

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION)

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-064174

FURTHER PAPERS

REGARDING THE

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ARMY

IN

INDIA.

(In continuation of Cd. 2572.)

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
By DARLING & SON, LTD., 34-40, BACON STREET, E.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
WYMAN AND SONS, LTD., FETTER LANE, E.C.,
and 32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.;
or OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH;
or E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1905.

[Cd. 2615.] Price 1d.

I N D I A

No. 1.

From Governor-General of India to the Secretary of State,
dated 6th July, 1905.

(Telegraphic.)

Your Military Despatch, No. 66, of the 31st May. Military Administration. We think scheme therein proposed, unless modified in important particulars, will be unworkable in operation, and that it will imperil military control of Governor-General in Council. It will further impose heavy burden upon Viceroy, while depriving him of indispensable advice. To remedy these defects we desire to submit following representations :—

1. Paragraph 23 assigns functions to Military Supply Member which cannot properly be performed except by a soldier, but is otherwise not inconsistent with appointment of a civilian. We think that he should always be a soldier, as Military Member has hitherto invariably been. Though we do not press for alteration in existing law, nomination of a civilian would obviously be fatal to safeguards which we now desire to create.
2. Paragraphs 15 and 23 are ambiguous as to functions of new Member. We advise that he should be available for official consultation by Viceroy on all military questions without distinction, and not only upon questions of general policy or when cases are marked for Council. We propose that identical conditions should apply to both of the Military Departments, and that upon submission of any case from either Department, Viceroy should, if he deems it necessary, refer it to head of other Department for advice. We do not anticipate that this will become general practice in either case, but power of reference will relieve Viceroy of burden of some responsibility, and where resorted to should tend to promote co-ordination.

MVA:q. 2.N
DS
64174

do so, and the right of every member as established by law to discuss matters in Council will, of course, remain unaffected. But His Majesty's Government having decided to alter the existing system, and to give to members in charge of Army and Military Supply Departments independent channels of communication with Governor-General in Council, it follows that neither member can have any special claim to be consulted or to note on the proposals of the other.

- (3.) Reference of important matters to Mobilization Committee, of which Commander-in-Chief and Military Supply Member were to be essential members, was contemplated in paragraph 22 of Despatch, and is approved accordingly.
- (4.) As stated in your telegram, Despatch was silent with regard to rank of Secretary to Government in Army Department, and His Majesty's Government see no objection to his having local rank of Major-General.
- (5.) Proposed schedule of classes of cases in Army Department, to be specially dealt with on the lines which you indicate, is quite in accordance with views of His Majesty's Government.

These arrangements, so far as they are matter for rules, will no doubt be embodied in Rules of Business which you were requested in paragraph 28 of Despatch to send home for approval. General approval above conveyed will be fully adhered to, but details must necessarily be subject to further consideration when rules are received.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

FURTHER PAPERS

REGARDING THE

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ARMY

IN

INDIA.

(In continuation of Cd. 2718.)

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.
By DARLING & SON, LTD., 34-40, BACON STREET, E.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
WYMAN AND SONS, LTD., FETTER LANE, E.C.,
and 32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.;
or OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH;
or E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1906.

[Cd. 2842.] Price 2d.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No. of Paper.	Document.	Date.	From	To	Subject.	Page.
1	Telegram	1905. Nov. 21	Secretary of State for India.	Governor-General of India.	Request for proposals as to amend- ment of Rules of Business.	3
2	Do.	1906. Jan. 23	Governor-General	Secretary of State	Proposals as to amendment of exist- ing Rules of Business.	3
3	Despatch	Feb. 9	Secretary of State	Governor-General	Decision as to new Rules of Business	6
4	—	—	—	—	Statement shewing existing Rules of Business, the Draft Rules pro- posed by the Government of India, and the Rules as approved by the Secretary of State.	11
5	—	—	—	—	Rules of Business in which no alteration was or is proposed.	14

No. 1.

From the Secretary of State for India (the Rt Hon. St. John Brodrick) to the Governor-General, dated 21st November, 1905.

(Telegraphic.)

My despatch No. 66 of 31st May last. Army Administration. Please take at once into consideration the Rules of Business which I requested your predecessor to submit, and let me know by telegraph as soon as possible what you propose.

No. 2.

[NOTE.—*The Text of the Rules mentioned in this telegram will be found on pages 11-14.*]

From the Governor-General of India to the Secretary of State (the Rt Hon. John Morley), dated 23rd January, 1906.

[Telegraphic.]

Your telegram of 21st November. Army Administration. I propose to amend existing rules of business to the extent shown in following draft :—

“ Rule 1 (E).—(vi.) Army Finance, and vii. the Military Accounts Department.

“(F) *Army Department*.—All business connected with (i.) the Army, except such business as is allotted to the Department of Military Supply, (ii.) Cantonments, (iii.) the Volunteers.

“(G) *Department of Military Supply*.—All business connected with (i.) the control of Army Contracts, (ii.) the purchase of Stores, Ordnance, and Remounts, (iii.) the custody and control of all Stores, Ordnance and Remounts not expressly assigned by Government of India to the Army Department, (iv.) the management of Military Works, (v.) the Clothing and Manufacturing Departments, (vi.) the Indian Medical Service, (vii.) the Royal Indian Marine, (viii.) Marine surveys and dangers to navigation (corresponding with the Hydrographic Section of the Admiralty).

“2. Subject to provisions of Rule 1, the business of the different Departments shall, for the purposes of the first perusal of papers, and of the initiation of orders thereon, be allotted to the Governor-General and the Members of Council in such manner as the Governor-General may from time to time direct.

“*Part II. Disposal of Business.* Draft Rule 3.—Save as otherwise provided by Rules 3a, 5 (2), 6, and 6a, cases shall ordinarily be submitted by Secretary in the department to which subject belongs for purposes of the first perusal of papers, and of the initiation of orders thereon, to the Member in charge of that Department.

“Draft Rule 3a.—In the Army Department papers and cases may be submitted to the Member in charge of the Department by the Head of the Division of the Department to which subject has been assigned by Member.

“Draft Rule 6a.—In order to enable the Secretary to Government of India in the Army Department to discharge duties imposed upon him by Rules 5 (2), 6, 9, and 39 : (i.) he shall be a member of the advisory Council ; (ii.) he shall have the right to attend all the meetings of the Mobilisation Committee, and shall be informed of business to be brought before the Committee, and of decisions arrived at, (iii.) all matters entered in a schedule approved by the Governor-General shall be referred to him before orders are issued ; (iv.) a list of the papers and cases submitted to the Member in charge of Department under Rule 3a shall be furnished to him daily ; (v.) he shall be entitled at any stage of discussion of any subject assigned to the Army Department, (a) to call for the papers, (b) to record, for the consideration of Member in Charge, a note on any matter.

“Draft Rule 11, (2) (b).—The Army Department and the Department of Military Supply may each, without making a previous reference to Financial Department, issue orders sanctioning any expenditure which (1) does not require sanction of Secretary of State, (2) does not involve any outlay in excess of total sanctioned Budget provision under any major head of account, and (3) does not involve re-appropriation from any one or more grants or minor heads of account to any other such grants or minor heads exceeding in the aggregate 3 lakhs in any one financial year.”

The draft distributes the functions of the present Military Department between the Army Department and the Department of Military Supply. It further amalgamates the new Army Department with the Army Headquarters under the control of the Commander-in-Chief as Member of Council. The following detailed explanation will show how effect has been given to these principles, and what provision has been made for necessary constitutional control of the army.

The additions under Rule 1 head (E) place Army Finance and the Military Accounts Department under the control of the Financial Department.

Rule 1, head (F) (i.), follows lines of existing rule, and assigns to the Army Department all business not expressly allotted to the Supply Department. There are now no cantonments in Native States administered by the Governor-General in Council.

Draft Rule 1, head (G) (ii.) and (iii.): we are about to refer to you a question as to your intentions in respect of mobilisation stores and the control of remounts. Sub-rule (iii.) has been drafted with object of avoiding any further amendment of rules on receipt of your decision.

Draft Rule 2: the word "ordinary" has been omitted in order to enable the Commander-in-Chief to take charge of Army Department.

Draft Rule 3 reproduces the existing rule, merely adding a reference to the new draft Rules 3a and 6a.

Draft Rule 3a provides for submission of cases by the heads of the divisions of the Army Department direct with the Member, and not through the Secretary. This is a necessary consequence of amalgamation of Army Headquarters with the Army Department.

Draft Rule 6a: this rule maintains the constitutional responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief to the Governor-General in Council by securing that the Secretary in the Army Department shall have full knowledge of the business of the Department at every stage from initiation to completion. He will then be in a position to keep the Governor-General fully informed regarding every detail of military administration over which the Government of India exercises ultimate control. All important questions arising in that Department will come before either the Mobilisation Committee or the Advisory Committee, or both. The Secretary will attend meetings of the former Committee, and will himself be a member of the latter, and will, therefore, be fully cognizant of all matters dealt with by them. As regards other questions which are not important enough to come before one or other of these committees, but which nevertheless require orders of the Government of India, those orders must, under Rule 10, be signed by him, and it will be his duty to see that they conform with the rules of practice and traditions of army administration in its relations to Government. He will also receive a daily list of the papers and cases submitted to the Commander-in-Chief by heads of divisions. Finally, a further security will be afforded by the schedule referred to in head 5 of your telegram of 14th July last. That schedule is an exhaustive enumeration of all cases which might have to be submitted to the Governor-General. I consider it sufficient to provide that the cases described in the schedule shall be referred to the Secretary, who will be responsible for submitting to the Governor-General those cases which he considers it desirable for his Excellency to see. Finally, the daily list of papers and cases submitted direct to the Commander-in-Chief will enable the Secretary to comply with requirements of Rule 5 (2).

Although under my proposals the position of Secretary in the Army Department will differ somewhat from that of secretaries in other departments, I regard this as unavoidable, and, in view of many safeguards provided for him, I consider his position as unassailable, and in no way inferior to theirs.

The object of draft Rule 6a, (v.) (b), is to enable Secretary to place his views before the Commander-in-Chief, and thus, in the event of those views being accepted by him, to obviate necessity of a reference to Governor-General.

Draft Rule 11, (2) (b), is accepted by the Financial Department as sufficient for their requirements.

The procedure explained above will apply only to the Army Department, and not to the Department of Military Supply. The Member in charge of that Department will be in exactly the same position as any other member of the Governor-General's Council, and, as at present advised, I think all cases should be submitted to him by the Secretary.

Arundel, Ibbetson, Richards, and Hewett dissent from these proposals, since they object to intended amalgamation of Army Headquarters Staff with

the Government of India's Secretariat. They hold strongly that, if the control of Government over the Army and its head is to be a reality, it is essential to keep the functions of the Commander-in-Chief as Executive Head of the Army entirely distinct from his functions as Member of Council in charge of Army Department, and entitled in that capacity to pass orders in the name and with the authority of the Government of India, and that the agencies through which these two distinct classes of functions are respectively exercised should be kept separate. They object also to the position assigned to the Secretary in the Army Department, which differs from that of all the other secretaries to Government, inasmuch as, instead of whole business of Department passing through his hands from its inception and in ordinary course, much of it will reach him only after orders have been approved for signature, unless by the exercise of an invidious discretion he specially calls for papers. They attach special importance to a strong position for the Army Secretary, since, in the absence of the constitutional check provided in civil matters by the existence of local governments with free access to Viceroy, his independence is the main security for effective control.

On the other hand Baker, Major-General Scott, and Lord Kitchener consider above suggestions are not in accordance with Secretary of State's Despatch, are not practical, would re-introduce duplication of work which it was intended to abolish, and would form an expensive as well as inefficient system of administration. They therefore hope that you will approve of rules as amended, which in their opinion completely safeguard independence of Secretary in Army Department and the constitutional control of the Viceroy and Council over Army matters.

I am bound to say I cannot accept objections of the honourable members who dissent from my proposal to the amalgamation of Army Headquarters Staff with the Government of India Secretariat. I regard such amalgamation as inherent in the organisation proposed by the Secretary of State, and as essential to its proper working. I do not consider that it can have any injurious effect in the control of Government over the Army, or over the Commander-in-Chief; neither can I admit comparison between local governments and the Army Department as sound. The independent position of Secretary, and his free access to the Viceroy has, I consider, been very fully guaranteed, and the constitutional control of the Army by the Viceroy and Council amply recognised.

I entirely agree with the views expressed by the Commander-in-Chief, Baker, and Major-General Scott, but am anxious you should have the opinions of all my colleagues.

No. 3.

Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General, dated 9th February, 1906.

MY LORD,

I have considered in Council Your Excellency's communication of 23rd January, and the new Draft Rules of Business proposed by the Government of India, in conformity with the request made by my predecessor in his Despatch of 31st May, 1905, and repeated in his telegram of 21st November.

2. The policy set out in that Despatch was designed to put an end to an alleged conflict between the Military Department of the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief as head of the Army; to do away with a troublesome and superfluous duplication of work and to concede to the Commander-in-Chief "greater freedom of working." With these objects in view th

Military Department was to be transformed into a branch of administration confined to contracts, ordnance, military stores, works, and the like. The Commander-in-Chief, on the other hand, was to be placed in charge of a newly designated Army Department, which would be invested with all the duties and powers of which the old Military Department had been stripped, save those comprehended under the name of Military Supply.

3. Changes such as these, it is manifest, could easily be made to raise the largest questions of military organisation in India, such, for example, as were handled in the Commission of 1879, and on some other occasions. The scheme itself was inevitably open to many criticisms, both of principle and detail, and to these it was abundantly subjected from various quarters. Is not the combination, it was asked, of the active duties of executive command with the duties of general military administration, a burden too heavy for any one man, however capable and energetic, to support? Can the accidents of personality be overlooked, and the difference between a Commander-in-Chief with special aptitude and predilection for training, discipline, manœuvres, mobilisation, and all the conduct of actual war; and a Commander-in-Chief of another type who excels, and might perhaps have been expressly appointed because excelling, in the sphere of office administration and preparation? How is one system to fit each of these two types? What, again, is to happen in this important sphere of office administration and organization, if the Member in Charge of the Army Department, in his other capacity of Commander-in-Chief, is called away to duties in the field? Ought not the Member in Charge of Military Supply to be a civilian rather than a soldier? On the other hand, is it indispensable that purely military proposals by the Commander-in-Chief should always be formally submitted to criticism from other military experts, provided always that the Governor-General in Council exercises actual and decisive control where any political or financial question, great or small, directly or indirectly arises? And might not that control be more impaired by a possible concert between two different military authorities under the old system—and I understand that such cases have not been unknown—than by a single military authority with unshared military responsibility, such as is contemplated under the new?

4. These are some of the points that have been brought into view by the Despatch of 31st May, 1905, and in the proceedings that followed it. Your Excellency is familiar with them all, and it would be waste of time, under our present circumstances, for me to ask you to travel over ground so well trodden. Into the great fundamental questions of military systems His Majesty's Government do not consider that the occasion of this Despatch calls upon them to enter. They have to deal with an actual emergency, and to terminate a deadlock that, apart from a mischievous rise of temperature in discussion to a point considerably above normal, cannot become other than detrimental to effective administration of the Army itself.

When Your Excellency assumed the responsibilities of your great office last November, and I became Secretary of State a few weeks later, it was no *tabula rasa* that we found. A proposed scheme had been agreed upon in principle, with whatever reluctance and qualification, between the Secretary of State in Council and the Governor-General in Council, with the concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief, last July. This compromise among conflicting opinions as to the best way of meeting an admitted desirableness of some improvement and readjustment in the position of the Military Department, His Majesty's Government do not think it wise to reopen, nor by a stroke of the pen to dismiss, at the risk of an indefinite prolongation of fruitless and injurious controversy. On a survey of the practical circumstances of the case, they are convinced that it would be altogether inexpedient to break off Your Excellency's labours in working out the plan of last summer, in accordance with the request addressed by my predecessor to the Governor-General of that day. Accordingly, the task that Your Excellency had undertaken proceeded. It is impossible not to recognise the care, fidelity, and diligence, with which those labours on a vexed and thorny question have been performed, and His Majesty's

Government owe Your Excellency their thanks for the full and candid narrative in which you have taken pains to record what has passed.

5. The draft of the rules, in Your Excellency's language, "distributes the functions of the present Military Department between the [proposed new] Army Department and the Department of Military Supply"; and it amalgamates the new Army Department with the Army Headquarters under the control of the Commander-in-Chief as Member of Council." You further explain in detail how effect is to be given to these objects, and what provision is to be made for the constitutional control of the Army. The cardinal object of maintaining the constitutional responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief to the Governor-General in Council is to be secured by arranging "that the Secretary in the Army Department shall have full knowledge of the business of the Department at every stage, from initiation to completion," so as to "be in a position to keep the Governor-General fully informed upon every detail of military administration over which the Government of India exercises ultimate control." Your Excellency adds, however, the extremely important limitation "that although under my proposals the position of Secretary in the Army Department will differ somewhat from that of Secretaries in other departments, I regard this as unavoidable, and, in view of many safeguards provided for him, I consider his position as unassailable, and in no way inferior to theirs."

The Financial Department accept as sufficient for their requirements the Draft Rules affecting them, and the other arrangements for securing complete financial control of military expenditure. The Member in charge of the Department of Military Supply is to be in exactly the same position as any other Member of the Governor-General's Council.

6. On the consideration of these changes, your Excellency's Council found itself divided. Four Members of the Council dissented from the proposed alterations, and Your Excellency summarises with marked clearness and good faith the line of their objections. The four dissentient Members, as you state their view, "object to the intended amalgamation of the Army Headquarters Staff with the Government of India's Secretariat. They hold strongly that, if the control of Government over the Army and its head is to be a reality, it is essential to keep the functions of the Commander-in-Chief as Executive Head of the Army entirely distinct from his functions as Member of Council in charge of the Army Department, and entitled in that capacity to pass orders in the name and with the authority of the Government of India." They insist "that the agencies through which these two distinct classes of function are respectively exercised should be kept separate. They object also to the position assigned to the Secretary in the Army Department, which differs from that of all the other Secretaries to Government, inasmuch as, instead of the whole business of the Department passing through his hands from its inception and in ordinary course, much of it will reach him only after orders have been approved for signature, unless by the exercise of an invidious discretion he specially calls for papers. They attach special importance to a strong position for the Army Secretary, since, in the absence of the constitutional check provided in civil matters by the existence of local governments with free access to Viceroy, his independence is the main security for effective control."

* Sir A. Arundel.
Sir D. Ibbetson.
Mr. Richards.
Mr. Hewett.

Such is Your Excellency's report of the attitude of those Members of Council* who were unable to assent to the proposed plan.

On the other hand, the Commander-in-Chief, General Scott, and Mr. Baker regard these suggestions of their colleagues as unpractical, as re-introducing that duplication of work of which complaint was made, and as likely to set up a system of administration at once inefficient and expensive. With those views Your Excellency agrees.

7. The proposed changes I have now examined with close attention in Council. The position of the Secretary of the Army Department is, as Your Excellency has always perceived, the pivot on which the discussion turns. Whether any rule that the wit of man could devise on paper would effectively secure the absolute independence of this representative of the Government of India in the Army Department, and guarantee with certainty that the Governor-General could make sure of competent information and counsel enabling him to test proposals coming to him from the Army Department, may be doubtful. But I am advised here unanimously, and I consider, that if the supremacy of the civil government is to be real and effectual, and if the Governor-General in Council is to be in a position to fulfil the duty cast upon him by the Statute of 1833, of superintending, directing, and controlling military affairs in India, then it is necessary that the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department should have status, powers, duties, and responsibilities precisely similar to those of the Secretaries to the Government of India in the other Departments.

The rules as drafted and forwarded to me by Your Excellency would appear to effect a practical amalgamation between the new Army Department and the Headquarters Staff. The Commander-in-Chief becomes necessarily the head of both, and Rule 3 (a) provides that "papers and cases," may be submitted to him direct by various members of the Headquarters Staff. It might thus happen, I conceive, that a very important matter might be submitted to the Commander-in-Chief (as Member in Charge of the Army Department) by the Chief of the Staff, and might be placed before the Governor-General in Council, although the Secretary of the Army Department would practically have had no opportunity of saying anything on the merits of the case. It would, as I understand, be quite impossible in any other Department—in the Financial Department, for instance,—that a matter should be thus dealt with by the Member in Charge, without passing through the hands of the Secretary.

8. It appears to me that the members of the Army Headquarters Staff, while continuing to perform as heretofore their duties as members of that staff in all matters in the control of the Commander-in-Chief as such, should, on the other hand, be Departmental Officers of the Army Department, though without any of the powers of a Secretary. In their two separate and distinct capacities the members of the Headquarters Staff—that is to say, the Chief of the General Staff, should such an officer be created, the Quartermaster-General, the Adjutant-General, the Director of Ordnance, the Principal Medical Officer, and the Military Secretary,—will thus perform two separate and distinct functions; one, the function appertaining to their respective duties as Members of the Headquarters Staff pure and simple; the other, the function appertaining to their duties as officers of the Army Department. From this point of view, it would be incorrect in fact, as it seems undesirable in principle, to speak of the amalgamation of the Army Headquarters Staff with the Government of India Secretariat. For some purposes, and for those only, the members of the Headquarters Staff will be brought within the Army Department.

It follows from this that no member of the Headquarters Staff, when engaged on the work of the Army Department, should have any power to submit direct to the Member in Charge of the Army Department (that is to say, to the Commander-in-Chief) any case in that department, or to issue in regard to such work in it any order on behalf of the Government of India.

9. Now, in so far as the proposed Rules do not keep the Army Department distinct from the Headquarters Staff, and in so far as they put the Secretary of that department on a lower pedestal than other secretaries, they would depart from the intention of the scheme set forth in my predecessor's Despatch of 31st May, 1905, and accepted, though reluctantly, and subject to modifications, as I have already said, by Your Excellency's predecessor on 6th July, 1905. To that extent I regret that I am unable to approve them.

Your Excellency's suggested Draft Rule 3 (a) should therefore, in my opinion, be omitted, and the reference to it in Draft Rule 3 should be struck out. These suggested alterations will necessitate the striking out of paragraph (IV.) of Draft Rule 6 (a) as unnecessary. I also suggest that after the words "Advisory Council" in Draft Rule 6 (a) the words "and of the Mobilisation Committee" should be added, and paragraph (II.) of that rule should be omitted. In Draft Rule 11 (2) (b) after the words "Secretary of State" the words "in Council" should be added.

It further appears to me that the Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Supply Department should be a member of the Mobilisation Committee; that the Member in charge of the Military Supply Department should be a Member of the Defence Committee; and that the Governor-General should have power to appoint for the time being to the Mobilisation Committee, the Defence Committee, and the Advisory Council, or to any or either of them, such person as he may consider advisable. I assume that any Member of the Mobilisation Committee may note upon any case before that Committee, and such note, when made, will form part of the case for submission to the Governor-General in Council.

10. The object of these amendments is to make sure that all matters, before they reach the Commander-in-Chief, as Member in charge of the Army Department, shall have passed through the hands of the Secretary.

I venture to hope that after considering the case as I have now put it, Your Excellency will regard this as a vital element in any scheme which is to be at once workable and constitutional.

In your other amendments I have only to express my concurrence.

11. With entire freedom from personal prepossession, anxious to avoid exaggerations, and strongly desiring to find myself in substantial accord with the Government of India, I have done my best to decide in Council the questions arising under the Draft Rules wholly upon their merits. I trust that the opinions expressed in this Despatch will tend to compose a controversy too long outstanding; and will safeguard the fundamental principle that the Government of India, in all its branches, aspects, and divisions, subject to the statutory powers of the Secretary of State, has been solemnly and deliberately confided by Parliament to the Governor-General in Council.

12. Lord Lansdowne, in his speech in the House of Lords on 1st August, 1905, said of the plan devised by my predecessor for reorganising military administration in India: "There is no finality in these things, and a moment may come when it will be necessary to reconsider some of the details." This remains true. Meanwhile, as everybody will agree, far less depends upon the letter of the written rule, important as the written rules undoubtedly must be, than upon a spirit of harmonious co-operation in working them. That spirit I confidently anticipate Your Excellency will have the high good fortune to secure.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient
humble servant,

(Signed) JOHN MORLEY

No. 4.

Existing Rules of Business in which alterations have been proposed.

1. The business of the Government of India shall be classified and distributed among the different Departments under the following heads, and each of the subjects hereinafter indicated shall, for the purposes of these rules be deemed to belong to the Department to which it is allotted in the annexed list :—

- (A) Home Department.
- (B) Department of Revenue and Agriculture.
- (C) Public Works Department.
- (D) Foreign Department.
- (E) Finance Department.

All business throughout British India and in all places in Native States administered by the Governor General in Council connected with the administration of

- (i.) General Finance, that is to say—
 - (a) the Public Accounts and Estimates ;
 - (b) the Public Expenditure.
 - (c) the Public Ways and Means including Loans to and from the Public Treasury.
 - (d) the Management of the Public Funds.
 - (e) Taxation.
 - (f) Provincial and Local Finance.
 - (g) the Borrowing of Public Bodies ; and
 - (h) Alienations of Revenue and of Land.
- (ii.) Separate Revenue, that is to say—
 - (a) Opium.
 - (b) Salt.
 - (c) Stamps.
 - (d) Excise ; and
 - (e) Assessed Taxes.
- (iii.) Currency and Banking, that is to say—
 - (a) the Mints.
 - (b) Coinage.
 - (c) Paper Currency and
 - (d) Presidency Banks.
- (iv.) Salaries and allowances, that is to say—
 - (a) the Pay and Allowances of Public Officers.
 - (b) Leave to Public Officers and
 - (c) Pensions and Gratuities ; and
- (v.) the Civil Account Department including Treasuries.

Draft Rules of Business proposed by the Government of India in their telegram of the 23rd January, 1906.

1. The business of the Government of India shall be classified and distributed among the different Departments under the following heads, and each of the subjects hereinafter indicated shall, for the purposes of these rules, be deemed to belong to the Department to which it is allotted in the annexed list :—

- (A) Home Department.
- (B) Department of Revenue and Agriculture
- (C) Public Works Department.
- (D) Foreign Department.
- (E) Finance Department.

All business throughout British India and in all places in Native States administered by the Governor General in Council connected with the administration of

- (i.) General Finance, that is to say—
 - (a) the Public Accounts and Estimates ;
 - (b) the Public Expenditure.
 - (c) the Public Ways and Means including Loans to and from the Public Treasury.
 - (d) the Management of the Public Funds.
 - (e) Taxation.
 - (f) Provincial and Local Finance.
 - (g) the Borrowing of Public Bodies ; and
 - (h) Alienations of Revenue and of Land.
- (ii.) Separate Revenue, that is to say—
 - (a) Opium.
 - (b) Salt.
 - (c) Stamps.
 - (d) Excise ; and
 - (e) Assessed Taxes
- (iii.) Currency and Banking, that is to say—
 - (a) the Mints.
 - (b) Coinage.
 - (c) Paper Currency and
 - (d) Presidency Banks.
- (iv.) Salaries and allowances, that is to say—
 - (a) the Pay and Allowances of Public Officers.
 - (b) Leave to Public Officers and
 - (c) Pensions and Gratuities ; and
- (v.) the Civil Account Department including Treasuries ;
- (vi.) Army Finance ; and
- (vii.) the Military Accounts Department.

Rules of Business as approved by the Secretary of State in Council in his despatch, dated 9th February, 1906.

1. The business of the Government of India shall be classified and distributed among the different Departments under the following heads, and each of the subjects hereinafter indicated shall, for the purposes of these rules, be deemed to belong to the Department to which it is allotted in the annexed list :—

- (A) Home Department.
- (B) Department of Revenue and Agriculture.
- (C) Public Works Department.
- (D) Foreign Department.
- (E) Finance Department.

All business throughout British India and in all places in Native States administered by the Governor General in Council connected with the administration of

- (i.) General Finance, that is to say—
 - (a) the Public Accounts and Estimates ;
 - (b) the Public Expenditure.
 - (c) the Public Ways and Means including Loans to and from the Public Treasury.
 - (d) the Management of the Public Funds.
 - (e) Taxation.
 - (f) Provincial and Local Finance.
 - (g) the Borrowing of Public Bodies ; and
 - (h) Alienations of Revenue and of Land.
- (ii.) Separate Revenue, that is to say—
 - (a) Opium.
 - (b) Salt.
 - (c) Stamps.
 - (d) Excise ; and
 - (e) Assessed Taxes.
- (iii.) Currency and Banking, that is to say—
 - (a) the Mints.
 - (b) Coinage.
 - (c) Paper Currency and
 - (d) Presidency Banks.
- (iv.) Salaries and allowances, that is to say—
 - (a) the Pay and Allowances of Public Officers.
 - (b) Leave to Public Officers and
 - (c) Pensions and Gratuities ; and
- (v.) the Civil Account Department including Treasuries ;
- (vi.) Army Finance ; and
- (vii.) the Military Accounts Department.

Existing Rules of Business in which alterations have been proposed.

(F) Military Department.

All business throughout British India and, save as otherwise provided in the case of cantonments, in all places in Native States administered by the Governor-General in Council, connected with the administration of—

(i.) the Army;

(ii.) Cantonments, other than those in Native States administered by the Governor-General in Council;

(iii.) Military Works;

(iv.) the Volunteers;

(v.) the Royal Indian Marine; and

(vi.) Marine Surveys and dangers to Navigation (corresponding with the Hydrographic section of the Admiralty).

[(G) Department of Commerce and Industry.]

RULE 2.

Subject to the provisions of Rule I, the business of the different Departments shall, for the purposes of the first perusal of papers and of the initiation of orders thereon, be allotted to the Governor-General and the Ordinary Members of Council in such manner as the Governor-General may, from time to time, direct.

PART II.—DISPOSAL OF BUSINESS.

RULE 3.

Save as otherwise provided by Rule 5, sub-section 2, and Rule 6, cases shall ordinarily be submitted by the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs for the purposes of the first perusal of papers and of the initiation of orders thereon, to the Member in charge of that Department.

Draft Rules of Business proposed by the Government of India in their telegram of the 23rd January, 1906.

(F) Army Department.

All business connected with—

(i.) the Army, except such business as is allotted to the Department of Military Supply;

(ii.) Cantonments;

(iii.) the Volunteers.

(G) Department of Military Supply.

All business connected with—

(i.) the control of Army Contracts;

(ii.) the purchase of Stores, Ordnance, and Remounts;

(iii.) the custody and control of all Stores, Ordnance, and Remounts not expressly assigned by the Government of India to the Army Department;

(iv.) the management of Military Works;

(v.) the Clothing and Manufacturing Departments;

(vi.) the Indian Medical Service;

(vii.) the Royal Indian Marine;

(viii.) Marine Surveys and dangers to navigation (corresponding with the Hydrographic Section of the Admiralty).

RULE 2.

Subject to the provisions of Rule I, the business of the different Departments shall, for the purposes of the first perusal of papers and of the initiation of orders thereon, be allotted to the Governor-General and the Members of Council in such manner as the Governor-General may, from time to time, direct.

PART II.—DISPOSAL OF BUSINESS.

RULE 3.

Save as otherwise provided by Rules 3a, 5, sub-section, 2, 6, and 6a, cases shall ordinarily be submitted by the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs for the purposes of the first perusal of papers, and of the initiation of orders thereon, to the Member in charge of that Department.

RULE 3a.

In the Army Department papers and cases may be submitted to the Member in charge of the Department by the Head of the Division of the Department to which the subject has been assigned by the Member.

Rules of Business as approved by the Secretary of State in Council in his despatch dated 9th February, 1906.

(F) Army Department.

All business connected with—

(i.) the Army, except such business as is allotted to the Department of Military Supply;

(ii.) Cantonments;

(iii.) the Volunteers.

(G) Department of Military Supply.

All business connected with—

(i.) the control of Army Contracts;

(ii.) the purchase of Stores, Ordnance, and Remounts;

(iii.) the custody and control of all Stores, Ordnance, and Remounts not expressly assigned by the Government of India to the Army Department;

(iv.) the management of Military Works;

(v.) the Clothing and Manufacturing Departments;

(vi.) the Indian Medical Service;

(vii.) the Royal Indian Marine;

(viii.) Marine Surveys and dangers to navigation (corresponding with the Hydrographic Section of the Admiralty).

RULE 2.

Subject to the provisions of Rule I, the business of the different Departments shall, for the purposes of the first perusal of papers, and of the initiation of orders thereon, be allotted to the Governor-General and the Members of Council in such manner as the Governor-General may, from time to time, direct.

PART II.—DISPOSAL OF BUSINESS.

RULE 3.

Save as otherwise provided by Rules 5, sub-section 2, 6, and 6a, cases shall ordinarily be submitted by the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs for the purposes of the first perusal of papers, and of the initiation of orders thereon, to the Member in charge of that Department.

RULE 3a.

Not approved.

Existing Rules of Business in which alterations have been proposed.

Draft Rules of Business proposed by the Government of India in their telegram of the 23rd January, 1906.

Rules of Business as approved by the Secretary of State in Council in his despatch dated 9th February, 1906.

RULE 6a.

In order to enable the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department to discharge the duties imposed upon him by Rules 5, subsection 2, 6, 9, and 39 :

- (i.) he shall be a member of the advisory Council.
- (ii.) he shall have the right to attend all the meetings of the Mobilisation Committee, and shall be informed of the business to be brought before the Committee, and of the decisions arrived at ;
- (iii.) all matters entered in a schedule approved by the Governor-General shall be referred to him before orders are issued ;

(iv.) a list of the papers and cases submitted to the Member in charge of the Department, under Rule 3a, shall be furnished to him daily ;

(v.) he shall be entitled, at any stage of the discussion of any subject assigned to the Army Department—

(a) to call for the papers,

(b) to record, for the consideration of the Member in charge, a note on any matter.

RULE 11 (2) (b).

The Military Department may, without making a previous reference to the Finance Department, issue orders sanctioning any expenditure which does not require the previous sanction of the Secretary of State in Council and does not involve any outlay in excess of the total Budget-grant to the Military Department or a reappropriation from any one to any other grant or minor head of Account.

(i.) does not require the sanction of the Secretary of State ;

(ii.) does not involve any outlay in excess of the total sanctioned Budget provision under any major head of Account ; and

(iii.) does not involve reappropriation from any one or more grants or minor heads of Account to any other such grants or minor heads exceeding in the aggregate 3 lakhs in any one financial year.

RULE 11 (2) (b).

The Army Department and the Department of Military Supply may each, without making a previous reference to the Financial Department, issue orders sanctioning any expenditure which—

(i.) does not require the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council ;

(ii.) does not involve any outlay in excess of the total sanctioned Budget provision under any major head of Account ; and

(iii.) does not involve reappropriation from any one or more grants or minor heads of Account to any other such grants or minor heads exceeding in the aggregate 3 lakhs in any one financial year.

RULE 6a

In order to enable the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department to discharge the duties imposed upon him by Rules 5, subsection 2, 6, 9, and 39 :

(i.) he shall be a member of the advisory Council and of the Mobilisation Committee;

(ii.) all matters entered in a schedule approved by the Governor-General shall be referred to him before orders are issued ;

(iii.) he shall be entitled, at any stage of the discussion of any subject assigned to the Army Department—

(a) to call for papers,

(b) to record, for the consideration of the Member in charge, a note on any matter.

RULE 11 (2) (b).

The Army Department and the Department of Military Supply may each without making a previous reference to the Financial Department, issue orders sanctioning any expenditure which—

No. 5.

The following Rules of Business are mentioned in telegram from the Viceroy of India, dated 23rd January, 1906, but no alteration was or is proposed in them :—

5 (2). Any case which is of special importance and urgency may be submitted by the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs, direct to the Governor-General, who may either pass orders on it himself, or send it for disposal to the member in charge of that Department :

Provided that when a case is so submitted to the Governor-General the member in charge shall be informed of the fact by the Secretary.

6. Any case may, at any stage, if the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs thinks fit, be submitted by him to the Governor-General.

9 (1). Every case the subject of which concerns another Department shall, unless it be one of extreme urgency, be referred for consideration to such Department before it is circulated to the members or brought before a meeting of Council, and before any orders are issued.

(2). If all the Departments concerned are not in agreement regarding a case dealt with under this Rule, it shall be submitted by the Secretary in the Department to which the subject belongs to the Governor-General for orders as to its being brought before a meeting of Council.

39 (1). The Secretary in each Department shall be responsible for the careful observance therein of these Rules.

(2). Where a Secretary considers that there has been any departure from these Rules he shall personally bring the matter to the notice of the Governor-General.

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

[Handwritten signature]

X

CORRESPONDENCE

REGARDING THE

ABOLITION OF THE DEPARTMENT

OF

MILITARY SUPPLY.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
By DARLING & SON, LTD., 34-40, BACON STREET, E.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
WYMAN AND SONS, LTD., FETTER LANE, E.C., and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
OLIVER & BOYD, TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH; or
E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN

1909.

[Cd. 4574.] Price 2½d.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Document.	Date.	From.	To.	Subject.	Page.
1	Despatch	1905. 31 May	Secretary of State	Governor-General	Military administration in India.	3
2	Despatch	1906. 9 Feb.	Secretary of State	Governor-General	New rules of working...	12
3	Letter	1907. 19 March	Governor-General	Secretary of State	Observations on working of new system.	16
4	Despatch	28 June	Secretary of State	Governor-General	Further information re- quested.	17
5	Letter	26 Sept.	Governor-General	Secretary of State	Reply to No. 5	18
6	Despatch	27 Dec.	Secretary of State	Governor-General	Postponement of pro- jected changes.	19
7	Letter	1908. 1 Oct.	Governor-General	Secretary of State	Proposed abolition of de- partment of military supply.	20
8	Despatch	1909. 22 Jan.	Secretary of State	Governor-General	Proposals sanctioned ...	22
9	Diagram showing the organization of the Army Administration on the abolition of the Military Supply Department.					23

EAST INDIA (ARMY ADMINISTRATION).

CORRESPONDENCE

REGARDING THE

ABOLITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY SUPPLY.

No. 1.*

Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General in Council, No. 66, Military, dated May 31, 1905.

I have considered in Council with very great care your despatch in the Military Department, No. 36, dated 23rd March, 1905, in which you favoured me with the views of your Government as to the present system of military administration in India, and forwarded the opinions of the Commander-in-Chief and the Member of Council in charge of the Military Department, commonly referred to as "the Military Member," and also a Minute from Your Excellency on the whole situation. I recognise to the full the importance of the issues which you have now brought to my notice, and have submitted them for the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

2. It is pointed out in the early portion of the despatch under reply that the question submitted to you assumes a larger aspect than that which was raised in my despatch, No. 153, of the 2nd December, 1904, and you are of opinion that "the failure to provide the Indian Army in the past with a scheme of mobilisation equal in scope to that on which we are now engaged, upon Lord Kitchener's advice, in carrying into effect, is not due to the system under which we are working, but to the absence of funds, and to that cause alone." I entirely accept Your Excellency's statement as to the facts which have come under your personal notice, and realise that expenditure, which it has been reasonable to incur in recent favourable years, could not have been undertaken 10 or 15 years ago. But I would point out that, since the year 1900, there have been a succession of surpluses ranging from £1,670,000 to £4,950,000. The certainty of such surpluses accruing has usually been manifest some months before the close of the financial year. It appears to me beyond question, from some of the instances which have been brought before me in the present correspondence, that considerable orders for deficient supplies could have been more readily placed, under a system free from the delays necessitated by the relations existing between the Department of the Commander-in-Chief and the Military Department, than has been possible up to now.

3. I agree with Your Excellency in regarding the case submitted by the Commander-in-Chief, and the reply of Sir Edmond Elles, as opening up wide questions, the consideration of which is rendered extremely difficult by the startling discrepancy between the contentions of Lord Kitchener and the opinion which Your Excellency in Council has pronounced upon them. Lord Kitchener calls attention to the "enormous delay and endless discussion" involved in the Indian system; he speaks of vexatious and, for the most part, unnecessary criticism, extending not merely to the "financial effect of the proposal, but to its desirability or necessity from the purely military point of view." He regards the system as one of "dual control and divided responsibility," and after citing a number of instances in support of his view, he states that "the Army is bad, despite its splendid material in officers and men," and that no continuity of policy has been pursued except that which is inherent to the present system, namely, "that of making it easy to stand still, and extremely difficult to move forward."

* Originally printed in Cd. 2572 of 1905 (page 57).

4. Your Excellency's despatch challenges these imputations *en bloc*, while the answer of Sir Edmond Elles on the charges of delay fully satisfies your Government. As regards the friction attributed to the present system, you desire to dissociate yourselves altogether from the charge that these two officers have been trained to unfortunate jealousy and antagonism, and you think that "there is no unnecessary "or inherent want of co-ordination between the different parts of the military "machine." You more especially refer to the treatment of the Commander-in-Chief's memorandum respecting preparations for war and the rapid realisation of the reorganisation scheme put forward by him as being an unanswerable refutation of the charges against the Military Department. You are "particularly surprised "to learn that the Military Member is really omnipotent in India in military affairs, "and you regard the proposal of Lord Kitchener as one to substitute for the control "of the Army by the Governor-General in Council, which we regard as a funda- "mental principle of our constitution, control by a single individual, that is to say, the Commander-in-Chief himself." You further point out the impossibility of any one individual, however able, undertaking the sole control of the Departments now divided between the Military Member and the Commander-in-Chief, and you regard the presence of a Military Member as indispensable, in order to secure technical criticism of military proposals made by the Commander-in-Chief.

5. Your Excellency's despatch, in which all your colleagues, with the exception of the Commander-in-Chief, concur, shows that there is a complete divergence between the views of yourself and your Council and those of the Commander-in-Chief as to all these questions. No fault is admitted in the system; no suggestions are considered necessary for recasting it. Indeed, it is not easy to see in what respect, in consonance with your despatch, it would be possible to suggest reform. On the other hand, in the Minute of Your Excellency, of the 6th February, enclosed for our information, it is stated that "any reasonable reform or readjustment in "the system we would willingly consider, but no such proposals are before us." I could have wished that we had heard at the same time what was in Your Excellency's mind in regard to possible reforms or readjustments, and in what direction you thought it possible that they might proceed. In regard to this, I have carefully considered the past history of the relations of the Commander-in-Chief and the Military Department, in order to ascertain whether the difficulties which have now arisen are of a novel character, or whether, having occurred before, any remedies have been proposed for them.

6. Your Excellency's Minute states, after reciting the numerous occasions on which the Army organisation has been made the subject of review and criticism, that "on all these occasions, without exception, the result has been a confirmation "of the existing system, which may be said, therefore, to be supported by a consensus "of authority almost unprecedented in the history of military administration." I cannot help feeling that this proposition is subject to some qualifications.

Sir Ashley Eden's Commission of 1879 stated in very strong terms the objections which existed to the present system, and the impossibility of working it satisfactorily.

Among other pregnant passages it states :—

"The position of the Executive Commander-in-Chief as a Member of Council "is, in the opinion of the majority, one without precedent in the organisation of "any European Government or army. It is contrary to one of the most essential "and salutary principles of sound administrations; and the common instinct and "experience of all administrations, whether representative or despotic, has every- "where rejected it.

"It has been found to weaken simultaneously the executive initiative of the "military, and the financial control of the civil authority, by constantly confounding "and confusing their respective spheres of independent activity. It renders "practically impossible that continuous personal contact, which in every well- "organised system of military administration has been found so beneficial, between "the supreme executive head of the whole army and the subordinate heads of its "various branches and corps. Finally, between the Governor-General, the Com- "mander-in-Chief and the Military Member, whom it places in fundamentally false "relations towards each other, there has been, under each successive administration "since the existence of this ill-advised arrangement, continual friction, or cause for "friction.

"One remedy which has occasionally been proposed for the inconveniences of "the existing arrangement has been the division of the whole Army into four such

“army corps as we have agreed to recommend, and the abolition of the appointment of Commander-in-Chief altogether, making the Military Member of the Council practically the Commander-in-Chief and the head of the War Department,—making him, in fact, the administrative and executive head of the Army. We cannot bring ourselves to advocate such an arrangement.”

In consequence, the Committee recommended a drastic change in the existing system by excluding the Commander-in-Chief from Council.

Lord Lytton, writing as Governor-General in 1880, with a greater experience of war on a large scale than any of the Governors-General who have followed him, fully supported the Commission in their desire for change, but stated very forcibly his reasons for thinking that change should take the shape of excluding the officer in charge of the Military Department from Council, and not the Commander-in-Chief. The following paragraphs supply the main points in Lord Lytton's argument:—

“Take away this seat in Council and intensify the Commander-in-Chief's subordination to the Military Member, as the Commission proposes to do, and it seems to me that the official position of the great executive head of the Army in India must forthwith become not only intolerable but untenable. I cannot but fear that no officer conscious of his own abilities, and possessing, with the independence of character and intellect which is desirable, the military rank and reputation which are requisite to fill with adequate efficiency and influence the great office of Commander-in-Chief in India, would then be found willing to accept it on such terms, and this would be a serious misfortune for both the Government and the Army of India. I cannot too emphatically record my conviction that the dual military Government organised in this country ‘on a system of want of trust’ should be abolished as speedily and completely as possible. To quote once more the wise words of Lord Dalhousie, ‘there cannot be two masters having the power to control public measures.’

“My conclusion is, then that the Commander-in-Chief should be himself the Military Member, *and the only Military Member* of the Viceroy's Council. In him alone, as in the War Minister of every country not governed by parliamentary institutions, should be united and concentrated the executive command and the administrative control of the Army.

“The recognised head of this great Army of India, cannot, with advantage to it or to the State, be long or frequently absent from the seat of Government, and were the Commander-in-Chief in India fully invested (as I for one would wish to see him) with all the important functions and responsibilities appropriate to his natural position in a non-Parliamentary Government, he would I feel sure be the first to recognise that his proper place is by the side of the Viceroy, and that it is not consistent with the efficient discharge of his highest duties to absent himself from the Council table of the Governor-General in order to take personal command of fractions of his own army which may happen to be employed at any time on active service.

“I do not approve or support the proposal to exclude the Commander-in-Chief from Council. But I am, nevertheless, deeply convinced of the expediency of putting an end to the dual element in our present military administration.”

No action was taken on either of these proposals.

Lord Dufferin, writing in 1888, expressed in the following very strong terms his preference for the maintenance of the Military Member in Council:—

“The history of the past is invoked by the department which is concerned with the maintenance of the constitutional and traditional policy of the Government of India, while the purely military view of the matter under discussion is powerfully represented by the Commander-in-Chief both through the medium of his staff, and by his own presence and influence in the Council Chamber. Under such a system I believe there is neither danger of rash innovations being carried by a military chief who from absence from India, or other causes, may not be in sympathy with Indian circumstances and affairs, nor the slightest risk that the Army of India shall be passed in the race of military reforms and inventions.

“It will be seen, therefore, that I hold the strongest opinion that the form of the supreme military administration in India, should not be changed, but that opportunity should be taken to introduce improvements whenever this can be done without impairing the constitutional structure.

“In conclusion, I desire to point out to my colleagues that these opinions are founded upon no mere theoretical considerations, but are based upon experience,

“for it has been my lot to overlook during my tenure of office considerable military operations and to enter upon military questions of great magnitude and importance.”

But in the following year Lord Roberts, the then Commander-in-Chief, placed his views very unmistakably before the Governor-General (Lord Lansdowne) in the following passages taken from his Minute:—

“Although it would be difficult to find more able or experienced officers than those at present employed in administering the Army, inclusive of its finances and subsidiary departments; and although the Military Secretariat and the Army Headquarters offices have been brought close together at considerable expense, still, official correspondence has increased enormously, and the relations between the two great departments of the Indian War Office are becoming less cordial than might be desired.

“Such a state of things is much to be regretted. Here are two sets of officers of high capacity, animated by a common zeal, guided by a common sense of duty, and each striving to do their best for the Sovereign they serve and the army to which they belong. Yet each set appears to be pulling a different way, to be following a different object, and to be actuated by a jealous rivalry rather than by a friendly emulation. Such a result can only be brought about by a system so radically faulty that it neutralizes individual effort and estranges official relations.”

Changes in procedure were in consequence authorised by Lord Lansdowne, which satisfied Lord Roberts, and secured a more effective working of the system during the remainder of his period of office.

Your Excellency, while referring to the above opinions and some others, has not cited the views of any of the Commanders-in-Chief later than Lord Roberts, and no formal expression of opinion seems to have been invited on this matter in the ten years which preceded the appointment of Lord Kitchener. But it has been brought to my notice that both Sir George White and Sir William Lockhart, during their respective periods of command, at different times expressed opinions very similar to those which have been cited from Lord Roberts' Minute of 1889. It is also noteworthy that in June, 1898, Sir Donald Stewart, in a minute recorded in this Office, written apparently under a sense of the difficulties which then prevailed, gave his opinion as follows:—

“I should like to go further and ask the Government of India to consider the desirability of excluding the Commander-in-Chief from Council. The Government can at any time consult the Commander-in-Chief on military or other matters when the necessity arises.”

7. So far then from the existing system being supported by a consensus of authority almost unprecedented in the history of military administration, I would point out, for your Excellency's consideration, that, while successive Commanders-in-Chief have found it exceedingly difficult to work, the force of their contentions is fortified by the fact that the Ashley Eden Committee, Lord Lytton, and Sir Donald Stewart, all at different times proposed the removal of one of the contending parties from Council, and the evidence taken generally would appear to show that, although a *modus vivendi* has been secured by the tact and good feeling of the officers principally concerned, the system has not been one tending to smooth or effective working. To these authorities must be added that of the present Military Member, who, in the minute enclosed in Your Excellency's despatch, argues in favour of the abolition of the dual system by the removal from Your Excellency's Council of the Commander-in-Chief, and adds that “his dual functions have in the past given rise to friction and will certainly do so again.”

8. In reviewing the minutes which you have placed before me, I desire at once to express my conviction that there has been no deliberate opposition to or delay of the Commander-in-Chief's proposals by the Military Department. It is due to Sir Edmond Elles' own character, as well as to that of the officers serving under him, to make it perfectly clear that his discharge of duty has been dictated entirely by his conception of the responsibilities devolving upon him, and of the public interest. Moreover, his line of conduct has under existing regulations received the approval of Your Excellency's Government. The treatment of Lord Kitchener's reorganisation scheme by the Military Department is, as Your Excellency justly observes, a testimony to the spirit which animates the work of the higher officers of that Department. The question to be now considered is whether the conception which the Military Member has formed of his duty, no doubt following the precedent of some of his predecessors, is a correct one. Sir Edmond

Elles states that "the system is that of *divide et impera*," and he cites the late Sir George Chesney to the following effect: "If the relations between Army Headquarters and the Government, as represented by the Military Department, are to be maintained harmoniously under the proposed arrangement, it can only be by the authorities connected with the former recognising their position of relative subordination, subordination compatible with deference to their opinions on the part of the Military Department, but nevertheless that the Military Department is the Government as far as they are concerned, and that its decisions must be loyally accepted."

9. These views appear to have animated the Military Member in the whole of his conduct of the affairs of his department. In theory they merely assert what is patent to everyone connected with the Government of India, namely, that the Commander-in-Chief, like every person and every department in the Government of India, must be subordinate to the Governor-General in Council, and must take his orders through some channel, and that the Military Department is the channel for conveying such orders. They infer that any indisposition on the part of the Commander-in-Chief and Army Headquarters to accept them in such a manner is due to a lack of appreciation of the constitutional principles on which the Government is conducted.

10. In practice, however, the insistence on Sir George Chesney's formula leads to an anomalous condition of affairs. It is obviously impossible for the Governor-General, who is himself immediately responsible for the control of the Foreign Department, who regulates the disposal of the difficulties that arise in all other departments of Government, and who holds one of the most laborious posts, if not the most laborious post, under the British Crown, to be consulted daily and hourly on the numberless questions which arise in the administration of an army. As a matter of daily routine, it is obvious that only a small number of such questions can be submitted to him or to the Council at all. They have to be decided, therefore, by some responsible officer, who, in this case, is the Member in charge of the Military Department.

The position, therefore, is as follows:—The most distinguished soldier available is placed in command of the Army in India. He is necessarily subject, as in the case of every other country where the command of the Army is not in the hands of a despotic ruler, to financial and political checks. But, in the case of India, alone, as it is believed, among all military organisations, the Commander-in-Chief is subject to having his military proposals checked and criticised by another expert of less standing and reputation than himself, who, after reviewing them, has the privilege of submitting the result to the final court of appeal in India, namely, the Governor-General in Council, where he votes on an equality with the Commander-in-Chief, and, finally, conveys to his own colleague the orders of the Government. This situation is rendered the more anomalous by the fact that the Secretary to the Government of India, who is necessarily in close relations with the Member in charge of the Military Department, is also an officer in the Army, and is available for consultation by the Viceroy, without the knowledge of the Commander-in-Chief, who has consequently two critics of inferior rank whose views on military questions may be preferred to his. Under such a system it can only be due to the tact and judgment which have been shown by all parties that complaints have not more frequently transpired; and, were it not for the important constitutional questions which are raised in the despatch under reply, and which have no doubt been present to the minds of Your Excellency's predecessors, it is doubtful whether the system in its present form would have been allowed to continue without modification up to the present time.

11. In paragraph 10 of the despatch, under reply, Your Excellency states that "in its constitutional aspect, we are as much in disagreement with the argument of the Commander-in-Chief as we have been in its more critical features. We regard his scheme as a proposal, not so much to improve the efficiency of the Army either in peace or war, as to revolutionise the Government of India," and you speak of "a system of military autocracy such as is advocated by Lord Kitchener." In paragraphs 14, 15, and 16 of Your Excellency's Minute, you review the dangers which would be involved by having a Commander-in-Chief as sole military adviser to the Government. I think that, in putting forward this contention, Your Excellency has hardly done justice to the checks under which the Government of India is worked. Even if the proposal of Lord Kitchener were adopted in its entirety,

measures connected with the Army would still be subject financially to the criticism of an expert financier with a large department, the head of which has a seat in Council. In their political bearing they would come under the review of the five or six trained heads of departments sitting in Council, while above and beyond both is the Governor-General himself, wielding great power, with access to all documents or persons whom he may desire to examine. Supposing all these obstacles to have been surmounted, any change of importance, and many which are not of great importance, are, by the statutes which govern the administration of India, referred to the Secretary of State in Council at Whitehall. The organisation of the department under the Secretary of State involves the review of any military measure by a Military Department which has at present an Indian General at its head. Such measures are then submitted to one or more Committees of the Council of India, on which experienced military officers have, from its inception, always had a place, and are finally subject to the decision of the Secretary of State in Council. By the mere fact of the time occupied in the transmission and consideration of the documents, it is obvious that no step can be taken hastily or without due deliberation. Indeed, were the machinery about to be set up *de novo*, it is open to doubt whether the Indian Government might not urge that the checks imposed on the passage of a measure from the time it leaves the hands of its author to its final adoption after discussion in London, are too numerous for the rapid progress of business. Bearing in mind all these processes, which, though familiar to Your Excellency, do not appear to have been fully weighed in the despatch under reply, it is difficult to understand how the absence of a second military expert in Council "would produce a military autocracy," or violate "a fundamental principle of our constitution."

12. His Majesty's Government, after most carefully weighing the arguments put forward on both sides, are forced to the conclusion that, while there may be strong reasons against the adoption as a whole of the proposals of the Commander-in-Chief, the time has come when it is necessary substantially to reform and re-adjust the system under which military business is conducted. Whatever the views of the framers of the Military Department may have been at its inception, it is clear that it can only have been intended to typify the paramount civilian control of the Governor-General in Council, and not to supply a military equipoise to the authority of the Commander-in-Chief. Nevertheless, during the last 25 years, the progress seems to have been consistently in the latter direction. The Secretariat has at its head a Major-General and two Colonels, while the number of military officers employed in the Department has very largely increased. Until recent years it was the practice of the head of the department to sink his military status on all occasions, and to adopt the civil *rôle* which appertains to the powers which he wields. While the estimate of those responsible as to the character of their duties appears to have somewhat changed, the actual work passing between the two departments has largely increased. It is noteworthy that in the year 1903-04 the number of communications passing between the Military Department and the Commander-in-Chief's Department amounted on mobilisation questions alone to nearly 10,000, although the two departments, as Your Excellency points out, are situated in the same building at Calcutta and in adjacent buildings at Simla. In reference to this, Sir Edmond Elles suggests that the abolition of the Mobilisation Committee is to a great extent responsible for this increase of correspondence, but it is clear that any committee, the chairman of which is liable to be subsequently overruled at the instance of one of the members, from whose department may emanate orders entirely opposed to the decision of the Committee, must be worked with some difficulty. The situation of both the Military Member and the Commander-in-Chief on such a Committee must necessarily be a delicate one.

13. The same observation applies to the discussions which have taken place between the two departments on matters in which military and financial considerations are blended. So long as the member in charge of the Military Department considers himself bound by his office to supply the Government of India with a technical and expert opinion on all that is proposed by the Commander-in-Chief, he would be wanting in his duty if he shrank from bringing forward such arguments as he thinks applicable to each case. It is thus possible for each officer to discharge his duty correctly, and yet for the public service to suffer, and I am satisfied that in many instances the discussions proceeding between these two departments have passed the limits of safety in matters in which action might be urgently required.

14. To take, as an instance, the question of the small arms ammunition reserve, on which both Lord Kitchener and Sir Edmond Elles have written at some

length. The printed proceedings show that Lord Kitchener asked for a reserve of 1,000 rounds per arm of small arms ammunition on the 17th February, 1904. The scheme apparently was not noted on in the Military Department till the 19th May, 1904, a loss of three months. Discussion in the department proceeded till the 21st July, 1904, when a despatch was sent to the Secretary of State asking what was the amount of the reserve of small arms ammunition maintained at home. The Secretary of State telegraphed a reply on the 16th August, but the Military Department decided to await details by post, and the case was returned to the Adjutant-General in the Commander-in-Chief's Department, apparently for the first time, on the 21st September, after more than seven months' delay. In October the Commander-in-Chief, while adhering to his already-recorded opinion, accepted the Military Department's proposal for the time being, but reserved the right to reopen the question in the future. Accordingly, after nine months' consideration, the reserve of 1,000 rounds asked for was cut down to 750 rounds, involving a total addition of 50,000,000 rounds to be manufactured in three years. Further discussions took place as to whether ammunition immediately available for purchase in England out of savings on the Military Budget should be accepted as part of this supply, which was again contested by the Military Department, and a final decision was only given on the 22nd December. The whole question thus occupied ten months, and it is noteworthy that during that period telegrams were passing between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy as to a possible mobilisation and the provision of stores, of which this reserve was not the least urgent.

15. In considering how the difficulties which have arisen can be met, I desire to lay down that, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, it is undesirable that in the future there should be two officers appointed to the Viceroy's Council for the purpose of giving expert opinions on military questions, or that there should be two departments under the Government of India equipped for the purpose of dealing with purely military problems. On the other hand, I agree with Your Excellency in your opinion that it would be impossible for any one man, however able and hard working, to undertake the whole responsibility of the business at present conducted by the Military Department and the Commander-in-Chief. It would not be in accordance with modern ideas of military organisation to hamper the Commander-in-Chief with the details of contracts, manufacture, the provision of stores, and the conduct of military works, when the responsibilities of his own peculiar province tend to increase every year. It is necessary that the Commander-in-Chief's mind should be free for the control of the personnel and training of the army, for strategical plans, and for the direction of military intelligence and of schemes for mobilisation. But while it is highly desirable to make a division of labour which should not impose on the Commander-in-Chief the direction of details which are not wholly of a military character, it is essential that, while sparing him this burden, we should not impose on him a greater one by the duplication of discussion relating to military problems of every description. Starting from this standpoint, the following changes of organisation appear to His Majesty's Government to be necessary.

16. They propose to draw a clear distinction between the purely military services which should be controlled by the Commander-in-Chief, and the services of supply and manufacture, which will be under the control of a separate officer whose relations with the Commander-in-Chief will differ from those of the member in charge of the Military Department as at present organised.

17. The Commander-in-Chief will be directly responsible to the Governor-General in Council for command, staff, and regimental appointments, promotion, discipline, training, organisation, distribution of the army, intelligence, mobilisation, schemes of offence and defence, peace manœuvres, war preparation (excluding supply of matériel), and the conduct of war. As regards the Supply and Transport Department, in which matters of personnel and matériel are alike concerned, the arrangement which has recently been made will be adhered to. Such matériel, ammunition, and stores as are required for mobilisation will be entrusted to a personnel directly responsible to the Commander-in-Chief.

18. The functions of the Military Department, in charge of another member of your Council, will be limited to responsibility to Government for the control of army contracts, the purchase of stores, ordnance, and remounts, the management

of Military Works, the Clothing and Manufacturing Departments, Indian Medical Service, and Indian Marine. The recent development of the Manufacturing Departments, which will, as Your Excellency informs us, be shortly employing 15,000 to 20,000 skilled artisans, will make a special demand upon the time and administrative ability of the member in charge.

With regard to Military Finance, it has been suggested that it would be very advisable to transfer the Departments of the Military Accountant-General and of the Controllers to the Finance Department of Your Excellency's Government. This, it is urged, while strengthening the financial control of your Government over all military proposals, would diminish the probability of friction between the Commander-in-Chief's Department and the Department of Military Supply, and would give to the latter some useful relief. I request that Your Excellency will consider this proposal in Council, and will favour me with your opinion upon it.

19. When effect is given to these provisions, the work of the present Military Department will be distributed between two Departments, one of which, dealing with the subjects specified in paragraph 17, will be known as "The Army Department," and will be in charge of the Commander-in-Chief as Member of Council; while the other, to be called "The Department of Military Supply," will deal with the subjects mentioned in paragraph 18, and will be in charge of another Member of Council; and each of these departments will have its own Secretariat.

20. Apart from the apportionment of duties as indicated above, the procedure to be followed in conducting business between the Army Department and the Military Supply Department is very important, since it appears that the friction which has occurred of late years is due to the methods of the Military Department, as well as to the principles on which it has worked. The Member in charge of the Military Supply Department should realise that his duties are more of a civil than of a military nature, and that his business is to assist the Commander-in-Chief in his endeavours to render the army in all respects fit for war, within the limits of financial considerations.

21. The present system under which junior officers in the Military Department record their criticisms on the purely military proposals of the Commander-in-Chief will necessarily terminate. Neither the Member nor his Department will have the power to veto any proposal put forward by the Commander-in-Chief. The power of veto (apart from any statutory powers vested in the Governor-General) must rest exclusively with the Governor-General in Council after due consideration. As a means of expediting business, it appears particularly desirable that there should be frequent personal conference between the heads of the Military Supply and Army Departments.

22. In this connection I think that the sittings of the Mobilisation Committee may advantageously be revived. The difficulties which prevented Lord Kitchener from fully availing himself of the Committee in the past will have been done away with. The Commander-in-Chief, sitting as President of such a Committee, which would include the Member in charge of the Department of Military Supply, and other officers, will be able rapidly and effectively to dispose of many questions which are now the subject of prolonged correspondence.

23. The Member of Council in charge of the Military Supply Department will specially advise the Governor-General in Council on questions of general policy as distinct from purely military questions, and it will be desirable in the event of the Commander-in-Chief being an officer of the British service, that the Member should be an officer of considerable Indian experience and of administrative capacity, and intimately acquainted with the characteristics of the Native Army. His functions will be essentially those of a civilian administrator with military knowledge and experience. The changes which it is proposed to introduce into his department will make it necessary to dispense with some of the officials in the department whose numbers have considerably increased in the last twenty-five years, and to employ officers of a rank not so high as at present, but equal to that of their predecessors in earlier years, while the Secretary should not, in future, be of higher rank than that of Colonel. Some reduction of staff will also be possible which will go towards meeting the additional cost of the changes which are recommended at Army Headquarters, and which I now bring to Your Excellency's attention.

24. The duties of the Commander-in-Chief have been constantly increasing of recent years. It has become necessary for the Commander-in-Chief to control questions of military intelligence and organisation, and to spend even a larger time than heretofore upon the personnel of the army. The greater amount of scientific attainment now required by officers necessitates a much more careful weighing of promotions, many of which have hitherto been given by seniority. Inspections by the Commander-in-Chief mean a great deal more than they did thirty or forty years ago. Arrangements for mobilisation, which have been shown to involve the control of the personnel connected with the custody of ammunition and stores, as well as of the Supply and Transport Department, will form a further addition to his duties. Nor can it be forgotten that the reorganisation scheme of the Commander-in-Chief and the measures which will be rendered necessary on the completion of the strategic railways, for which authority will shortly be asked, will form a specially heavy burden on the Commander-in-Chief for the next five years. I am of opinion, therefore, that it is essential that, under the arrangement proposed, an additional officer of superior rank should be appointed as Chief of the Staff to the Commander-in-Chief.

25. This addition will make it possible in future to lay down that, as vacancies occur, when the Commander-in-Chief is an officer of the British Army, two out of the three chief officers under him—the Chief of the Staff, the Adjutant-General and the Quartermaster-General—shall be selected from the Indian Army, while, when the Commander-in-Chief is an Indian Army officer, two out of the three staff officers may be drawn from the British Army. While it is desirable that the Commander-in-Chief should be the sole expert adviser of the Government on purely military questions, it appears to be of great importance that adequate experience and advice should be ready to his hand at the inception of all his proposals.

26. The desire to obtain increased efficiency and proper training for a voluntary army must involve an increase of strain upon officers and men, whether in Great Britain or India, and it often happens that the best military results cannot be obtained without a curtailment of holidays and recreation, or without calling for a certain amount of self-sacrifice on the part of all ranks. It is highly desirable in an organisation like the Indian Army, that the measures, which may be necessary for this purpose, should not be undertaken, or even indicated, without careful expert consideration at headquarters, and it is clear that the necessary precautions in carrying out such measures should not depend on the foresight of one officer in the military hierarchy alone.

27. Assuming this to be recognised, it is most important that the Commander-in-Chief should not feel that all his measures are put forward tentatively to be checked by minute criticism in another department, after he has arrived at his opinion. He should be in a position to submit his schemes direct to the Governor-General in Council, which is not at present the case. It is, therefore, essential that there should be a Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department to prepare cases and documents for direct submission to the Governor-General in Council, and to undertake correspondence with other Government Departments. Alike when the Commander-in-Chief is present, and in the event of his absence from Council, this officer will attend its meetings to submit papers and to give such information and explanations as may be asked for. He will draw the same salary as may hereafter be assigned to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Supply Department.

28. I have now laid down the measures which it appears to me, after consideration in Council, desirable to adopt in view of the decision of His Majesty's Government that the present conflict of authorities shall be put an end to, and that greater freedom of working shall be given to the Commander-in-Chief. I request that Your Excellency will consider forthwith what procedure will be necessary to give effect to this decision, and that you will submit for my approval the arrangements and the rules of business which it will entail. I have already requested Your Excellency's Government to advise how the question of the Finance Department should be dealt with, while the Commander-in-Chief will no doubt furnish for approval the general distribution among his staff officers of the different duties hereby assigned to him.

29. It is highly desirable, in the interests of all concerned, that the changes which His Majesty's Government have decided upon should not be delayed, and

that the officials, who may be appointed to undertake the discharge of the duties laid down above, should enter upon office as soon as may be convenient, but not later than the 1st October next.

30. I have felt it necessary to review at considerable length the various points which have arisen in the present controversy, in order that Your Excellency's Government may be assured that the changes now proposed have not been adopted without the fullest possible consideration of all the interests involved. The smooth and effective working of any department, civil or military, can only be secured by the goodwill of individuals, but the organisation which His Majesty's Government have decided to adopt may, I hope, be counted upon to remove the obvious causes of friction which have militated, in some instances, against good working in the past. The undoubted supremacy of the Governor-General in Council will be maintained. The Commander-in-Chief will wield powers and possess machinery adequate for the furtherance of his military schemes, but not such as to free him from proper financial and political criticism. The Military Supply Department will form a valuable link between the civil and military elements in the Government of India, and the officers employed in it and in the Army Department respectively will mutually assist each other in removing the obstacles which the present Commander-in-Chief, in common with some of his predecessors, finds to be existing to the impediment of business. I cannot doubt that all departments of the Indian Government, and all the individuals concerned, will co-operate with Your Excellency to bring the new system into successful working at the earliest possible moment.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ST. JOHN BRODRICK.

No. 2.*

*Despatch from the Secretary for State for India to the Governor-General in Council,
No. 18 Military, dated 9th February, 1906.*

I have considered in Council Your Excellency's communication of 23rd January, and the new Draft Rules of Business proposed by the Government of India, in conformity with the request made by my predecessor in his despatch of 31st May, 1905, and repeated in his telegram of 21st November.

2. The policy set out in that despatch was designed to put an end to an alleged conflict between the Military Department of the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief as head of the Army; to do away with a troublesome and superfluous duplication of work and to concede to the Commander-in-Chief "greater freedom of working." With these objects in view the Military Department was to be transformed into a branch of administration confined to contracts, ordnance, military stores, works, and the like. The Commander-in-Chief, on the other hand, was to be placed in charge of a newly designated Army Department, which would be invested with all the duties and powers of which the old Military Department had been stripped, save those comprehended under the name of Military Supply.

3. Changes such as these, it is manifest, could easily be made to raise the largest questions of military organisation in India, such, for example, as were handled in the Commission of 1879, and on some other occasions. The scheme itself was inevitably open to many criticisms, both of principle and detail, and to these it was abundantly subjected from various quarters. Is not the combination, it was asked, of the active duties of executive command with the duties of general military administration, a burden too heavy for any one man, however capable and energetic, to support? Can the accidents of personality be overlooked, and the difference between a Commander-in-Chief with special aptitude and predilection for training,

* Originally printed in Cd. 2842 of 1906 (page 6).

discipline, manœuvres, mobilisation, and all the conduct of actual war; and a Commander-in-Chief of another type who excels, and might perhaps have been expressly appointed because excelling, in the sphere of office administration and preparation? How is one system to fit each of these two types? What, again, is to happen in this important sphere of office administration and organisation, if the Member in Charge of the Army Department, in his other capacity of Commander-in-Chief, is called away to duties in the field? Ought not the Member in Charge of Military Supply to be a civilian rather than a soldier? On the other hand, is it indispensable that purely military proposals by the Commander-in-Chief should always be formally submitted to criticism from other military experts, provided always that the Governor-General in Council exercises actual and decisive control where any political or financial question, great or small, directly or indirectly arises? And might not that control be more impaired by a possible concert between two different military authorities under the old system—and I understand that such cases have not been unknown—than by a single military authority with unshared military responsibility, such as is contemplated under the new?

4. These are some of the points that have been brought into view by the despatch of 31st May, 1905, and in the proceedings that followed it. Your Excellency is familiar with them all, and it would be waste of time, under our present circumstances, for me to ask you to travel over ground so well trodden. Into the great fundamental questions of military systems His Majesty's Government do not consider that the occasion of this despatch calls upon them to enter. They have to deal with an actual emergency, and to terminate a deadlock that, apart from a mischievous rise of temperature in discussion to a point considerably above normal, cannot become other than detrimental to effective administration of the Army itself.

When Your Excellency assumed the responsibilities of your great office last November, and I became Secretary of State a few weeks later, it was no *tabula rasa* that we found. A proposed scheme had been agreed upon in principle, with whatever reluctance and qualification, between the Secretary of State in Council and the Governor-General in Council, with the concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief, last July. This compromise among conflicting opinions as to the best way of meeting an admitted desirableness of some improvement and readjustment in the position of the Military Department, His Majesty's Government do not think it wise to re-open, nor by a stroke of the pen to dismiss, at the risk of an indefinite prolongation of fruitless and injurious controversy. On a survey of the practical circumstances of the case, they are convinced that it would be altogether inexpedient to break off Your Excellency's labours in working out the plan of last summer, in accordance with the request addressed by my predecessor to the Governor-General of that day. Accordingly, the task that Your Excellency had undertaken proceeded. It is impossible not to recognise the care, fidelity, and diligence, with which those labours on a vexed and thorny question have been performed, and His Majesty's Government owe Your Excellency their thanks for the full and candid narrative in which you have taken pains to record what has passed.

5. The draft of the rules, in Your Excellency's language, "distributes the functions of the present Military Department between the [proposed new] Army Department and the Department of Military Supply"; and it "amalgamates the new Army Department with the Army Headquarters under the control of the Commander-in-Chief as Member of Council." You further explain in detail how effect is to be given to these objects, and what provision is to be made for the constitutional control of the Army. The cardinal object of maintaining the constitutional responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief to the Governor-General in Council is to be secured by arranging "that the Secretary in the Army Department shall have full knowledge of the business of the Department at every stage, from initiation to completion," so as to "be in a position to keep the Governor-General fully informed upon every detail of military administration over which the Government of India exercises ultimate control." Your Excellency adds, however, the extremely important limitation "that although under my proposals the position of Secretary in the Army Department will differ somewhat from that of Secretaries in other departments, I regard this as unavoidable, and, in view of many safeguards provided for him, I consider his position as unassailable, and in no way inferior to theirs."

The Financial Department accept as sufficient for their requirements the Draft Rules affecting them, and the other arrangements for securing complete financial control of military expenditure. The Member in charge of the Department of

discipline, manœuvres, mobilisation, and all the conduct of actual war; and a Commander-in-Chief of another type who excels, and might perhaps have been expressly appointed because excelling, in the sphere of office administration and preparation? How is one system to fit each of these two types? What, again, is to happen in this important sphere of office administration and organisation, if the Member in Charge of the Army Department, in his other capacity of Commander-in-Chief, is called away to duties in the field? Ought not the Member in Charge of Military Supply to be a civilian rather than a soldier? On the other hand, is it indispensable that purely military proposals by the Commander-in-Chief should always be formally submitted to criticism from other military experts, provided always that the Governor-General in Council exercises actual and decisive control where any political or financial question, great or small, directly or indirectly arises? And might not that control be more impaired by a possible concert between two different military authorities under the old system—and I understand that such cases have not been unknown—than by a single military authority with unshared military responsibility, such as is contemplated under the new?

4. These are some of the points that have been brought into view by the despatch of 31st May, 1905, and in the proceedings that followed it. Your Excellency is familiar with them all, and it would be waste of time, under our present circumstances, for me to ask you to travel over ground so well trodden. Into the great fundamental questions of military systems His Majesty's Government do not consider that the occasion of this despatch calls upon them to enter. They have to deal with an actual emergency, and to terminate a deadlock that, apart from a mischievous rise of temperature in discussion to a point considerably above normal, cannot become other than detrimental to effective administration of the Army itself.

When Your Excellency assumed the responsibilities of your great office last November, and I became Secretary of State a few weeks later, it was no *tabula rasa* that we found. A proposed scheme had been agreed upon in principle, with whatever reluctance and qualification, between the Secretary of State in Council and the Governor-General in Council, with the concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief, last July. This compromise among conflicting opinions as to the best way of meeting an admitted desirableness of some improvement and readjustment in the position of the Military Department, His Majesty's Government do not think it wise to re-open, nor by a stroke of the pen to dismiss, at the risk of an indefinite prolongation of fruitless and injurious controversy. On a survey of the practical circumstances of the case, they are convinced that it would be altogether inexpedient to break off Your Excellency's labours in working out the plan of last summer, in accordance with the request addressed by my predecessor to the Governor-General of that day. Accordingly, the task that Your Excellency had undertaken proceeded. It is impossible not to recognise the care, fidelity, and diligence, with which those labours on a vexed and thorny question have been performed, and His Majesty's Government owe Your Excellency their thanks for the full and candid narrative in which you have taken pains to record what has passed.

5. The draft of the rules, in Your Excellency's language, "distributes the functions of the present Military Department between the [proposed new] Army Department and the Department of Military Supply"; and it "amalgamates the new Army Department with the Army Headquarters under the control of the Commander-in-Chief as Member of Council." You further explain in detail how effect is to be given to these objects, and what provision is to be made for the constitutional control of the Army. The cardinal object of maintaining the constitutional responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief to the Governor-General in Council is to be secured by arranging "that the Secretary in the Army Department shall have full knowledge of the business of the Department at every stage, from initiation to completion," so as to "be in a position to keep the Governor-General fully informed upon every detail of military administration over which the Government of India exercises ultimate control." Your Excellency adds, however, the extremely important limitation "that although under my proposals the position of Secretary in the Army Department will differ somewhat from that of Secretaries in other departments, I regard this as unavoidable, and, in view of many safeguards provided for him, I consider his position as unassailable, and in no way inferior to theirs."

The Financial Department accept as sufficient for their requirements the Draft Rules affecting them, and the other arrangements for securing complete financial control of military expenditure. The Member in charge of the Department of

Military Supply is to be in exactly the same position as any other Member of the Governor-General's Council.

6. On the consideration of these changes, Your Excellency's Council found itself divided. Four Members of the Council dissented from the proposed alterations, and Your Excellency summarises with marked clearness and good faith the line of their objections. The four dissentient Members, as you state their view, "object to the intended amalgamation of the Army Headquarters Staff with the Government of India's Secretariat. They hold strongly that, if the control of Government over the Army and its head is to be a reality, it is essential to keep the functions of the Commander-in-Chief as Executive Head of the Army entirely distinct from his functions as Member of Council in charge of the Army Department, and entitled in that capacity to pass orders in the name and with the authority of the Government of India." They insist "that the agencies through which these two distinct classes of function are respectively exercised should be kept separate. They object also to the position assigned to the Secretary in the Army Department, which differs from that of all the other Secretaries to Government, inasmuch as, instead of the whole business of the Departments passing through his hands from its inception and in ordinary course, much of it will reach him only after orders have been approved for signature, unless by the exercise of an invidious discretion he specially calls for papers. They attach special importance to a strong position for the Army Secretary, since, in the absence of the constitutional check provided in civil matters by the existence of local governments with free access to Viceroy, his independence is the main security for effective control."

* Sir A. Arundel.
Sir D. Ibbetson.
Mr. Richards.
Mr. Hewett.

Such is Your Excellency's report of the attitude of those Members of Council* who were unable to assent to the proposed plan.

On the other hand, the Commander-in-Chief, General Scott, and Mr. Baker regard these suggestions of their colleagues as unpractical, as re-introducing that duplication of work of which complaint was made, and as likely to set up a system of administration at once inefficient and expensive. With those views Your Excellency agrees.

7. The proposed changes I have now examined with close attention in Council. The position of the Secretary of the Army Department is, as Your Excellency has always perceived, the pivot on which the discussion turns. Whether any rule that the wit of man could devise on paper would effectively secure the absolute independence of this representative of the Government of India in the Army Department, and guarantee with certainty that the Governor-General could make sure of competent information and counsel enabling him to test proposals coming to him from the Army Department, may be doubtful. But I am advised here unanimously, and I consider, that if the supremacy of the civil government is to be real and effectual, and if the Governor-General in Council is to be in a position to fulfil the duty cast upon him by the Statute of 1833, of superintending, directing, and controlling military affairs in India, then it is necessary that the Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department should have status, powers, duties, and responsibilities precisely similar to those of the Secretaries to the Government of India in the other Departments.

The rules as drafted and forwarded to me by Your Excellency would appear to effect a practical amalgamation between the new Army Department and the Headquarters Staff. The Commander-in-Chief becomes necessarily the head of both, and Rule 3 (a) provides that "papers and cases," may be submitted to him direct by various members of the Headquarters Staff. It might thus happen, I conceive, that a very important matter might be submitted to the Commander-in-Chief (as Member in Charge of the Army Department) by the Chief of the Staff, and might be placed before the Governor-General in Council, although the Secretary of the Army Department would practically have had no opportunity of saying anything on the merits of the case. It would, as I understand, be quite impossible in any other Department—in the Financial Department, for instance,—that a matter should be thus dealt with by the Member in Charge, without passing through the hands of the Secretary.

8. It appears to me that the members of the Army Headquarters Staff, while continuing to perform as heretofore their duties as members of that staff in all

matters in the control of the Commander-in-Chief as such, should, on the other hand, be Departmental Officers of the Army Department, though without any of the powers of a Secretary. In their two separate and distinct capacities the members of the Headquarters Staff—that is to say, the Chief of the General Staff, should such an officer be created, the Quartermaster-General, the Adjutant-General, the Director of Ordnance, the Principal Medical Officer, and the Military Secretary,—will thus perform two separate and distinct functions; one, the function appertaining to their respective duties as Members of the Headquarters Staff pure and simple; the other, the function appertaining to their duties as officers of the Army Department. From this point of view, it would be incorrect in fact, as it seems undesirable in principle, to speak of the amalgamation of the Army Headquarters Staff with the Government of India Secretariat. For some purposes, and for those only, the members of the Headquarters Staff will be brought within the Army Department.

It follows from this that no member of the Headquarters Staff, when engaged on the work of the Army Department, should have any power to submit direct to the Member in Charge of the Army Department (that is to say, to the Commander-in-Chief) any case in that department, or to issue in regard to such work in it any order on behalf of the Government of India.

9. Now, in so far as the proposed Rules do not keep the Army Department distinct from the Headquarters Staff, and in so far as they put the Secretary of that department on a lower pedestal than other secretaries, they would depart from the intention of the scheme set forth in my predecessor's despatch of 31st May, 1905, and accepted, though reluctantly, and subject to modifications, as I have already said, by Your Excellency's predecessor on 6th July, 1905. To that extent I regret that I am unable to approve them.

Your Excellency's suggested Draft Rule 3 (a) should therefore, in my opinion, be omitted, and the reference to it in Draft Rule 3 should be struck out. These suggested alterations will necessitate the striking out of paragraph (IV.) of Draft Rule 6 (a) as unnecessary. I also suggest that after the words "Advisory Council" in Draft Rule 6 (a) the words "and of the Mobilisation Committee" should be added, and paragraph (II.) of that rule should be omitted. In Draft Rule 11 (2) (b) after the words "Secretary of State" the words "in Council" should be added.

It further appears to me that the Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Supply Department should be a member of the Mobilisation Committee; that the Member in charge of the Military Supply Department should be a Member of the Defence Committee; and that the Governor-General should have power to appoint for the time being to the Mobilisation Committee, the Defence Committee, and the Advisory Council, or to any or either of them, such person as he may consider advisable. I assume that any Member of the Mobilisation Committee may note upon any case before that Committee, and such note, when made, will form part of the case for submission to the Governor-General in Council.

10. The object of these amendments is to make sure that all matters, before they reach the Commander-in-Chief, as Member in charge of the Army Department, shall have passed through the hands of the Secretary.

I venture to hope that after considering the case as I have now put it, Your Excellency will regard this as a vital element in any scheme which is to be at once workable and constitutional.

In your other amendments I have only to express my concurrence.

11. With entire freedom from personal prepossession, anxious to avoid exaggerations, and strongly desiring to find myself in substantial accord with the Government of India, I have done my best to decide in Council the questions arising under the Draft Rules wholly upon their merits. I trust that the opinions expressed in this despatch will tend to compose a controversy too long outstanding; and will safeguard the fundamental principle that the Government of India, in all its branches, aspects, and divisions, subject to the statutory powers of the Secretary of State, has been solemnly and deliberately confided by Parliament to the Governor-General in Council.

12. Lord Lansdowne, in his speech in the House of Lords on the 1st August, 1905, said of the plan devised by my predecessor for reorganising military administration in India: "There is no finality in these things, and a moment may come when it will be necessary to reconsider some of the details." This remains true. Meanwhile, as everybody will agree, far less depends upon the letter of the

written rule, important as the written rules undoubtedly must be, than upon a spirit of harmonious co-operation in working them. That spirit I confidently anticipate Your Excellency will have the high good fortune to secure.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) JOHN MORLEY.

No. 3.

Letter from the Governor-General in Council to the Secretary of State for India, No. 33, dated 19th March, 1907.

Your predecessor, in his despatch No. 66 (Military), dated 31st May, 1905, informed us that His Majesty's Government had decided that the business of army administration in India should, in future, be controlled by two Departments, viz., the Army Department and the Department of Military Supply. To the Army Department was entrusted the conduct of all military business except such as was specifically allotted to the Department of Military Supply. To the latter was assigned the important but auxiliary role of controlling Army contracts, purchasing stores, ordnance and remounts, managing Military Works, the clothing and manufacturing departments, and administering the Indian Medical Service and Indian Marine. Each of these Departments was to be equipped with its own Secretariat Staff and establishments.

It was also suggested that the officers of the Military Accountant-General, and of the Controllers of Military Accounts, should form part of the Finance Department, so as to strengthen the financial control of the Government of India over all proposals entailing military expenditure. This proposal was considered by us in Council, and we recommended that Army Finance should be administered by the Finance Department,—a special Military Branch of the latter being created for this purpose.

2. Revised Rules of Business, giving effect to these arrangements, were drafted by us and submitted for your approval on the 23rd January, 1906, and after being amended in certain particulars were brought into operation on the 19th March, in accordance with the sanction conveyed in your despatch No. 18 (Military), dated 9th February, 1906.

3. A year having elapsed since the inauguration of the changes referred to, we beg to submit the following observations upon the working of the new system.

4. The abolition of a long-established administrative agency like the late Military Department, and its replacement by the newly created Departments above mentioned, necessarily entailed some temporary inconvenience. The Army and Military Supply Departments, at their inception, had to overcome the difficulties which present themselves to all newly organized offices; the detailed distribution of work between the various Divisions of the Army Department had to be arranged for; the co-ordination of the work of the Army Department and Department of Military Supply *inter se*, and with other Departments of Government, had to be adjusted; and lastly the heavy arrears of work left over by the late Military Department had to be disposed of. This work imposed a considerable strain upon the two Departments and their newly established Secretariats, which, however, gradually lessened as the new system of administration got into working order and its principles and practice became well understood.

5. The endeavours of the Commander-in-Chief to increase the efficiency of the Army have, in respect to its matériel and stores, been cordially supported by the Department of Military Supply, which has worked with the Army Department in a spirit of loyal co-operation, and made considerable progress in the development of its manufacturing resources.

6. Owing to the dual functions imposed upon the Heads of Divisions of Army Headquarters, viz., the Chief of the Staff, the Quartermaster-General, the Adjutant-General, the Principal Medical Officer, and the Military Secretary, under paragraph 8 of your despatch, it was found necessary to issue simple rules of procedure, based upon the Secretariat Instructions, so that the distinction therein prescribed might be fully understood and complied with. Further, in order that these

Divisions might be familiarised as soon as possible with the new methods of business, a quota of experienced Secretariat clerks was allotted to each, so as to complete their personnel with a nucleus of trained men.

A satisfactory feature of the new system is that the Heads of Divisions of Army Headquarters, with whom rests the initiation of new proposals, being now personally accountable for the latter in every respect, evince a growing sense of their financial responsibility, which is being more fully developed by associating them in the duty of watching expenditure in those Grant heads of the Military Budget with which they are specially concerned.

7. Our opinions with regard to Army administration in its relation to Military Finance have been so fully stated in our despatch No. 10-M.F., dated 7th February, 1907, that it is unnecessary to refer to them here. We are, however, glad to report that the various measures which have been undertaken to ensure the smooth working of the new system have been completely successful, and that the business of Army administration, in all Departments, is now conducted with a singleness of purpose and a freedom from delay which is greatly to the advantage of the Public Service.

8. Under the present constitution of Army administration, all important measures are discussed either in the Advisory Council, or in the Mobilization or Defence Committee, and all proposals emanating from Army Headquarters requiring Government sanction—except those of a routine or trifling nature—have first to receive the Commander-in-Chief's executive approval, and have then to obtain the administrative concurrence of the Army Member, through the Army Secretary. The Secretary is consequently in complete touch with the work of the Department and acquainted with the progress of all its cases, and the Viceroy is kept fully informed of all measures undertaken in the administration of the Army by the Secretary of the Department concerned, who is able to bring any important matter to His Excellency's immediate notice at any stage from initiation to completion.

9. We recognize that finality in military administration is difficult of attainment and that it may be necessary to make some modifications in the details of the system now in force, in order to simplify its organisation and reduce its cost; but we have much satisfaction in being able to report that the important changes ordered in your despatch, No. 18 (Military), dated 9th February, 1906, have been productive of excellent results, and that, thanks to the harmonious co-operation of all concerned, they have fulfilled the intentions of His Majesty's Government, and justified the anticipations expressed in the concluding paragraphs of your despatch.

We have, &c.,
(Signed)

MINTO.
KITCHENER.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
E. N. BAKER.
C. H. SCOTT.
H. ADAMSON.
J. F. FINLAY.
J. O. MILLER.

No. 4.

Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General in Council, No. 105, Military, dated 28th June, 1907.

I have received and considered in Council your despatch in the Army Department, No. 33, dated 19th March, 1907, in which Your Excellency's Government report on the working of the new system of Army Administration in India.

2. I have read with pleasure the excellent results so far achieved by the harmonious co-operation of all concerned in fulfilling the intentions and in justifying the anticipations of His Majesty's Government. Friction appears to have sensibly decreased, and for this, praise is due to all who have taken part in the development of the new system.

3. I agree with Your Excellency, however, in recognising that it may be found necessary to make modifications of the system with the view of simplifying its organisation and reducing its cost.

4. There appears to me to remain under the new system so little work to be controlled by the Honourable Member in charge of the Military Supply Department, that the expediency of maintaining this appointment, or the Secretariat attached to it, or perhaps both, becomes a matter for consideration.

5. I should be glad therefore to receive full information on various points bearing on this question, such as (1) the financial saving that might be effected by the abolition of the Department of Military Supply; in this connection it should be shown whether the pay of the Secretariat, as well as that of the Honourable Member, would be saved entirely, or whether this Secretariat would have to be transferred, in whole or in part, to the Army Department; (2) whether the work now entrusted to the Supply Department would, in the event of the appointment being abolished, be transferred to the Army Department or apportioned to members of the Army Staff, or otherwise disposed of; (3) whether the experience of the working of the Army Department, so far as it goes, tends to show that it has been able to grapple adequately with the work with which it has had to deal; (4) whether there is any congestion in the office of the Secretary of the Army Department or of that in the Chief of the Staff, and, if so, how this compares with the condition of affairs that existed in the offices of the Commander-in-Chief before the abolition of the Military Department of the Government of India.

6. The question of the necessity of maintaining the Department of Military Supply is one which I am prepared to consider on the receipt of the views of Your Excellency's Government as to the expediency of its maintenance or its abolition on political, administrative, and economical grounds; and in order that I may be enabled to arrive at a decision I request that I may receive a full exposition of your views on all the points at issue as well as the detailed information on the several matters noted above.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) JOHN MORLEY.

No. 5.

Letter from the Governor-General in Council to the Secretary of State for India, No. 96, dated 26th September, 1907.

We have received and considered in Council your despatch, Military, No. 105, dated 28th June, 1907, in which you propose, for our consideration, the abolition of the Military Supply Department, its work being taken over by the Army Department, and the consequent reduction of the representation of the Army in the Council of the Governor-General of India.

2. After giving this question our fullest consideration we are agreed in respectfully but strongly deprecating the re-opening of the question of Military Administration in India at the present time, and only some 18 months after the introduction of the new system, when if the proposed change should be accepted, we cannot but apprehend a recrudescence of heated and acrimonious public discussion which in the interests of the Army and the Government of India generally it is most desirable to avoid.

3. To the specific questions asked by you we are able to reply as follows:—

- (i) If it should be decided to abolish the Department of Military Supply, the pay of the Honourable Member, and of the Secretary, would be saved. These together amount to Rupees 1,10,000 per annum. The cost of the remaining officers of the Secretariat and of the clerks and menial establishments, with their allowances and contingent expenses, amounts to Rs. 1,80,650 per annum. Exactly what proportion of these could be dispensed with we should hesitate to say without much more detailed consideration than seems justified at this stage. We feel, however, some confidence in affirming that the reduction would in no case amount to less than one-fourth of the whole, and we anticipate that it might not improbably be as much as one-half. In other words, the total saving involved in the measure will not in any case fall short of one and-a-half lakhs a year, while it will more probably approximate to two lakhs.

- (ii) The work now entrusted to the Supply Department would be transferred partly to the Army Department, and would be dealt with in part by the Army Headquarters Staff.
- (iii) So far as our experience goes of the working of the Army Department, it tends to show it has been fully able to grapple with all the work with which it has had to deal.
- (iv) There is no congestion in either the office of the Secretary of the Army Department, or that of the Chief of the Staff. This compares most favourably with the condition of affairs that existed in the offices of the Commander-in-Chief, and in the Secretariat of the late Military Department of the Government of India before the abolition of the latter. All arrears have been disposed of, while the current work both in the Army Department Secretariat and in Army Headquarters is well up to date, and is dealt with as it arises.

4. After giving the matter our fullest consideration, although we are, as stated in paragraph 2, unanimous in deprecating the raising now of the question of carrying out the suggested reform, we are agreed that the proposal is administratively and economically based on sound arguments and will have to be dealt with sooner or later.

5. With regard to the political considerations involved, we are of opinion that we cannot do better than leave the question entirely for your consideration and decision.

We have, &c.,

(Signed) MINTO.
 " KITCHENER.
 " H. ERLE RICHARDS.
 " E. N. BAKER.
 " C. H. SCOTT.
 " H. ADAMSON.
 " J. F. FINLAY.
 " J. O. MILLER.

No. 6.

*Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General in Council,
 No. 211, Military, dated 27th December, 1907.*

I have considered in Council your despatch in the Army Department, No. 96, dated 26th September, 1907, in which you express your agreement with the view that the abolition of the Department of Military Supply would be advantageous on administrative and economical grounds, but deprecate the re-opening of the question of military administration in India at the present time, as you fear a recrudescence of heated and acrimonious public discussion.

2. I do not feel sure that this apprehension is well founded. It seems to me that public opinion has to a great extent acquiesced in the settlement arrived at in 1905, and that the partisanship which at that time was acute in India has died out; and further, that some of those who were opposed to the change then made, now recognise that the Military Supply Department, as an integral part of the military administration, has proved to be superfluous, and is also useless for such purposes as had previously been considered to require the existence of a military authority in the Government of India separate from the Commander-in-Chief. The share of work and responsibility assigned to the Military Supply Member and his staff has been diminished by the transfer of the Supply and Transport Corps to the control of the Commander-in-Chief, and the efficiency and economy realised by this change suggest the expediency of making further similar changes as soon as possible.

3. In these circumstances, even if a considerable amount of discussion and controversy were to be aroused, I could not for that reason consent to be a party to the retention of an arrangement which throws a heavy charge upon the revenues of India, and which has, in your opinion, been shown by the experience hitherto acquired to be unnecessary and inconvenient.

4. I am, however, willing, in deference to the wishes of your Excellency's Government, to postpone any action in the matter for a year from the present time.

Further experience will then have been gained, and there will be less probability than at present of any discussion other than what may be required on the merits of the case. I request that you will keep the subject in view, and address me again upon it before leaving Simla in the autumn of 1908.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN MORLEY.

No. 7.

*Letter from the Governor-General in Council to the Secretary of State for India,
No. 103, dated 1st October, 1908.*

In Your Lordship's despatch, Military, No. 211, dated 27th December, 1907, paragraph 4, you desired that we should address you again on the subject of the abolition of the Department of Military Supply before leaving Simla in the autumn of 1908.

2. The experience gained since we wrote our despatch in the Army Department, No. 96, dated the 26th September, 1907, has not altered the views we then placed before Your Lordship.

3. Should you, however, be of opinion that the time is now opportune for abolishing the Department of Military Supply, the following are our proposals for dealing with the work of the Army in India which is at present carried out by that Department:—

The business now dealt with in the Department of Military Supply consists of—

- (i) Purchase of Remounts, Stores and Ordnance.
- (ii) Control and custody of Ordnance, Stores and Remounts.
- (iii) The management of Military Works.
- (iv) The Clothing and Manufacturing Department.
- (v) The Indian Medical Service.
- (vi) The Royal Indian Marine.
- (vii) Marine Surveys and dangers to navigation.

This we suggest should be disposed of as follows:—

By the Army Department.

- (i) The Indian Medical Service.
- (ii) The Royal Indian Marine.
- (iii) Marine Surveys and dangers to navigation;

and for this purpose the Army Department will also become the Marine Department of the Government of India.

Two new divisions should be created at Army Headquarters:—

- (i) Under the Director-General of Ordnance for the purchase, control and custody of Ordnance stores; and administration of the Ordnance Department and Ordnance Factories.
- (ii) Under the Director-General of Military Works for the management of the Military Works Services.

The Clothing and Manufacturing Department should form a new branch of the existing Division of the Adjutant-General. The purchase, control and custody of Remounts and the Remount Department should form a new branch of the existing Quartermaster-General's Division.

The financial business which is at present disposed of by the Department of Military Supply in the exercise of the financial powers vested in a Department of the Government of India, would be dealt with by the Military Finance Secretary under the arrangements proposed in paragraphs 9 and 10 of our despatch No. 10 M. F., dated the 7th February, 1907, and accepted in Your Lordship's Financial despatch, No. 49, dated the 12th April, 1907.

4. In order to deal efficiently with the extra work which the above redistribution would impose on the Army and Military Finance Secretariats, we would ask for authority to strengthen the superior staffs of these Departments. Our estimate must of necessity be somewhat general; but we put forward the following proposals as being likely to represent the maximum requirement, and we shall be prepared to reduce them if experience shows them to be in excess of what is absolutely necessary for the efficient working of the new system of administration.

Army Department.

(a) 1 additional Deputy Secretary on Rs. 1,700 per mensem.

(b) 1 additional Assistant Secretary on Rs. 1,000 per mensem.

These are the rates of pay attached to the existing appointments in the Department.

Military Finance.

(c) 1 additional Assistant Secretary on Rs. 1,000 per mensem.

(d) The increase of the pay of one of the existing Assistant Secretaries from Rs. 750—50—1,000 to Rs. 1,000—50—1,300.

With regard to the additional Assistant Secretary we propose the same rate of pay as that authorized for the similar appointment in the Army Department, because the lower rate assigned to the appointment in this Branch has been found inconvenient in practice.

An increase of pay is proposed for the existing Assistant Secretary because his responsibilities will be increased. At present this officer submits his cases to the Secretary through the Deputy Secretary, who is already sufficiently employed. If the financial business of the Department of Military Supply is transferred to the Military Finance Secretariat, we think that it will save time and duplication of work to let the general Assistant Secretary submit cases direct to the Secretary, but as the latter is a civilian, it will be essential that he shall be able to rely on the technical accuracy of his assistant, and in order to secure and retain the services of a man with the necessary qualifications, we are of opinion that the pay of the appointment should be raised to the figure proposed above.

As regards clerks and menials we estimate that additional establishments costing about Rs. 40,000 a year, or somewhat below half the present cost of those now employed in the Department of Military Supply, would be required to deal with the extra work that would devolve on the Army and Military Finance Secretariats. We propose to defer the preparation of formal proposition statements until we receive your Lordship's decision. Such establishments of the Department of Military Supply as can be utilized in the additional appointments required will be retained, and the balance disposed of by compensation pensions and gratuities. In this connection we would bring to Your Lordship's notice that the establishments to be dispensed with, will, under Article 436, Civil Service Regulations, be entitled to three months' notice or full pay in lieu.

5. The following table shows the general financial effect of our proposals :—

Department.	Permanent Establishment.			Other expenses, i.e., Local and Travelling Allowances, Postage, Telegrams, &c.			Net result + Increase — Reduction.
	Class.	Present.	Proposed.	—	Present.	Proposed.	
Department of Military Supply.	Officers ...	Rs. 1,46,708	Rs. Nil	} Other expenses	Rs. 63,850	Rs. Nil	} —2,94,225
	Clerks and menials.	83,667	Nil				
Army Department	Officers ...	74,400	1,06,800	} Other expenses	77,360	1,12,360	} + 98,108
	Clerks and menials.	1,05,787	1,36,495				
Military Finance Branch of Finance Department.	Officers ...	85,050	1,00,500	} Other expenses	31,080	38,080	} + 32,450
	Clerks and menials.	47,826	57,826				
Total ...	—	5,43,438	4,01,621		1,72,290	1,50,440	—1,63,667

We have, &c.,

(Signed) MINTO.
 " KITCHENER.
 " H. ERLE RICHARDS.
 " C. H. SCOTT.
 " H. ADAMSON.
 " J. O. MILLER.
 " W. L. HARVEY.
 " J. S. MESTON.

No. 8.

*Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General in Council,
No. 10, Military, dated 22nd January, 1909.*

I have considered in Council your Army Department despatch, No. 103, dated 1st October, 1908, in which you inform me that you have not altered the views expressed in your despatch, No. 96, of 26th September, 1907, regarding the question of the abolition of the Department of Military Supply; that is to say, you agree with me that the Department should be abolished, and only differ from me in holding, as you did a year-and-a-half ago, that this measure should not be carried into effect until some future time when it might be less likely to cause public discussion and controversy.

2. While appreciating the inconveniences that such controversies may possibly cause, I see no ground for altering the decision which I expressed in my despatch of 27th December, 1907. I request therefore that the abolition may take effect at the earliest date which will permit adequate notice to be given to the Honourable Member at present in charge of the Department of Military Supply and his subordinates, and will allow time for formulating the new arrangements. The beginning of the financial year 1909-10 will, I think, be a convenient time to fix for this change, and I request that Your Excellency will make the necessary communication to Major-General Scott, who will, I trust, understand that the decision to abolish the Military Supply Department has been taken on financial and administrative grounds only; and involves no shadow of reflection on his efficiency as Member of the Government of India in charge of this Department since November, 1905.

3. I sanction the proposals submitted in paragraphs 3 and 4 of your despatch for dealing with the work of the Army in India at present entrusted to the Department of Military Supply. Under the new arrangements the appointment of Secretary to the Government of India in the Army Department will be one of even greater importance than at present. It requires an officer possessing high ability and extensive military experience, and especially a thorough knowledge of the Native Army. As one of the highest posts in the administration of the Army in India, it should ordinarily be filled by an officer of not lower rank than Major-General.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) MORLEY OF BLACKBURN.

No. 9.

Diagram showing the organisation of the Army Administration in India on the abolition of the Military Supply Department.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

Commander-in-Chief as Member in Charge of the

ARMY DEPARTMENT.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

Two Deputy Secretaries.
Two Assistant Secretaries.

Chief of the Staff's Division. Adjutant-General's Division. Quarter-Master-General's Division. Principal Medical Officer. Director-General, Ordnance. Director-General, Military Works. Indian Medical Service. Royal Indian Marine.

GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING

NORTHERN ARMY.

1st Division. 2nd Division. 3rd Division. 7th Division. 8th Division.

and the { Kohat
Bannu } Independent Brigades.
Derajat

GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING

SOUTHERN ARMY.

4th Division. 5th Division. 6th Division. 9th Division. Burma Division.

and the Aden Independent Brigade.

54174

MV4:9.2.N
DS