir Richard and Arthur Onslow. The returns are missing.

the well known family of Duncombe of Weston Street, etc. etc., in Surrey—(not the founder, as Manning and Bray say, II, p. 126). He died in 1674. The Blackwells were a London family of whom I know nothing.

Sir Richard Onslow was called to the new House of Lords.

In Guildford Colonel John Hewson was elected, *vice* Major-General Kelsey, who elected to sit for Dover.

For Reigate, John Goodwyn was returned, but elected to sit for East Grinstead. Colonel Sir Thomas Pride was returned, but was promoted to the House of Lords. Colonel Jerome Sankey seems to have been finally elected.

Colonel Sir Thomas Pride had “purged” the House of Commons in 1648, to ensure the judicial murder of the King. He had become a Surrey landowner. In 1654 he bought the Great Park of Nonsuch, with the Lodge then called Worcester House, whence Worcester Park. He died here in 1658. He had been a drayman.

For Richard Cromwell’s Parliament a return was made to the old constituencies. Returns are incomplete. Francis Drake sat for the County, Thomas Turgis and Edward Bysshe for Gatton, and Henry FitzJames and John Westbrooke for Haslemere, the latter a man of old Surrey family long settled near Godalming, in place of John Hooke disallowed.¹

¹ Yet John Hooke should have been an acceptable candidate. He was of the neighbourhood, Bramshott, and his aunt had been the wife of John Pym and his grandmother sister to Francis Rouse, Speaker of the Barebones Parliament.