

## THE LORDS-LIEUTENANT OF SURREY.

BY

THE EARL OF ONSLOW, P.C., F.S.A.,

*President of the Society.*

---

BY the middle of the sixteenth century the ancient office of Sheriff had declined in importance. No longer was he "the Governor of the Shire, the Captain of its forces, the president of its Court." It is true that the County Court was still in existence, but its importance was gradually diminishing owing to the growth of the power of the Justices of the Peace first constituted under Edward III. By the time of the Tudors the Justices acting under the Court of King's Bench administered in the county the statutes relating to police and other matters of local government; the military position also of the Sheriff had declined.

The actual constitution of the office of Lord-Lieutenant did not take place till the Statute of 37 Henry VIII (1545), but prior to that date Special Commissions were issued to special officers other than the Sheriff for the raising and training of county levies to guard against foreign attack or domestic disorder. Thus in 1536 Sir Anthony Browne, K.G., called up the Surrey levies for thirty-two days' training. Sir Anthony was son of the Constable of Calais and Lucy Nevill daughter of John, Marquess of Montacute. Browne was several times Knight of the Shire for Surrey and acquired much property in the county at the Dissolution of the Monasteries.

The first functioning Lord-Lieutenant under the Act of 1545 seems to have been Henry, 14th Earl of Arundel, who was appointed in 1545. Whether he had the actual title of Lord-Lieutenant or not seems to be uncertain, but he is styled Commissioner of Array in Cos. Surrey, Sussex, Hants, Wilts, Oxon and Berks in 1545 and Lieutenant of Sussex in 1549.

Commissions of Lieutenancy in those days were issued annually and not necessarily renewed, indeed they were at that time *ad hoc* appointments in case of necessity.

In 1551 William Parr, Marquess of Northampton, became Lieutenant (Warrant Books of the S. of S. R.O.) and held the office until 1553. He held the lieutenancy of many other counties at various times, but his close connection with Surrey is shown by his having been created in 1550 Bailiff of Surrey, Steward of Godalming and Keeper of Henley and Guildford Parks. Northampton, who was a brother of Catherine Parr, wife of Henry VIII, was attainted on the accession of Mary owing to his support of Lady Jane Grey, but pardoned in 1554 and re-created a Marquess on the accession of Elizabeth.

Lord Howard of Effingham exercised the duties of Lord-Lieutenant during Wyatt's rebellion, and Lord Montague, a son of Sir Anthony Browne, did the same in 1557 until Arundel, who had served as Lord-Lieutenant in 1545, held the office for two years in 1558-9. In 1559 Lord Howard of Effingham was appointed Lord-Lieutenant and was the first to hold the office for any length of time as he served continuously till his death in 1573. He was succeeded by his son Charles, who had been for several years Knight of the Shire and a J.P. for Surrey. The Lord-Lieutenancy seems to have been in abeyance until 1585, but in 1579 Lord Howard, now Earl of Nottingham, was a Joint Commissioner of Musters in Surrey. In 1585 Nottingham was given a series of commissions placing him at the head of the defence of the country against the Spanish menace. He was made Lord-Lieutenant of Sussex, Surrey, Devon and Cornwall and Lord High Admiral of England, Ireland and Wales. In 1588 he commanded in chief at the defeat of the Spanish Armada. He held the Lieutenancy of Surrey until his death in 1624 and for the first time combined with it the office of *Custos Rotulorum*. The duties of this office as those of the Lord-Lieutenancy had originally formed part of those of the Sheriff, but in the reign of Henry VIII it became the custom to designate in the Commission of the Peace one of the leading Justices of the county as *Custos Rotulorum* or "keeper of the rolls of the peace," a man who according to Lambard (*Eiren-aica*) was "especially picked out either for wisdom, countenance, or credit." Not until the reign of William and Mary

was it usual to combine the two offices ; and in Surrey this did not take place till the middle of the eighteenth century. From 1621 until his death in 1624 Nottingham held the Lieutenancy jointly with his son Charles, second Earl, who had sat in several Parliaments as a member for Surrey constituencies. On the death of his father he became Lord-Lieutenant, but there was associated with him as joint Lieutenant John Ramsay, Earl of Holderness. He died, however, in 1626, and Edward, Viscount Wimbledon was appointed in his stead. Wimbledon was the third son of William, second Lord Burghley and first Earl of Exeter. He held the post till his death in 1638. In 1636 Thomas, Earl of Arundel also became joint Lieutenant and held the office until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, when the Royal Commissions terminated. Nottingham, however, was recommissioned by the Parliament as sole Lieutenant, but died almost immediately, and was succeeded by Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland, who was also Lord-Lieutenant of Sussex.

During the lieutenancies of the two Nottinghams and Northumberland we observe a growing activity on the part of the Deputy-Lieutenants. The Nottinghams were both engaged in public affairs at home and abroad and Northumberland with his own business in the North ; so details of county military organization were left to the Deputy-Lieutenants, Sir Poynings More of Loseley, Sir Robert Parkhurst, member for Guildford, Nicholas Stoughton and Sir Richard Onslow, Knight of the Shire. Throughout the Civil War we hear very little of the Lord-Lieutenant, though Northumberland held the post until the Restoration, when he became Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of Sussex and Lord-Lieutenant of Northumberland. In Surrey he was succeeded by Lord Mordaunt of Avalon, the second son of the first Earl of Peterborough, who had been one of the commissioners in 1659 to treat for the Restoration of Charles II. He held the office till his death in 1675, when he was succeeded by Prince Rupert, Duke of Cumberland. When Rupert died in 1682 he was followed by Henry Howard, 7th Duke of Norfolk. As has already been mentioned in the reign of William and Mary, it became general for the two offices of Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum to be merged in one person, though they

continued to be separate appointments, the former being made by Letters Patent and the latter under writ of Privy Seal. By this time the more active military duties of the Lord-Lieutenant had diminished, but he still exercised considerable patronage in the county, appointing all Deputy-Lieutenants and all Officers of Militia and still being the Military Commander in Chief of the County Forces. In 1689 the General Session of the Justices of the County was the supreme County Authority. The Custos Rotulorum, who appointed the Clerk of the Peace, presided, though there was no official rule. In the eighteenth century this custom subsided—the Justices chose chairmen *ad hoc*—or sometimes acted without any chairman at all, but before the middle of the century it became the custom to appoint a regular Chairman of Quarter Sessions.

Norfolk, who had been appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Berks as well as Surrey in 1682 and Lord-Lieutenant of Norfolk in 1683, received a new commission as Lord-Lieutenant on 6th May, 1689, and a writ of appointment under the Privy Seal of Custos Rotulorum of the same three counties on 14th June of the same year. The Lieutenancy of Surrey he held till his death in 1701, but he relinquished the office of Custos Rotulorum in 1699. In this he was succeeded by Charles, 2nd Earl of Berkeley, who seems to have had no personal connection with Surrey. Berkeley was succeeded as Custos Rotulorum of Surrey by his son the third Earl in 1710, and it was only on his death in 1736 that the two offices were again merged in one person, namely Thomas, Lord Onslow, who had been appointed Lord-Lieutenant in 1717. Since that date both offices have been combined. When Norfolk died in 1701 he was succeeded by George, Duke of Northumberland, a natural son of Charles II. He relinquished the post in 1714 and was succeeded by Charles, 1st Earl of Halifax, on whose death in 1715 John, 2nd Duke of Argyll and Greenwich was appointed. From the death of Norfolk in 1701 till the resignation of Argyll in 1716 no one with a real connection with the county had filled the office of Lord-Lieutenant, but in 1716 George I appointed Richard, first Lord Onslow, who for many years had been a Knight of the Shire. He died in 1717 and was succeeded by his son Thomas, second Lord Onslow. Thomas had been for a number of years Knight of the Shire. He was a peculiar-

looking man, short and stout—his soubriquet was “Duck-legs.” He married a rich heiress, Elizabeth Knight of Jamaica, and with her money considerably extended his Surrey property and built the present house at Clandon. There is not much to record of his lieutenancy except one anecdote which is a queer commentary on eighteenth-century credulity.

As Lord-Lieutenant, or as a J.P. perhaps, he had a curious duty to perform in 1726. A certain Mary Toft of Godalming had aroused the interest of the scientists of those days by pretending through an ingenious fraud to give birth to rabbits. She succeeded in deceiving Dr. John Howard of Guildford, and Mr. St. Andre, the King’s Surgeon Anatomist. The fraud was unmasked by Sir Richard Manningham, F.R.C.S. Lord Onslow was asked to obtain the evidence of all those at Godalming or at Guildford who might be able to throw light on the case, and their depositions were sworn before him, either at Guildford or at Clandon.

In 1740 Thomas died and was succeeded by his son Richard, 3rd Lord Onslow, who also succeeded him as Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum. He had for some years been M.P. for Guildford, but he had no great taste for affairs. It so happened that during his reign the importance of the Lord-Lieutenancy increased. Nominally the appointment of Justices was, as it still is, in the hands of the Crown through the Lord Chancellor. Down to the middle of the seventeenth century the Judges of Assize were expected to make recommendations of suitable persons, but after the Restoration this ceased with the Judges’ supervision of county business. A period of purely political manipulation succeeded, but as Justices were appointed or dismissed for no reasons but political ones, Local Government suffered badly. Gradually the Crown came to rely on the Lord-Lieutenants more and more, and by the time that Richard Onslow became Lieutenant of Surrey the advice of the Lieutenant was the main avenue to the Bench, though the Chancellor retained the right which he still enjoys of independent appointment. It will be seen that the patronage placed considerable power in the hands of the Lieutenant, especially when it was added to the appointment of Deputy-Lieutenants and Militia Officers.

In 1745, when the invasion of England by the Pretender

took place, the Lord-Lieutenant formed an association to raise a regiment of County Militia. A County Meeting was held at Kingston on 9th October, 1745, and a regiment raised (*London Gazette*, 3.12.1745). Onslow commanded the regiment as Colonel, but it never took the field and indeed can hardly have been said to have existed except in embryo.

In 1757 Pitt's Militia Bill received the Royal Assent, but owing to the opposition shown in Surrey and elsewhere to its provisions, it was not till 1759 that Onslow was able to take measures to raise the regiments. In January three-fifths of the county quota of men were chosen and enrolled and commissions issued to the requisite number of officers. Onslow wrote to Pitt asking for arms and accoutrements for the regiment. He himself had been appointed the first Colonel of the Regiment, but he resigned soon and Sir Nicholas Carew took his place. On 25th June, 1759, Onslow writes to Pitt that the regiment consisted of 800 men, divided into ten companies and twenty-five officers and forty N.C.O.s. On 3rd June, 1759, he was directed to embody the regiment and despatch five companies to Rochester and Strood, two to Dartford and Crayford, and three to Gravesend. In November the regiment was split into two, the first battalion of five companies being under the command of Sir Nicholas Carew and the second under George Onslow. The Colours of the Regiment supplied by the War Office were two, a Union Flag and a White Flag bearing the arms of the Lord-Lieutenant, *i.e.* the Onslow Arms. The Lord-Lieutenant's Arms were also borne on the drums. On the death of George II the Lord-Lieutenant wrote to Pitt as follows (*H.O. Papers Militia*, p. 103):

CLANDON,

19 June, 1761.

SIR,

You have herewith the names of the several gentlemen who have been appointed . . . officers in the Surrey Militia, whose Commissions determine by the revocation of mine from his late Majesty. I must therefore desire you to lay their names before H.M. . . .

On 22nd December, 1762, Egremont, who on the accession of Bute's Government had succeeded Pitt, sent orders to disembody the Militia.

The Militia were not called out again during Onslow's lifetime, but owing to the unsettled state of affairs, he was directed

in 1771 to furnish a complete return of the strength of his forces and a general muster was ordered in 1773.

Just before his death, the Surrey Militia volunteered to be employed on any duty that H.M. should think proper. Weymouth, then Secretary of State, wrote to Onslow:

“H.M. commands me to convey through you H.M. Lieutenant of the County of Surrey, his very gracious approbation of the commendable zeal and spirit shown by the Officers of the Militia of that County in their loyal offer . . .”

Onslow died in 1776 and was succeeded by his second cousin George, Lord Cranley, son of Speaker Arthur Onslow, who thus became Lord Onslow and Cranley. He became 1st Earl of Onslow in 1801. In 1776 he succeeded his cousin as Lord-Lieutenant of Surrey and Custos Rotulorum. Prior to his being created a peer he had sat for long as Knight of the Shire for Surrey and he had also commanded the Surrey Militia. He had been Mayor of Guildford in 1768 and was High Steward of Kingston. He became High Steward of Guildford as his three predecessors in the Lieutenancy had been when he succeeded to the Onslow peerage. In 1778, as soon as the Treaty between France and the revolted American Colonies became known, he was ordered to embody the Surrey Militia and prepare them for service. The powers of the Lord-Lieutenant over the Militia had been revised since 1757 and he was entrusted by the Act of 1779 with the duty of the apportionment of the men in different parishes and of conducting the militia ballot. He also still appointed the officers, after submitting their names to the King. To ensure that the latter might be persons interested in the defence of the realm, the Lord-Lieutenant was entrusted with the duty of making certain regulations at his own discretion as to their social position, and a property qualification was also required. Moreover, when the Militia was not embodied, the Lord-Lieutenant had power to discharge a certain number of officers after four years' service in order to create a reserve. Lastly, the Lord-Lieutenant was entrusted with the duty of supervising and arranging for the regular annual trainings. Thus, the whole military administration of the county was in his hands (Burns' Digest, 1779).

The Militia on this occasion were embodied for four years

and it was not till 28th February, 1783, that were issued orders to disembody them (*H.O. Letter Book Militia*, 1782-89, p. 117).

With the renewed outbreak of war with France in 1792 the Lord-Lieutenant of Surrey was called upon to embody the Militia afresh.

During the interval between, the regular training had proceeded and the Lord-Lieutenant seems to have kept his force well up to the standard of military efficiency.

War was declared by France the week after the execution of Louis XVI, but it was not till December that orders were issued to call out the Militia. The regiment was 199 under strength and Onslow found that uneasiness was felt with respect to the provision for the families of embodied men. Some correspondence took place on the subject and finally the difficulty was settled by a promise conveyed by the Home Office of a Bill to revise the Act of 1762 dealing with this subject.

A year later, owing to the threats of invasion, an Act was passed "for encouraging and disciplining such corps . . . as shall voluntarily enrol themselves for the defence . . . of the Kingdom." Onslow immediately took advantage of the new law to raise troops in Surrey and his efforts met with a ready response. Lord Leslie and Onslow's eldest son Thomas, then twenty-eight years of age, set to work to raise a Yeomanry Regiment. Leslie was Colonel and Thomas Lieutenant-Colonel and the regiment consisted of 8 troops of 40 men.

Onslow raised a subscription throughout the country and obtained a sum of £14,274, for internal defence (*M. and B.*, III, 676). Guildford applied to Onslow for leave to raise a Company of Volunteers, as did other places in the county. Though the Government fully expected invasion, they did not avail themselves of all the offers of volunteers immediately. In 1796, however, the supplementary Militia Act was passed, and in the following year Onslow was busy in raising further regiments. In January 1797 the first appointment of officers took place. During 1797 and the subsequent two years Onslow was inundated with offers to enrol in defence of the country. The town of Farnham was particularly anxious to form a Company, but for some reason the Government refused the offer. In July 1799 the whole volunteer force of the country was reviewed by the King on Wimbledon Common, and Onslow

received the congratulations of the Secretary of State on the success of the turn-out.

In 1798 the Militia in Surrey was reported to be below the strength required by Act of Parliament. This seems to have caused some comment, for Tierney raised the question in the House of Commons and moved for an inquiry into the Lord-Lieutenant's conduct in regard to the manner in which the Act to provide for the defence of the realm had been carried into effect in the County of Surrey. Nothing came of it, however, and Tierney was beaten in a division by 141 to 22 on 8th May, 1798.

In July 1799 the Surrey Militia were quartered at Plymouth. In August Onslow wrote to Huskisson about the future establishment of the Militia saying that the three regiments had each furnished their quota to the line and he hoped to be allowed to divide the County now, reduced to 1,800, into three regiments of 600 each. It appears, however, that the Government favoured the reduction of the strength to one regiment, as Onslow wrote on 13th October strongly urging the retention of the 2nd Surrey on the establishment (*Militia*, 1798-1802, No. 27, H.O.).

In 1801 we find the strength of the Militia in Surrey to have fallen below the standard of efficiency, and in October Lord Hobart wrote strongly to the Lord-Lieutenant urging him to lose no time in supplying the deficiency. He reminded him of the penalty the County was under for every man deficient after this notice under the Act of 39 Geo. 106, c. 10. Nothing, however, was done, as the preliminaries of peace were signed in the same month and ratified at Amiens in March 1802. In April the Militia were disembodied.

The Peace of Amiens was of short duration. War broke out again in 1803, but before relations between England and France were severed the Militia was embodied, on 11th March, 1803. A difficulty occurred among the officers at the outset. Major Hudson, who had been appointed to a vacant majority, in 1801, now was posted to a company. The difficulty was due to there being two Lieut.-Colonels, the junior, Colonel Sutton, being appointed Major of the Regiment. The Lord-Lieutenant was called on to decide. He could not do so himself and consulted Lord Hobart. The matter was eventually

referred to the law officers, who decided in favour of Hudson, Sutton being placed on the supernumerary list until a vacancy should occur.

Just before the embodiment took place Onslow submitted (*H.O.*, 1803, Vol. XXXI) a scheme for the organization of the Surrey Militia. By this scheme two regiments were to be constituted with the same number of companies into which the two corps were formed previous to the passing of the last Act. This scheme was accepted by the Government and duly carried out.

A good deal of difficulty was experienced in getting recruits. This was the case mainly in Southwark where the men used to abscond as soon as enrolled. Onslow took drastic action to stop this by sending a Guard to attend the Magistrates Court where the enrolment took place. They were then marched off to headquarters, where they underwent "such personal alteration as would make them readily known to military men and consequently more readily apprehended if they deserted." Still the quota was not forthcoming, and in May an urgent letter (*H.O.*, 1803, Vol. XXXI) came from the Home Office, saying that unless the quota were forthcoming by the end of the month the regiment would be disembodied. By hook or by crook the Lord-Lieutenant collected the men and the regiments were maintained.

On 11th July a meeting of Lords-Lieutenant was held at the Horse Guards. This meeting was for the purpose of fixing the precedence of the various embodied Militia Regiments. This was the last occasion on which Onslow was able to appear in public for some time, as he was taken ill in 1804, and obliged to appoint a Vice-Lieutenant to perform his duties. The Vice-Lieutenant was Lord Teignmouth. Teignmouth was appointed in March 1804 and it was not until August 1807 that we find Onslow again acting as Lord-Lieutenant.

In 1802 the "Volunteer Act" was passed, which granted volunteers exemption from the militia ballot in consideration of a five days' annual training. In 1803 the Government called for more volunteers. The administration of the Force fell upon the Lords-Lieutenant and the task was no light one. There was no lack of recruits, for by volunteering a man escaped the militia ballot—also it was known that there was

a probability of the levy *en masse* being carried out, under which every able-bodied man would be drilled whether he liked it or not. Chief among the difficulties was that of obtaining arms. In Surrey this threatened to ruin the Force. The Lord-Lieutenant protested strongly and forwarded a letter from one of his colonels saying that among 600 men there were but 220 muskets and that unless the remainder were at once found by the Ordnance the Corps would be broken up; for the men had drilled for three months without arms and were tired of it. But want of discipline was an even greater evil. In the Lambeth Corps the right of appointing the officers was vested in the members of the corps, who had equipped themselves. The original officers were appointed by a civil committee, which consisted of persons who had subscribed liberally to the equipment of the Corps. But there was constituted a Military Committee which at once came to loggerheads with the Civil Committee over the appointment of officers. The Camberwell Corps actually mutinied and Teignmouth, acting for Onslow, disbanded it, but the members were all accepted as recruits for the Southwark Corps.

Affairs did not improve with the passage of time. In fact it was Onslow's duty to report in 1807 one of the worst cases of indiscipline that had occurred throughout the country. On parade, a sergeant of the Richmond Corps struck Colonel Drew, who caused him to be disarmed and turned out. The Sergeant brought an action against the Colonel and it was held that the latter had no right to take the Sergeant's sword; so Drew was mulcted in £500 damages and costs. No wonder that Teignmouth reported when Onslow took over the duties of Lord-Lieutenant again after his illness in 1807, "The Volunteer plan was at first entered into in a right and proper spirit, but now it has dwindled down to little else than exemption from other services." He might have put the case much more strongly.

In the autumn of 1807 the Copenhagen Expedition was undertaken owing to the grave danger that was imminent from the co-operation of the Danes with the French and the consequent increasing peril of invasion. All leave was stopped for the Army and Militia, strong inducements were held out to militia men to join the line and an Act was passed to enable

the Militia to be speedily completed owing to the peculiar exigency of the present moment. Lord Hawkesbury wrote to Onslow :

“ . . . requiring as it does an immediate and large increase of the public force of the country, coupled with the limited period which the law has prescribed for completing the levy to be made under the present Act, will suggest to you the extreme importance of giving the utmost activity and dispatch to all the proceedings to be held under the provision of this Act.”

Onslow immediately set to work to cause a new list to be prepared of men liable to serve (*H.O.*, 1804-7, p. 341). A meeting of the Lieutenancy was held in October when it was reported that there were 23,185 men liable to serve and the number fixed to be balloted out was 1,002.

This is an interesting record as it shows how little pressed we were for men during the Napoleonic Wars compared to the stress in 1914-18.

This was practically Onslow's last public action. He remained Lord-Lieutenant till the end of his life and in the nominal performance of his duties until 1812, but in that year his increasing infirmities rendered it impossible for him to continue. He did not resign his post but appointed his son Vice-Lieutenant on 17th February, 1812. He lived two years longer, dying on 17th May, 1814, at Clandon.

In appointing his son Vice-Lieutenant, Onslow followed the precedent set by Nottingham two hundred years before. A somewhat similar course was adopted during the Great War when Lord Ashcombe appointed Sir Edmund Elles, G.C.I.E., to be his Vice-Lieutenant and to assist in the heavy duties of the lieutenancy. But the Second Earl of Onslow did not succeed his father in the lieutenancy, though he did so in the High Stewardship of Guildford. George, 4th Viscount Middleton, became Lord-Lieutenant.

After the Napoleonic Wars the military activity of the county diminished rapidly and the Militia which during its embodiment had reached a high degree of efficiency, deteriorated. The Militia were not called out for training until 1820 and again in 1831, but after their disbandment on the latter occasion they remained so until their reorganization in 1852. Lord Middleton died in 1830 and was succeeded in the Lieutenancy by Charles, second Lord Arden, who had sat for a number

of years in Parliament but not for a Surrey constituency. He had been Master of the Mint (then a political post) in 1801, a Lord of the Admiralty and a Lord of the Bedchamber. He was a P.C. and F.R.S.

When he died he was succeeded by William, 1st Earl of Lovelace, who had been in command of the Surrey Yeomanry. Lord Lovelace's lieutenantancy rivalled in point of view of time that of the 4th Onslow, for he filled the office from 1840 till his death in 1893.

He was born in 1805 and at the age of four, *i.e.* in 1809, was taken to see George, Lord Onslow. The latter told him to remember that he had met a man who as a child had seen one of the halberdiers on the scaffold of Charles I. This was Augustin Boisragon, who functioned in this manner, aged eighteen, in 1649. Lord Onslow was born in 1731 and Boisragon must have been well over 100 when he saw him. In 1809 Onslow was seventy-eight and Lord Lovelace died eighty-four years later. The three lives span 262 years. The story is quite authenticated and there is no doubt of its truth as many can testify who heard it from Lord Lovelace.

In 1871 the Militia Act deprived the Lord-Lieutenancy of much of its military patronage, but this was revived in a new form some thirty-five years later when the Territorial Force was instituted. The Volunteer movement, however, took place during Lord Lovelace's tenure of office and he was active in its encouragement from 1859 onwards. His successor was Admiral the Hon. Francis Egerton, who died in 1896 and was succeeded by William, 8th Viscount Midleton, whose period of office coincided with the South African War, during which he raised afresh the Surrey Regiment of Yeomanry which had been disbanded as a separate unit and had become a troop of the Hampshire Yeomanry in 1830.

The new regiment was commanded by Col. the Hon. Henry Cubitt, who when Lord Midleton resigned became Lord-Lieutenant in 1905 and who still continues to preside over the County, and we hope may long continue to do so.

A list of the Lord-Lieutenants of Surrey is displayed in the County Hall at Kingston, but this differs in some respects from that which my researches lead me to believe to be accurate, so I venture to append a list giving my authorities for my statements.

Date.	Persons performing duties of Lord-Lieutenant but not actually named as such.	Lords-Lieutenant.	Lords-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum.	Authorities.
1536 . . .	Sir Anthony Browne, K.G.	—	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); Loseley MSS.
1549 . . .	Henry, 14th Earl of Arundel, K.G.	—	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); <i>Acts of the P.C.</i> , n.s., Vol. VII.
1551-53 . . .	—	William Parr, Marquis of Northampton, K.G.	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); Warrant Book; Loseley MSS., 11th July, 1553; Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> .
1553 . . .	Lord William Howard, afterwards Lord Howard of Effingham.	—	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden).
1557 . . .	Anthony, Viscount Montague, K.G.	—	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); Loseley M.S., 1557, x, 1.
1558-59 . . .	—	Henry, 14th Earl of Arundel, K.G.	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); Loseley MSS., 28th March, 1558, xii, 19. Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; <i>State Papers Dom.</i> , xiii, 12.
1559-73 . . .	—	William, Lord Howard of Effingham, K.G.	—	<i>Complete Peerage</i> ; <i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden).
1573 . . .	—	Charles, 1st Earl of Nottingham, K.G.	—	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden).
1585-1624 . . .	—	—	Charles, 1st Earl of Nottingham, K.G.	<i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden); Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Signed Rolls, Record Office.

Date.	Persons performing duties of Lord-Lieutenant but not actually named as such.	Lords-Lieutenant.	Lords-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum.	Authorities.
1621-42 .	—	Charles, 2nd Earl of Nottingham, K.G. (joint). John, 1st Earl of Haldernesse (joint).	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Patent Rolls 13.
1624-26 .	—	Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon.	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Patent Rolls 17; <i>Complete Peerage</i> .
1626-38 .	—	Thomas, 3rd Earl of Arundel (joint). Charles, 2nd Earl of Nottingham, K.G., New Commission under Parliament	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Manning and Bray, <i>Victoria County History</i> (Malden).
1635-42 .	—	Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland.	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Patent Rolls 23d.
1642 . . .	—	John, 1st Viscount Mordaunt of Avalon. Rupert, 1st Duke of Cumberland, K.G.	—	<i>Commons Journals</i> , ii, 459.
1642-60 .	—	Henry, 7th Duke of Norfolk, K.G.	—	<i>Commons Journals</i> , ii, 794.
1660-75 .	—	George, 1st Duke of Northumberland, K.G.	—	Patent Rolls 26d.
1675-82 .	—	—	—	Patent Rolls 7.
1682-1701	—	—	Henry, 7th Duke of Norfolk, K.G., 1689-99.	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Patent Rolls 3 and 4d.
1702-14 .	—	—	—	Military Books of the Secretaries of State.

Date.	Persons performing duties of Lord-Lieutenant but not actually named as such.	Lords-Lieutenant.	Lords-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum.	Authorities.
1714-15 .	—	Charles, 1st Earl of Halifax.	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> .
1715-16 .	—	John, Duke of Argyll and Greenwich.	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Military Books of the Secretaries of State ; <i>Complete Peerage</i> . Military Entry Books.
1716-17 .	—	Richard, 1st Lord Onslow.	—	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> ; Patent Rolls I.
1717-40 .	—	Thomas, 2nd Lord Onslow.	Thomas, 2nd Lord Onslow, 1737-40.	Military Books of Secretary of State ; <i>London Gazette</i> .
1740-76 .	—	—	Richard, 3rd Lord Onslow.	Doyle, <i>Official Baronage</i> .
1776-1814	—	—	George, 4th Lord Onslow, 1st Lord Cranley (1st Earl of Onslow).	
1814-30 .	—	—	George, 4th Viscount Midleton.	<i>Complete Peerage</i> .
1830-40 .	—	—	Charles, 2nd Lord Arden.	<i>Complete Peerage</i> .
1840-93 .	—	—	William, 1st Earl of Lovelace.	<i>Complete Peerage</i> .
1893-96 .	—	—	Admiral the Hon. Francis Fegerton.	<i>London Gazette</i> .
1896-1905	—	—	William, 8th Viscount Midleton.	<i>London Gazette</i> .
1905 . . .	—	—	Col. the Hon. Henry Cubitt, afterwards Lord Ashcombe.	<i>London Gazette</i> .