

MV41 2M63t
A864
014331

~~M/13~~
S 131.

~~R/134~~

S. 131

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-014331

R E P O R T .

OF

THE COMMISSION³

ON

THE MEMORIALS OF INDIAN OFFICERS.

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



LONDON:
PRINTED BY GEORGE E. EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1864.

CONTENTS.

HER MAJESTY'S COMMISSION - - - - -	iii
REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS - - - - -	v

APPENDIX.

Appendix.	Page	Appendix.	Page
A. Memorandum of the Measures adopted by the Indian Government as regards the Officers of the Indian Army - - - - -	1	M. Returns from the India Office, showing what Regiments of the Indian Army have immediately benefited by the Retirement of Officers on Extra Annuities, and what Regiments have not immediately benefited thereby - - -	153
B. Statement, on the part of the Memorialists, of the Law, Practice, and Custom upon which the Officers of the late East India Company's Military Forces found the grievances complained of by them - - - - -	5	N. Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, dated 15th November 1862, discontinuing Indian Allowances to Officers with Colonels' Allowance not required to reside in India - - -	159
C. Observations of the India Office, on the foregoing Statement - - - - -	50	O. Despatch of the Court of Directors of the East India Company, dated 8th July 1858, relative to Promotion to Lieutenant Colonels of all Majors of the Indian Ordnance Corps - - -	159
D. Enquiry addressed by the Commissioners to the Committee acting on behalf of the Memorialists - - - - -	52	P. Despatch of the Secretary of State for India, dated 14th June 1859, revoking a portion of the previous Order of 8th July 1858 - - -	159
E. Observations of the Committee thereon - - - - -	53	Q. Royal Warrant of 1st January 1862, relative to Promotions to the Rank of General Officers in the Amalgamated Armies - - - - -	160
F. Supplementary Memorandum submitted by the Committee - - - - -	62	R. Returns from the Military Secretary, Horse Guards, of the Number of Colonels entitled to Promotion to the Rank of General Officers, whose Commissions are dated prior to 17th February 1861 - - - - -	161
G. Memorials of Indian Officers forwarded to the Commissioners by the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for India, together with a list and Schedules thereof according to their several subjects - - - - -	63	S. Memorandum from the Military Secretary, India Office, relative to the Promotion of Lieutenant Colonels of the Ordnance Corps on the Amalgamated List - - - - -	161
H. General Order by the Governor General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861, regarding the Amalgamation of the Indian with the Royal Army - - - - -	144	T. Statement from the Military Secretary, India Office, showing the Number of Colonels on 1st July 1863, who attained that Rank prior to the Amalgamation - - - - -	161
I. Letter from the Military Secretary, India Office, relative to Promotions of Lieut. Colonels - - - - -	150	U. Extract from a Return made to the House of Commons on 27th July by the Military Secretary, India Office, relative to the Number of Officers who retired on the Extra Annuities granted by the India Government - - -	162
J. Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, dated 31st July 1862, relative to succession to Colonels' Allowances - - - - -	150		
K. Memorandum from the Military Secretary, India Office, showing the average time in which Lieutenant Colonels have succeeded to Colonels' Allowances in the several Presidencies of India - - -	151		
L. Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, dated 10th August 1861, relative to the Grant of Extra Annuity to Officers on retiring - - -	151		

C O M M I S S I O N .

VICTORIA R.

Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith.

To Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Robert Monsey, Baron Cranworth, Our right trusty and well-beloved Cousin and Councillor, Edward, Earl of Ellenborough, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Our right trusty and well-beloved Beaumont, Baron Hotham, of that Part of Our United Kingdom called Ireland, Lieutenant-General of Our Forces, Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Joseph Warner Henley, Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Charles Yorke, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Lieutenant-General of Our Forces, Our trusty and well-beloved Augustus Clarke, Esquire, Major-General of Our Indian Forces, Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Peter Melvill Melvill, Knight Commander of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Major-General on the Retired List of Our Indian Forces.

Whereas by the Act for the better Government of India passed in the Session of Parliament held in the Twenty-first and Twenty-second Year of Our Reign, Section 21 Fifty-six, it was, amongst other Things, enacted that the Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company should be deemed to be the Indian Military and Naval Forces of Her Majesty, and that such Forces should be liable to serve within the same territorial Limits only, for the same Terms only, and be entitled to the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company. c. 1
Sec. 56.

And whereas by the Act "to repeal so much of the Act of the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Victoria, Chapter Twenty-seven, and of certain other Acts as authorizes the Secretary of State in Council to give Directions for raising European Forces for the Indian Army of Her Majesty," it was, amongst other Things, enacted that the Advantages as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, Privileges, Promotion, and otherwise, secured to the Military Forces of the East India Company by the said Government of India Act; Section Fifty-six, should be maintained in any Plan for the Re-organization of the Indian Army. 23 & 24
c. 100.

And whereas, since the passing of the above-mentioned Acts, or of the said first-mentioned Act, divers Memorials have been addressed to the Commanders-in-Chief, and the Governments of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay respectively, and by them transmitted to the India Office, or have been addressed direct to the Secretary of State for India, relating to certain of the Measures adopted by the Government of India towards such Re-organization of the Indian Army, and the Amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian Forces aforesaid with Her Majesty's General Forces, wherein Complaints are made that, in framing or carrying into execution such Measures,

the Assurances given by Parliament in the said recited Enactments as to the Preservation of the Advantages of the late Military Forces of the East India Company as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, Privileges, and Promotion have been departed from.

And whereas We have thought it expedient that Inquiry should be made into the Justice of such Complaints.

Now We, reposing great Trust and Confidence in your Zeal, Discretion, and Ability, have authorized and appointed, and do by these Presents authorize and appoint, you the said Baron Cránworth, the said Earl of Ellenborough, the said Baron Hotham, the said Joseph Warner Henley, the said Sir Charles Yorke, the said Augustus Clarke, and the said Sir Peter Melvill Melvill, to be Our Commissioners to inquire into and examine whether any Departure from the Assurances aforesaid has taken place, by reason of the Measures which have been taken since the passing of the said first-mentioned Act for the Government of India, by the Secretary of State in Council, or by the Government or Military Authorities in India, towards such Re-organization and Amalgamation as aforesaid.

And We do hereby authorize and empower you Our said Commissioners, or any Three or more of you, to obtain Information thereupon by the Examination of all Persons most competent by reason of their Knowledge, Habits, or Experience to afford it; and also by calling for all Documents, Papers, or Records which may appear to you, or any Three or more of you, calculated to assist your Researches and to promote the Formation of a sound Judgment on the Subject.

And We do hereby command and require you, or any Three or more of you, to report to Us, under your Hands and Seals, with all convenient Speed, your Opinion on the Questions submitted to you.

And We will and command, and by these Presents ordain, that this Our Commission shall continue in full Force and Virtue, and that you Our said Commissioners, or any Three or more of you, may from Time to Time proceed in the Execution thereof, and of every Matter and Thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from Time to Time by Adjournment.

And for your further Assistance in the Execution of these Presents, We do hereby authorize and empower you to appoint a Secretary to this Our Commission, whose Services and Assistance We require you to use from Time to Time, as Occasion may require.

Given at Our Court at Osborne House, Isle of Wight, the Second Day of May
One thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, in the Twenty-sixth Year of
Our Reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,
CHARLES WOOD.

R E P O R T.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

WHEREAS by a Commission under Your Majesty's Sign Manual, bearing date the Second Day of May 1863, directed to us the undersigned;

Reciting that by the Act for the better Government of India passed in the Session of Parliament held in the Twenty-first and Twenty-second Years of the Reign of Your Majesty, Section Fifty-six, it was, amongst other things, enacted that the Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company should be deemed to be the Indian Military and Naval Forces of Your Majesty, and that such Forces should be liable to serve within the same territorial limits only, for the same terms only, and be entitled to the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company;

And further reciting that by the Act passed in the Session of Parliament held in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Years of Your Majesty's Reign, intituled "An Act to repeal so much of the Act of the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Victoria, Chapter Twenty-seven, and of certain other Acts, as authorizes the Secretary of State in Council to give directions for raising European Forces for the Indian Army of Her Majesty," it was, amongst other things, enacted that the Advantages as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, Privileges, Promotion, and otherwise, secured to the Military Forces of the East India Company by the said Government of India Act, Section Fifty-six, should be maintained in any Plan for the Re-organization of the Indian Army;

And further reciting that since the passing of the above-mentioned Acts, or of the said first-mentioned Act, divers Memorials had been addressed to the Commanders-in-Chief, and the Governments of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay respectively, and by them transmitted to the India Office, or had been addressed direct to the Secretary of State for India, relating to certain of the measures adopted by the Government of India towards such Re-organization of the Indian Army, and the Amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian Forces aforesaid with Her Majesty's General Forces, wherein Complaints were made that, in framing or carrying into execution such Measures, the Assurances given by Parliament in the said recited enactments as to the preservation of the Advantages of the late Military Forces of the East India Company as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, Privileges, and Promotion had been departed from;

And further reciting that Your Majesty had thought it expedient that inquiry should be made into the justice of such Complaints; Your Majesty was therefore pleased to authorize and appoint us the undersigned to be Your Majesty's Commissioners to inquire into and examine whether any departure from the Assurances aforesaid has taken place, by reason of the Measures which have been taken since the passing of the said first-mentioned Act for the Government of India, by the Secretary of State in Council, or by the Government or Military Authorities in India, toward such Re-organization and Amalgamation as aforesaid; and Your Majesty was pleased to command and require us or any Three or more of us to report to Your Majesty under our Hands and Seals, with all convenient speed, our Opinion on the Questions submitted to us;

Now, therefore, we do hereby humbly certify to Your Majesty that in pursuance of the authority so given to us we have from time to time met and taken into consideration the said Memorials and the several Questions so submitted to us, and have agreed to the following Report:—

1. At our First Meeting, we received from Your Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India a printed paper, entitled "Memorandum explanatory of the Measures adopted as regards the Officers of the Indian Army." Appendix A.

2. We subsequently received from a Committee acting, as we understand, on behalf of the Memorialists, a paper entitled "Statement of the Law, Practice, and Custom, upon which the Officers of the late East India Company's Military Forces found the Grievances complained of by them, in their various Memorials and Petitions." Appendix B.

- Appendix C. 3. This Statement we communicated to the Secretary of State for India; and we afterwards received from him a paper entitled "Observations on the Statement of the Law, Practice and Custom, upon which the Officers of the late East India Company's Military Forces found the Grievances complained of by them in their various Memorials and Petitions."
- Appendix D. 4. The Secretary of State declining to sanction the communication of the papers which he had thus transmitted to us, to the Committee acting on behalf of the Memorialists, we thought it right to call their attention to the material facts and observations which those papers contained, requesting to be informed whether they admitted their accuracy, or had any Observations to make upon their bearing on the Questions now in discussion.
- Appendix E. 5. In reply, we received from the said Committee a paper entitled "Observations by the Committee acting on behalf of the Memorialists of the Indian Army on certain Facts and Cases transmitted by the Royal Commissioners."
- Appendix F. 6. We finally received a Supplementary Memorandum submitted for our consideration by the said Committee entitled "Supplementary Memorandum submitted for the Consideration of the Royal Commission by the Committee acting on the Memorialists' behalf."
7. These several papers, copies of which we have set out in an Appendix to this Report, appeared to us to exhaust the subject. We had before us the written Statements of the Government and of the Memorialists as well as the whole of the Memorials themselves, Copies of which will be found in the Appendix. We, therefore, considered ourselves competent to form our opinions upon the Questions submitted to us, without resorting to oral evidence.
- Appendix G. 8. In order to make intelligible the Opinions we have formed, it may be convenient to advert shortly to some of the Regulations which prevailed in the Indian Army while under the rule of the East India Company.
9. The main characteristic of that Army was that all Promotion in every Branch of it went according to Seniority.
10. In the Ordnance Corps of each Presidency, the Officers rose by Seniority to the rank of Regimental Colonel, *i.e.* the Officers of the Artillery to the rank of Colonel of Artillery, those of the Engineers to that of Colonel of Engineers.
11. In the Cavalry and Infantry the mode of rise was somewhat different. The progress through the grades of Cornet, Lieutenant, and Captain in the Cavalry up to that of Major, and of Ensign, Lieutenant, and Captain in the Infantry up to that of Major, was by regular rise in each separate Regiment; but after attaining the rank of Major, Promotion ceased to be in the Regiment. There was one General List of Colonels, Lieutenant-colonels, and Majors for the Cavalry and another for the Infantry in each Presidency; and as vacancies occurred, Majors became Lieutenant-colonels, and Lieutenant-colonels became Colonels according to their seniority on the General List of the Branch of the Service in each Presidency to which they severally belonged; and every Major when promoted to be a Lieutenant-colonel gave in succession a step, technically termed the Line Step, to his own Regiment.
12. Every Colonel of a Regiment was entitled beyond his pay to what were formerly called Off-reckonings, but which have more recently been designated Colonels' Allowances. This was always looked to by the Officers as an advantage, the attainment of which was an object of great moment. There were in the three Presidencies taken together 220 Regiments, including the Ordnance Corps, but although there were only 220 Regiments, there were 223 Colonels drawing Colonels' Allowances—for the 1st Regiment of European Infantry in each Presidency had two Colonels entitled to the privilege. In the Bengal Presidency there were 5 Colonels of Engineers entitled to these Allowances, 12 of Artillery, 10 of Cavalry, 4 for the three Regiments of European Infantry, and 74 for Native Infantry, making in all 105. It is not necessary to state in detail the numbers of the other Presidencies.
13. The General Officers, *i.e.* Major-generals, Lieutenant-generals, and Generals, rose by seniority from all the Branches of the Service, *i.e.*, from the Cavalry, the Infantry, and the Ordnance Corps, in one General Gradation List of Colonels for all the three Presidencies, according to their seniority in the Army, whether by Brevet or Regimental Rank.
14. Officers might retire, after a specified period of service, either on the full pay of the rank they had reached, or, at the option of the Officer, on a fixed scale of retirement, dependent on his length of service without reference to the rank he had reached.
15. Every Casualty, whether occasioned by death, retirement, or removal from a Regiment, gave a step to every Officer below the Officer occasioning the vacancy.

16. It is obvious from the fact that Promotion went strictly by seniority, that every Casualty, however occasioned, by giving Promotion to some Officer was advantageous to every one below him, either by giving him Promotion, or by bringing him nearer to Promotion. It was, therefore, the interest of the junior Officers to induce their seniors to retire from the Service; and a practice prevailed of raising Subscriptions among the Officers to be given by way of Bonus to a senior Officer as an inducement to retire; and it is said to have been a rare case that any Officer would retire without the benefit of such a Bonus. This practice, though lately decided to be illegal, was certainly acquiesced in by the East India Company.

17. Such having been some of the Rules which prevailed in the Indian Army, the Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. was passed in 1858, whereby the Government of Your Majesty's Indian Possessions was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown, and by the 56th Section of that Act it was enacted "that the Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company should be deemed to be the Military and Naval Forces of Her Majesty, and should be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty, as they would have been under to serve the said Company and should be liable to serve within the same Territorial Limits only, for the same terms only, and be entitled to the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company."

18. This Act received the Royal Assent on the 2nd of August 1858, but it only came into full operation in India on the 1st of November 1858. No change was then made in the Organization of the Indian Army. It continued organized as before, though in the service of Your Majesty instead of that of the Company.

19. A short time before the Act received the Royal Assent, Your Majesty was pleased to issue a Commission dated the 15th day of July 1858, and directed to the Right Honourable Major-General Peel, His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, the Right Honourable Lord Stanley, and others, to inquire into the Organization of the Army serving in the Pay and under the Control and Management of the Honourable the East India Company, and to report to Your Majesty what changes it might be expedient to make in the existing System.

20. The Commissioners made their Report dated the 7th day of March 1859; and therein amongst other things reported as follows:—"Your Majesty's Commissioners observe that the 56th Clause of the Act for the better Government of India assures to the Forces which now belong to Your Majesty's Indian Army, 'the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company.'

21. "The Privileges and Advantages thus referred to are detailed in the Appendix, but may be briefly stated to consist in a prescriptive right to rise strictly by Seniority to the Rank and Emoluments of Colonel of a Regiment, with the option of retiring before attaining that position, or after various periods of service, on a scale of Pay or Pension considerably higher than that granted to Officers of Your Majesty's Army of the Line. No change, therefore, can be made which would in any way disturb the system of Promotion by seniority as affecting Officers now in the Service, or interfere with any of their existing Privileges; but the 57th Section of the above-recited Act gives to Your Majesty full power to frame new Regulations on this and all other points, to be applied to the case of Officers and others who hereafter may enter the Indian Army."

22. In the Year 1860, it having been deemed expedient to alter the Organization of the Indian Army, by incorporating it with the rest of Your Majesty's Forces, so as to make them one Army, another Act of Parliament was passed for preventing the Enlistment in England of European Soldiers for service in India; and by that Act (23 & 24 Vict. c. 100.) it was provided that "the Advantages as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, Privileges, Promotions, and otherwise, secured to the Military Forces of the East India Company by the former Act should be maintained in any Plan for the Re-organization of the Indian Army."

23. These Acts having thus passed, the Amalgamation of the two Armies was effected in the Year 1861, in pursuance of a General Order promulgated by the Governor General of India in Council bearing date the 10th of April 1861, and framed in pursuance of directions conveyed to him in Despatches of the Secretary of State for India written and forwarded in the earlier months of that same Year. A copy of this Order is scheduled Appendix H. in the Appendix.

24. This General Order proceeded in the first place to deal with the European Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of the whole Indian Army, offering certain Bounties

to those who might be willing to enlist into certain new Royal Regiments then to be formed, *i.e.*, three new Regiments of Cavalry and nine of Infantry. But it is not important to refer particularly to those parts of the General Order which relate to the Non-commissioned Officers and Privates, no question as to them having been submitted to us.

25. With respect to the Officers, the General Order, having in its 23rd Section declared that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government scrupulously to adhere to the Pledge given to the Officers that due regard should be paid to their rights and claims, proceeded to deal in the first place with the Artillery.

26. It has been already stated that in the Bengal Army there were 12 Colonels of Artillery, all of whom drew Colonels' Allowances. The General Order provided that there should for the future be seven Brigades of Bengal Artillery, each with 48 Officers, *i.e.* one Colonel Commandant, (a rank then introduced for the first time into the Indian Artillery, though long used in the Royal Artillery,) two Colonels, four Lieutenant-colonels, eight Captains, nine Second Captains, and 24 Lieutenants. This change was made in order to assimilate the organization of the Bengal Artillery with that of the Royal Artillery, in which no Colonel draws Colonels' Allowances except the Colonel Commandant of each Brigade. But, inasmuch as before the change there were in the Bengal Artillery 12 Colonels drawing these Allowances, and by the new arrangement there would be only seven Brigades, each with a Colonel Commandant, drawing the Allowances, the Order went on to provide that the five supernumerary Colonels should still retain their Allowances, and should take the Regimental Rank of Colonel Commandant. Upon any Casualty occurring among the Colonels Commandant, including the Supernumeraries, Promotion was to go on regularly by seniority, save only that the List of Supernumeraries was to be gradually reduced by leaving every fourth vacancy unfilled, so that after 20 vacancies there would be no Supernumeraries. Similar provisions were made for the Artillery of each of the other Presidencies; and arrangements on the same principle were also made for the Engineers of all the three Presidencies.

27. Twelve new Regiments of the Line, *i.e.*, three of Cavalry and nine of Infantry, were substituted for the European Forces of the East India Company at the three Presidencies. And the General Order announced that the Officers of these new Regiments would be selected by the Commander-in-Chief in India from those Officers of the Indian Armies who might volunteer to join them subject to the approval of the Governor-General. But the 58th Section of the General Order declared that the names of the Officers so joining the new Regiments should continue to be borne on the Cadres of the Regiment from which they might volunteer, in order to regulate the Promotion of those Officers who might remain in the Regiment.

28. In the Native Cavalry and Infantry, extensive reductions in the number of the Regiments were contemplated at the date of the General Order; so that there would eventually be a great reduction in the number of Colonels, all of whom drew Colonels' Allowances. But the Order provided that, in spite of the reduction, Promotion in the whole line of Field Officers should go on to the rank of Colonel as theretofore, and as if the same number of Regiments remained; save only that; conformably to what was done in the Artillery and Engineers, only three vacancies in the rank of Colonel out of four should be filled up. It was found, however, that there were difficulties in carrying this arrangement into effect as to the Cavalry and Infantry, and eventually it has been ordered that Regimental Lieutenant-colonels, after 12 years' service in that grade, should become entitled to Promotion to the rank of Colonel with Colonels' allowances; and that Lieutenant-colonels of a date prior to 1st January 1862, should equally be entitled to the Promotion, if the step should come to them in ordinary course before they have completed 12 years' service as Lieutenant-colonel; and by a communication made to us by the India Office, we are informed that Promotions to Colonel under the 12 years' Service Rule are to be followed by corresponding Promotions in all the junior grades.

Appendix I.

29. We have yet to notice the most important of the Changes introduced on the Amalgamation of the two Armies. Under the old System, it had long been the practice to detach from the Regiments many of their Officers on what was called Staff employment. The duties thus discharged were often rather of a Civil or Political than of a Military character, and complaints were made that by this practice the efficiency of the Army was impaired. It often happened that nearly the whole career of an Officer was passed away from his Regiment, to which he was practically a stranger. He was, however, borne on the strength of his Regiment and succeeded by Promotion to its highest rank. On the other hand he contributed to its expenses, so far as related to the Mess and the Band, and generally to making up the Funds for inducing senior Officers to retire; and in the event of the Regiment being ordered on Active Service the Officers thus absent were ordinarily directed to join the Regiment. This whole system appeared to the

Government to be open to very serious objections, and, in order to get rid of it altogether, it was resolved to establish in each Presidency a Staff Corps, which, except as we will presently point out, should be entirely unconnected, with any other Regiments in the Army.

30. All Officers of the Royal as well as of the Indian Armies, who were at the date of the Amalgamation on Staff employment in India and who were under the substantive rank of Colonel, were declared to be eligible for admission to the Staff Corps; and Officers of either Service under the rank of Field Officer who were not on the Staff at the date of the Amalgamation were declared eligible to become candidates thereafter for similar admission. The selection of Officers for the Staff Corps was to rest with the Governments of the several Presidencies, subject to the approbation of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

31. The Promotion in the Staff Corps was to be thus regulated :—Ensigns, when transferred to that Corps, were to become Lieutenants; other Officers were, except in the case which we will mention, to have the rank they had in the Regiment from which they were transferred. Officers in the Staff Corps after 12 years' service, of which four must have been in the Staff Corps, were to become Captains; after 20 years' service, of which six must have been in the Staff Corps, were to become Majors; and after 26 years' service, of which eight must have been in the Staff Corps, were to become Lieutenant-colonels. It was further provided that Officers in Staff employment, at the date of the General Order, should be allowed to count their past service on the Staff as if it had been performed in the Staff Corps. One step of rank was to be given to every Officer joining the Staff Corps whose period of service would qualify him for it; and a period of two years, at least, was to elapse between each succeeding step. Thus a Captain of 24 years' standing who had served six years in a Staff appointment would join the Staff Corps as a Major, and at the end of two years would become a Lieutenant-colonel. The names of Officers transferred to the Staff Corps, as well as of those who had joined the new Line Regiments, were to be retained on the Cadre of the Regiment to which they had belonged, and to which they were to be considered as still belonging, for the purpose only of regulating the Promotion of the Officers who remained.

32. These are the only changes introduced by the Amalgamation to which it is at present necessary for us to advert.

33. Before we could proceed to inquire how far the Complaints referred to us for consideration are well founded, it was necessary that we should satisfy ourselves what is the fair construction to be put on the two Statutes to which we have referred, or rather on the first of them; for the second merely provides that what had been secured to the Indian Army by the first Act, should be maintained in any plan for its Re-organization. The question therefore is, what is fairly to be understood as having been guaranteed by Parliament to the Officers of the Indian Army, when, by the first Statute, it enacted that the Military Forces of the Company, becoming as they would become the Forces of Your Majesty, should be entitled to the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the East India Company.

34. In considering this subject, we must begin by assuming that the word "entitled" cannot be understood as referring to rights capable of being enforced in a Court of Justice. If any such rights exist, no opinion we may express can or ought to affect them. We propose, therefore, to assume that the Officers had not against the Company, and have not against the Crown, any such rights. And the question is, what, on that assumption, is the proper interpretation to be put on the language of the Act. It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if in the interests of India and of the Empire at large it should deem it necessary, from reducing the numbers of the Indian Army, or altering its Organization. It would have been in the power of the Company to make such reductions and changes, and a similar power was transferred to the Crown. All we can understand Parliament to have guaranteed to the Officers is, that in making any such reductions their interests should as little as possible be interfered with, and that in any change of Organization the Crown should, as no doubt the Company would have done, preserve all the Rules as to Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, which existed at the time the Act was passed; or, if in any case that should be impossible, then that some counterbalancing benefit should be given to compensate any advantage which it might be impossible to retain. When once we have come to the conclusion that what Parliament meant to guarantee was not a strict legal right, capable of being enforced in a Court of Justice, we are unavoidably, from the nature of the subject matter, obliged to adopt less definite principles of construction than those by which Acts of Parliament are generally to be interpreted. We

must consider the language of the Act in connexion with the subject with which it was dealing, and in that spirit we now proceed to consider the several Memorials referred to us by Your Majesty.

35. The largest number of Complaints arise out of the formation of the Staff Corps. It is complained, first, that as the Staff Corps constitutes substantially a new Regiment, the retention of the names of the Officers removed to it on the Cadres of their old Regiments is an infringement of the well-acknowledged rule of the Service under which the removal of an Officer from a Regiment invariably occasioned a vacancy, and so gave a step to those below him, from whatever cause the removal might have occurred. An Officer, it is contended, removed to the Staff Corps ceases, to all intents and purposes, to belong to the Regiment from which he has been removed, and so necessarily occasions a vacancy which, by the ordinary Rules of the Service, ought to be filled up by the Promotion of the Officer next in seniority.

36. But we cannot think that it could have been the intention of Parliament to bind the Crown to adhere strictly to these ordinary Rules in the extraordinary circumstances arising from changes introduced after the passing of the Act, when a strict adherence to these Rules would give to Officers remaining in their Regiments an unequal, and, in most cases, an extravagant advantage in Regimental Promotion.

37. By the present arrangements with respect to Officers transferred to the Staff Corps, every Officer remaining on the old Cadre of his Regiment will have Promotion on the happening of any casualty, which, if no Staff Corps had been created, would have given occasion to Promotion. We cannot think that Parliament meant to assure more than this.

38. The Officers would have a right to complain of any changes which would have the effect of retarding their Promotion. They can have no right to complain that such changes do not advance it.

39. We cannot, therefore, think that, so far as Promotion is concerned, the retention upon the Cadres of their old Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the Staff Corps is, practically, a departure from the Assurance given by Parliament that Indian Officers should, on the transfer of the Local Army to the Crown, retain all their previous Advantages.

40. We may here advert to a distinction made in the General Order as to Officers joining the Staff Corps from the Royal, and those joining it from the Indian Army. In the former case, every vacancy was to be filled up, but none were to be filled up in the latter.

41. This has been referred to as creating an invidious distinction to the prejudice of the Indian Army. But there was good reason for the distinction. It was not intended to make any change in the Establishment of the Royal Regiments; and in order to maintain their efficiency it was necessary to fill up every vacancy occurring among the Officers. From the Indian Regiments, many Officers had always been absent; and so far from desiring that all on the existing Establishment should be present, the Government had the intention of changing the Organization and reducing the number of Officers in a Regiment. To have filled up every vacancy would therefore have counteracted the object the Government had in view. It has further been provided that every vacancy thus occasioned in the Royal Army should be supplied by an Officer of corresponding rank from the Indian Army; so that no Promotion from one rank to another is given in the Line Regiment by reason of the vacancy.

42. But the obstruction of Promotion is not the only ground on which the establishment of the Staff Corps is complained of. The Rules under which it has been formed are complained of as unjustly giving superior rank to many of the Officers selected for that Corps, and so causing extensive Supersession of the Officers remaining with their Regiments. If a new Regiment had been formed, subject to the old rules of Promotion, and the Officers of the new Regiment had been transferred from Regiments already in existence, remaining in their former Regimental Rank, there would not necessarily have been any Supersession of the Officers remaining unremoved. Casualties might occur in the new, more rapidly than in the old Regiment; but this would be a mere chance, such as must always exist in all Regimental Organization, where accidents may give rise to Promotion in one Corps more rapidly than in another. But what the Officers complain of on this head is, the immediate and prospective Supersession in rank of Regimental Officers by those in the Staff Corps, which was the inevitable consequence of the Rules regulating Promotion in the Staff Corps, and especially of that which allows previous Staff Service to count towards the period of Service qualifying for Promotion in the Staff Corps.

43. We have to state our opinion that there are solid grounds for this complaint. The three or four senior Captains of an Indian Regiment are generally of more, sometimes of much more, than 20 years' standing in the Army; and whenever a second or lower Captain

of that standing, having had six years of previous Staff Service, joins the Staff Corps, he immediately becomes a Major and supersedes his senior Captains whom he leaves behind him; and at the end of two years he will become a Lieutenant-colonel, and so supersede not only the Captains formerly his seniors, but also, perhaps, the Major of his old Regiment. The same observation applies to Lieutenants. Now, considering how keenly Officers feel the being superseded by their juniors, and how much their interests may be thereby affected, we cannot be surprised at the Complaints which are made on this subject; and we are of opinion that, in this respect, the Parliamentary Assurance has not been adhered to.

44. The next Complaints to which we will refer are those which relate to retaining on the Cadres of the old Regiments the names of those Officers who joined the new Line Regiments formed under the General Order of Amalgamation. The Memorialists allege that every Officer who so joined the new Line Regiments ought to be considered as having created a vacancy in the Regiment from which he was removed thereby giving occasion to Promotion.

45. The formation of those Regiments was a measure of a peculiar character. We are not aware of any precisely similar measure, and there is, therefore, so far as we know, no exact precedent to guide our judgment. In all ordinary cases, where a new Regiment has been formed in the Indian Service, the Officers have been appointed according to certain fixed Rules, and, in every instance, Promotion has been given in the place of the Officers transferred; and we think that this practice should be adhered to whenever it can be done consistently with reason; but in this instance, where it was desired by the Government to form new Regiments of the Line for general service out of the old European Regiments, whose service was local, the Officers for the new Regiments were taken by preference from those of the old European Regiments who volunteered for the new Service, and were not, according to the usual rule, selected by Seniority from amongst the Officers of the army generally. A very large proportion of the Officers of the old European Regiments volunteered for the new Line Regiments, and were transferred to them; and if the usual rule of giving Promotion in the case of all vacancies created by the transfer of Officers to new Regiments, had been applied to Officers remaining on the Cadres of the old European Regiments, the Promotion given would have been to a most extravagant extent. We consider this result to be one forbidden by reason, and therefore not to be one which could have been in the contemplation of Parliament.

46. But with respect to such of the Officers of the new Line Regiments as were brought in, not from the old European Regiments, but from the Native Cavalry and Infantry, we think that the case is different; that the case of vacancies occasioned by bringing Officers from the Native Regiments falls under the ordinary rule under which Promotion has always been given on the transfer of an Officer to another Regiment; that no public interest interferes with their Promotion; that it is not contrary to reason; and therefore that the denial of such Promotion is an unnecessary departure from the Assurance given by Parliament.

47. We will here advert to another point raised by some of the Memorials. It is suggested, in respect to the removal of Officers, as well to the new Line Regiments as to the Staff Corps, that the Promotion of the Officers not so removed is interfered with not only by the retention on the Cadres of the old Regiments of the names of the Officers removed, but also by reason of the Officers so removed being employed generally on duties of a nature less likely to give occasion to Casualties than if they had remained in their Regiments.

48. Officers in Staff employ, it is said, are less frequently in the field, are generally employed in duties of a Civil or Political rather than of a Military character, and are less exposed to the severity of the Climate and other hardships of a Regimental life, and so are less likely to give occasion to vacancies, than Officers remaining with a Regiment. But it must be observed that under the Government of the East India Company, Officers were to a large extent detached on Staff Service; though, no doubt, in case of an actual Campaign, they were generally brought back to share in the dangers of their brother Officers. Even now, a large part of the Officers removed to the Staff Corps are employed in the Irregular Native Regiments, and so are exposed to the same risks and dangers as the rest of the Army; and in many other Staff employments the exposure to Climate is as great as with a Regiment in Cantonments. It is possible, however, that to some extent there may be a retardation of Promotion owing to many of the Officers of the Staff Corps being employed on services less exposed to Casualties than when they were serving with a Regiment. But this Disadvantage, so far as it exists, is of an inappreciable character, and in our opinion is not one to which the Parliamentary Guarantee can be considered as extending.

49. So, again, as to the Officers removed to the new Line Regiments, it is said they will not be, or will not necessarily be, exposed to the same risks from Climate as those who remain in the old Regiments. They may be sent to and employed in Countries where the risks from Climate are much less than in India. But the varieties of Climate in India itself are very great. Some Stations are as healthy as any in England. The service of Royal Regiments is in various Countries; some of them unhealthy. We cannot think that the superior healthiness of the Climate, in which the European Regiments transferred to the Royal Army may occasionally serve, affords any just ground of complaint to Officers remaining in the old Regiments, or is a violation of the Parliamentary Pledge.

50. We will next consider the Complaints in respect of Colonels' Allowances. The new Regulations on this subject are, as we have already stated, different in the Ordnance Corps from those in the Cavalry and Infantry. The principle on which the Amalgamation was made in the Ordnance Corps was the same in all the Presidencies, and the same as to the Artillery and the Engineers. We may therefore confine our remarks to the case of the Bengal Artillery, which will be a sample of the whole. Before the Amalgamation there were in Bengal 12 Battalions of Artillery, each with a Colonel drawing Colonels' Allowances, and two Lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.* there were in all 12 Colonels and 24 Lieutenant-colonels; and on any Casualty among the Colonels the senior Lieutenant-colonel succeeded to his place and drew the Allowances, besides his pay as Colonel. By the Amalgamation of the Indian with the Royal Artillery, the whole became one Regiment, the former 12 Bengal Battalions being divided into seven Brigades, each Brigade having its Colonel Commandant drawing Colonels' Allowances, with two Colonels and four Lieutenant-colonels. The whole establishment of the seven Brigades is therefore seven Colonels Commandant, 14 Colonels, and 28 Lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.* 49 Field Officers instead of 36 under the old System of Battalions. The five senior of these 14 Colonels were Colonels before the Amalgamation and drew Colonels' Allowances. This right is still preserved to them, and they enjoy the rank of Colonels Commandant, being supernumerary to the seven actually commanding Brigades. The other nine Colonels, making up the 14, were before the Amalgamation only Lieutenant-colonels, so that they are benefited by the increased rank and pay to which they become entitled as Colonels instead of Lieutenant-colonels. Upon the happening of any vacancy among the Colonels drawing Colonels' Allowances, it is filled up by seniority according to the general Rule of the Service, save only that, in order to get rid eventually of the Supernumeraries, every fourth vacancy is left unsupplied, so that after 20 vacancies there will cease to be Supernumeraries. The Memorialists complain of this latter arrangement as unjustly retarding the progress of Officers towards the attainment of Colonels' Allowances.

51. In order to enable us to say how far this Complaint is well founded, we must consider what is the precise operation of the Rule on the different ranks of the whole Corps. In the first place it can have no operation on those Officers who are actually drawing Colonels' Allowances, nor on the three Colonels who shall happen to stand next in order to the five Supernumeraries on the occurrence of the first three Casualties among those above them. The Colonel who stands next to the Supernumeraries when the fourth vacancy occurs will be retarded in his Promotion, and this will, more or less, affect every Officer below him. He will have to wait for a fifth vacancy before he succeeds to Colonels' Allowances, and the same observation applies to the 8th, 12th, 16th, and 20th vacancies. This is the extent of the injury occasioned by the Amalgamation, and what we have to consider is whether this is such a Grievance as to amount to a Breach of the Parliamentary Guarantee. There is great difficulty in saying that it is so. Every Officer thus retarded in his Promotion will, until his turn for Promotion arrives, have been in the enjoyment of rank and pay beyond what he would have had under the old System; and the question is whether such increased rank and pay may not be fairly considered as compensating the Officer for the retardation of his progress towards the Colonels' Allowances. To those who are juniors in the Corps, the increased rank and pay, and the greatly increased number of Field Officers must be more than an equivalent for delay in reaching the highest step to occur at a very distant day. To those who are at or near the Head of the List, the retardation must occur sooner, while the enjoyment of the increased rank and pay will have endured for a shorter time. It is impossible to find any general rule by which the balance of Advantage and Disadvantage at each particular stage of the Service can be accurately struck. But the principle on which the change has been made seems to be just; and it is clear that immediate pecuniary benefits are secured to all whose interests may be affected by the Rule in question, likely, in the case of the junior Officers, to exceed the pecuniary loss occasioned by retardation, and often to equal it even in the case of the seniors. We therefore think that under this head any solid ground of Complaint, if any should arise, must be of very rare occurrence and of a very limited character,

resulting from circumstances which it is not possible to foresee. We cannot think, therefore, that what has been done is a Breach of the Parliamentary Guarantee.

52. A similar principle as to Colonels' Allowances was originally contemplated for the Cavalry and Infantry, but this was found difficult in consequence of the very extensive reductions of the Native Regiments, and the Rule ultimately adopted has been that every Lieutenant-colonel shall become a full Colonel, and be entitled to Colonels' Allowances after holding the rank of Lieutenant-colonel for 12 years. If 12 years were a fair average of the time usually passed in the rank of Lieutenant-colonel, the principle adopted would be a fair one. The Memorialists say that the number ought to have been 10, not 12. Whether this Rule is open to objection, as being a Violation of the Parliamentary Guarantee, appears to us to depend on the question whether the number 12 has been ascertained to be a fair average. Appendix J.

53. It appears by information which we have received from the India Office, that the average in Bengal is 10·2 years, in Madras 11·8, and in Bombay 10·9; so that 12 years is just more than a year beyond what has been the average for the three Presidencies; but it is very nearly two years above the average in Bengal, of which the Army constituted nearly one-half of the whole Army of India. The rule must have been adopted in consequence of its having been felt that, without some such provision under the new circumstances of the Army, there would have been a retardation in the advance of Lieutenant-colonels to the rank of Colonel, which would have placed them in a position of Disadvantage compared with that in which they formerly stood, and therefore that in this respect the Assurances of Parliament would have been departed from. The rule, as we have explained its operation, does not appear to have removed this Grievance, as under it the period passed in a Lieutenant-colonelcy will, on the average of the whole Army, be about one-twelfth longer, and on the average of Bengal nearly one-sixth longer than it was before. The new rule, however, is not to affect the Lieutenant-Colonels, who attained that rank before the date of the new System, and so the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three Presidencies will be tested by the time at which these Lieutenant-Colonels will succeed to the Allowances in question, and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally in less than 12 years, we consider that unless the shorter average period be adopted the Guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to. Appendix K.

54. The next ground of Complaint relates to the course pursued by the Government to encourage Retirement from among the senior Officers of the Cavalry and Infantry. In consequence of the very large reductions in the number of the Native Regiments, there were a number of Lieutenant-colonels and Majors for whom it was impossible to find employment. These Officers would in ordinary course reach the rank of full Colonel, and so become entitled to Colonels' Allowances. It was considered that, by offering them a large addition to the Pension on which, by their length of service, they were entitled to retire, they might be induced to retire, and so that a considerable boon would be conferred on the Officers who should remain. A scale was therefore framed, fixing the sum to be offered to Field Officers below the rank of Colonel as an inducement to them to retire. The amount varied according to the standing of those to whom it was to be offered. To Officers who were of a standing which made it likely that by remaining in the Service they would soon become full Colonels, an additional Pension was offered amounting to 550*l.* per annum. To those further removed the sum was less, descending as low as 200*l.* per annum. And if as many as 300 Field Officers should not accept these terms, then they were to be offered to Captains of 25 years' standing and upwards. It was, however, made part of the Scheme that for every two Lieutenant-colonels accepting these terms, only one vacancy should be filled up. In the case of Majors and Captains accepting them, every vacancy was to be filled up. Appendix L.

55. To so much of this arrangement as regards the filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the Lieutenant-colonels, several of the Memorialists object. They say that, by the Rules of the Service, every Officer retiring thereby occasioned a vacancy, however his retirement might have been brought about, and so that it was a Breach of the Guarantee not to fill up all the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the Lieutenant-colonels who accepted the additional Pensions and quitted the Service. This arrangement appears to have had a very unequal operation. In many Regiments there has not occurred any Regimental Promotion. In the rest the Promotion has been of very varied amount. Those not benefited by immediate Promotion may seem to derive a certain prospective Advantage from the advance towards Promotion occasioned by so many retirements in the superior ranks; but it must be remembered that this Advantage will in all cases be materially diminished by the diminution in the number of Appendix M.

Lieutenant-colonels to which Promotion is denied. They advance towards a receding object.

56. We are unable to calculate the loss or the advantages, varying, as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different Regiments; but we think that, where loss can be ascertained to have taken place, there the Guarantee has not been adhered to.

57. Closely connected with the subject of Retirement is the Complaint that by the reductions which have been made, and by the transfer of Officers to the Staff Corps and the new Line Regiments, it has become impossible to continue the practice of forming, by contributions from the Officers, Funds out of which a Bonus may be given to an old Officer to induce him to retire, and so create a vacancy. The Officers urge that they have largely contributed money for this purpose, the whole of which is lost to them, inasmuch as in most cases there is not now a sufficient number of Officers interested in raising from time to time the requisite sums, the consequence of which is, that as they become advanced in standing, and probably anxious to retire, they cannot expect to receive a Bonus such as was before offered.

58. But it is impossible to understand the Parliamentary Guarantee to extend to this case. The Privileges and Advantages, which Parliament undertook should be preserved to the Army under the Crown as they had existed under the East India Company, were Privileges and Advantages existing between the Company on the one hand and the Army on the other. The Company was no otherwise a party to this System of giving a Bonus on retirement than as they may be considered to have given an express assurance that they would not interfere to prevent it, unless under circumstances of financial pressure and with due notice. All that could be asked of the Crown is to assume the same passive state which had existed on the part of the Company. But the System being illegal, it is impossible to understand Parliament as having meant to guarantee the continuance of a Practice which is contrary to Law.

Appendix N. 59. Some few of the Memorialists complain of a recent Order, whereby Regimental Colonels residing in India, but not required so to do, are no longer to be entitled to what are called Indian Allowances. Their right to these Allowances beyond their pay and their ordinary Colonels' Allowances was first conferred on Colonels not being Major-generals by a General Order, dated the 23d of June 1838. Whether this indulgence was given under the impression that it might be desirable to retain a few such Officers in India, or because it was thought not unreasonable to grant this boon to old Officers whose circumstances did not allow them to return to Europe, we need not enquire. Whatever may have been the motive, the Order, so far as Colonels not being General Officers are concerned, was one of a recent date, and we think that the Regulation was one which the Company would have felt itself fully justified in revoking, if it had seemed expedient so to do; and that the same power therefore may now be exercised by the Crown without thereby violating the spirit of the Guarantee. It could never have been intended to compel the Crown to give extra pay to Officers for remaining in India, when their services there were not wanted. The change, it will be observed, is altogether prospective, not affecting Colonels already in the enjoyment of the Privilege. The great object of Officers in the Indian Army, at all events of the great majority of them, has always been to reach a position which may enable them in their declining years to return to England with a competency. It can hardly be supposed that the Privilege of remaining in India with Indian Allowances after attaining the rank of full Colonel has ever seriously entered into the contemplation of those who have engaged in the Service.

Appendix O. 60. There is another ground of Complaint put forward in some of the Memorials which, we think, on the same ground as the last, is not well founded. In the year 1858, before the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown, it appeared desirable to the Court of Directors to alter the grades of the Officers in the Ordnance Corps so as to make them conform with those of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers. Previously to that time there had been in the Indian Artillery and Engineers the rank of Major as well as that of Lieutenant-colonel—no such rank existing in the Royal Ordnance Corps. In order to assimilate, in this respect, the Indian with the Royal Army, the Court of Directors, by a Despatch dated the 8th of July 1858 and addressed to the Governor-General, directed that all Majors in the Engineers and Artillery should forthwith receive Commissions as Lieutenant-colonels, bearing the same date as that of their Regimental Majorities; and also that the Commissions of the existing Lieutenant-colonels should be ante-dated in like manner with the dates of their Regimental Majorities. This was accordingly done. Complaints were immediately made by the Lieutenant-colonels of the Cavalry and Infantry, that this ante-dating of the Commissions operated injuriously towards them, as it placed these new Lieutenant-colonels of the Ordnance Corps above those who had previously been their seniors. These complaints having

been transmitted to the Home Government after it had been transferred to the Crown, the subject underwent re-examination, and by a Despatch of the Secretary of State for India, dated the 14th of June 1859, instructions were given for revoking so much of the prior Order as related to the ante-dating of the Commissions; and it was directed that they should bear date only from the time of the new Organization. The former Order having been in force when the Act transferring the Government of India to the Crown took effect, some of the Memorialists contend that its subsequent revocation was a Breach of the Parliamentary Assurance. We think, however, that this is a view of the case entirely incorrect. What was done was no violation of any Rule of the Service. It was merely what the Directors might and probably would have done. They had issued an Order in 1858 which in 1859 appeared in one particular to require amendment. We are therefore clearly of opinion that the Act of Parliament in no respect prevented the Crown from making the change which was made by the Despatch of the 14th of June 1859. Appendix P.

61. We will next advert to what, though not distinctly appearing on the Memorials referred to us, is, as appears by the first Paper submitted to us on behalf of the Officers, considered by many Indian Officers to be a Violation of the Privileges guaranteed to them, namely the alteration of the System on which Officers become General Officers.

62. In the Royal Army, Promotion in the Artillery and Engineers goes by seniority through the whole career of every Officer, *i.e.*, Colonels in the Artillery become successively, by seniority, Major-generals, Lieutenant-generals, and Generals, not succeeding in common with any other branch of the Army; so also in the Engineers. The Cavalry, Guards, and Infantry are in one general list by themselves.

63. We have already stated that in the Indian Army, the Rule was different. Officers rose to the Rank of Major-general, Lieutenant-general, and General from one List of Colonels common to every Branch of the Service in all the three Presidencies. When the Amalgamation took place, it was determined that the System of the Royal Army on this subject should be adopted in the Indian Army; a fixed number of General Officers being (as in the Royal Army), allotted to the Artillery, and another fixed number to the Engineers; and a Royal Warrant was issued on the 1st January 1862, prescribing the manner in which this change should be effected, and Promotions made to the Rank of General Officer in the two amalgamated Armies.

64. It is therein provided that all Colonels of either Army who attained that Rank prior to the 17th February 1861 shall succeed to the Rank of General Officer under the Regulations then in force for each Army respectively; but that all Officers in either Army who attained the Rank of Colonel on or after that date shall be placed according to their Commissions as Colonel or one General List, from which, so soon as all the Colonels of a date prior to the 17th February 1861 have become Major-generals, all Promotions shall be made according to seniority in succession to all vacancies in the Establishments of General Officers, whether of the British or Indian Services. It is also provided that if all the Colonels of one Army who held that Rank prior to 17th February 1861 shall have become Major-generals while some of the Colonels of the other Army of the same standing remain unpromoted, these last shall have the benefit of vacancies occurring among the Generals of either Army; Promotions from the amalgamated list will thus only be made when all who were Colonels prior to the above-mentioned date shall have become Major-generals. In the Artillery and Engineers of both Armies, Promotion to the Rank of General Officer is to continue as heretofore, until all the Colonels of Artillery and Engineers, as the case may be, of the Indian Army who held that Rank prior to the 17th February 1861 shall have become Major-generals; then all future Promotions to that Rank in the Ordnance Corps are to be made from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian Artillery, and from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian Engineers. A Copy of this Warrant is set out in the Appendix. Appendix Q.

65. The number of General Officers in the Royal Artillery had been 32, and by the Royal Warrant it was in consequence of the Amalgamation increased by 26, making together 58; and the number of General Officers of the Engineers, which had been 16, was increased by 12, making the total number 28.

66. The Officers of the Ordnance Corps who became Colonels on the Amalgamation, complain of the operation of this Warrant on the ground that, when all their seniors unaffected by the change shall have become Major-generals, their Promotion is likely to go on less rapidly than before. In order to show that this must be the case, they point out that except the Colonels, now made Colonels Commandant or Supernumerary Colonels Commandant, there was not in the Indian Army any Regimental Colonel of Artillery or Engineers before the date of the Amalgamation, whereas in the Royal Army

there is a long list of Colonels, not Colonels Commandant, and of Lieutenant-colonels with the brevet rank of Colonel of a date before the Amalgamation, all of whom must be made Major-generals before Promotion can reach those Indian Colonels who were promoted to that rank on the Amalgamation. This, however, might be true, and yet not work any injury to the Indian Officers. The question is not whether there may not be a long list of Colonels in the Royal Artillery who will become Major-generals before them, but whether the time at which they will become Major-generals is likely to be more remote than that at which they would have reached that rank under the old Organization.

67. We have found it impossible to ascertain when the Officers promoted on the Amalgamation to the rank of Colonel of Artillery or Engineers would, under the old Rules in force in the Indian army, if no Amalgamation had been made, have probably attained the rank of Major-General.

Appendix R. 68. By a return from the Horse Guards it appears that there are 58 Colonels of the Royal Artillery, whose Commissions are dated prior to 17th February 1861, who are entitled to promotion. When these Officers shall have been promoted, the amalgamated list for the Artillery will come into operation, and the six seniors upon it are the Colonels of Indian Artillery promoted to that rank on the 18th of February 1861. The senior of these Officers, therefore, now stands 59th Colonel of Artillery, and there being, as we have already stated, 58 General Officers appropriated to that branch of the Service, it is plain that he cannot become a Major-general until 59 vacancies have occurred in a list of 116 Officers.

69. We endeavoured, in order to test the effect of the Amalgamation, to ascertain how this Officer would have stood, with reference to the list of General Officers in the Indian Army, if there had been no change. But we have found this to be impossible. In that Army the General Officers were appointed from one list of Colonels of every branch of the Service in all the three Presidencies; and a Lieutenant-colonel may become a Colonel either by Regimental Succession or by Brevet. It appears, by a Return from the India Office, a copy of which is printed in the Appendix, that, but for the Amalgamation, none of the Officers promoted on the 18th of February 1861 to be Colonels of Artillery or Engineers would have yet reached the rank of Colonel. None of them therefore would yet have been on the list from which the General Officers were promoted, and it is impossible to say when any one of them would have become a Colonel, or how, when he attained that rank, he would have stood on the general list of Colonels, with respect to Officers becoming Colonels from other branches of the Service.

Appendix S.
ppen

70. These circumstances make it impossible to say what the effect of the Amalgamation has been on the prospects of Field Officers of the Artillery and Engineers of the Indian Army who were not Colonels before the Amalgamation, with reference to their becoming General Officers; and we, therefore, are unable to say whether on this head of Complaint there has or has not been a Violation of the Parliamentary Assurance.

71. Ultimately the change will be, to a very small extent, beneficial to the Ordnance Corps. It will put the Officers in rather a better position as to attaining the rank of General Officer than they were in under the old System, as is plain from the following considerations:—

72. The whole Establishment of Officers before the Amalgamation was 5,968 and the number of General Officers was 220, *i.e.*, not quite one General Officer to 27 Officers of all Grades.

73. The present number of Royal Artillery Officers is 831; that of the Indian Artillery, 672; total, 1,503. The number of General Officers to the Amalgamated Artillery is to be 58, which is nearly one to 26.

74. As to the Engineers, the present number of Officers of all Grades in the Royal Engineers is 452; in the Indian Engineers, 297, making in all, 749. The number of General Officers to the Amalgamated Corps is to be 28, *i.e.* a little more than one in 27.

75. The proportion, therefore, of General Officers to the whole Corps, both in the Artillery and Engineers, will be a trifle greater under the new than it was under the old System.

Ap

Appendix T.

76. The case as regards the Cavalry and Infantry is different. No Colonels were made in those branches of the Indian Service at the time of the Amalgamation, but several Lieutenant-Colonels have since that time become Colonels in the ordinary course of Promotion. It appears by a Statement from the India Office that there were on the 1st of July 1863, 70 Colonels in the Indian Army who had held that rank before the Amalgamation. None of these 70 are affected by the change now under consideration, but the 71st Colonel of the Indian Army will succeed to the rank of Major-general, not under the old Rule, but according to the arrangements introduced by the Warrant of the 1st of January 1862.

77. Under the old System there were 220 General Officers in the Indian Army, so that the 71st Colonel would have become a Major-general when 71 vacancies had occurred in a list of 290 Officers.

78. In the Royal Army (excluding the Ordnance Corps) there were formerly 260 General Officers, and it appears by a Statement received from the Horse Guards that there were, on the 1st of July 1863, 191 Colonels of a standing prior to the Amalgamation who will be entitled to promotion before the 71st Colonel on the Indian list. Appendix B.

General Officers of the Royal Army	-	260	70 Indian Colonels but also the 191
Colonels of ditto prior to 17 February 1861	-	191	Colonels of the Royal Army, making
General Officers of the Indian Army	-	220	together 261, have been promoted. There
Colonels of ditto prior to 17 February 1861	-	70	must therefore have been 262 vacancies out
			of a list of 741 Officers before he can obtain
			his Promotion; whereas according to the
			proportion of 71 out of 290,—according to which he would have succeeded under the old
			system,—he ought to obtain his Promotion on the happening of 181 vacancies instead
			of 262.

79. He cannot therefore succeed to the Rank of Major-general until not only the

80. Should this arrangement be carried into operation, it appears to us that it will cause injury of by no means an imaginary character. It will be felt less and less by Officers as they are further and further removed from the rank of Colonel. But the new Rule must cause to many Officers great delay in their Promotion, without any counter-vailing Advantage, and we therefore feel bound to express our opinion that in this respect the Parliamentary Assurance has not been fulfilled.

81. A further ground of Complaint as to the arrangement relative to General Officers is, that a due number of General Officers has not been allotted to the Indian Ordnance Corps. We have already stated that in the Royal Army, before the Amalgamation, the number of General Officers allotted to the Artillery was 32, and that the additional number added on the Amalgamation was 26. It is urged that it ought to have been at least 31, on the ground that the whole number of Officers of all grades in the Indian Artillery was, within 4, the same as in the Royal Artillery, the number in the former being 672, and in the latter 676. But although it is true that the number of Officers in the Royal Artillery when the Establishment was fixed in 1854 was only 676, the Memorialists do not seem to have adverted to the increase to that Corps made in subsequent years without any corresponding increase in the number of General Officers. The number of Officers in the Royal Artillery was at the time of the Amalgamation 831, not 676, and the number (26) added on the Amalgamation was a fraction higher than the proportion in the Royal Army would have warranted. A similar answer may be given as to the Engineers.

82. There are some few further grounds of Complaint, to which we do not think it necessary to advert in detail. It is complained, for example, that the Supernumerary Colonels Commandant in the Ordnance Corps are still counted as Effective Officers, as constituting a part of the two Colonels allotted to each of the seven Brigades. The whole number of Colonels before the Amalgamation (referring still to Bengal) was only 12. By the Amalgamation nine were added. Neither these nine nor their junior Officers can complain that more were not added, or that additional rank was given to all the former 12, or that five of them were retained as before in the Effective List. There is obviously no ground of Complaint on this head. It would doubtless have been more beneficial to the Officers to have had 14 Colonels instead of nine beyond the Supernumeraries, but there can be no ground of Complaint because more benefit might have been conferred than was actually conferred.

83. So again Complaints are made of some of the Rules governing admission to the Staff Corps, and that those who join that Corps are, with reference to Pensions particularly, in a less favourable position than that which they had previously occupied. Some Officers who had joined the Staff Corps represented to the Government that they had understood they were to retain their former rights to Pension. When their mistake was explained to them, and they were allowed to leave the Staff Corps if they thought fit, but elected to remain in it, they deprived themselves of all ground of Complaint.

84. Some Officers complain of the more wearisome nature of their duties, now that there are, in fact, in many cases, no Private Soldiers to command, and that the Cadre of Officers is all which practically remains in a Regiment. However much it may be to be regretted that their duties are of so much less interesting and active a character than they were formerly, we do not think that the change can be attributed to any act whereby the spirit of the Parliamentary Guarantee has been violated.

85. A Complaint is made by one Officer that, though skilled in the Burmese Language, in which he had been required to pass to hold his appointment in that Territory, he had been excluded from the Staff Corps, and degraded from the rank of Major to Captain, on account of his not having passed the prescribed examination in Hindostanee. This is evidently a matter to which the Parliamentary Guarantee has no application.

86. Some of the Officers who retired on the increased Annuities offered by the Government allege that they did so because, according to the Regulations in force at the time when they retired, they accepted the higher Pensions, which appeared to them the most advisable course for them to pursue; but that more advantageous Regulations were very shortly afterwards made in respect to Lieutenant-colonels succeeding to the Colonels' Allowances, which, if they had been earlier in force, would have prevented them from retiring, and so they consider they ought in fairness to be allowed either to cancel their Retirements and resume their old position in the Army, or to receive some addition to their present Pensions.

87. The additional Annuity first given as inducement to Officers to retire was not so large as that subsequently offered; and some of the Officers who retired on the first offer consider that they ought in justice to have the higher Annuities granted to them.

88. In all these cases—and there are others to which the same observation applies—it is obvious that what is complained of—having been their own voluntary act at the time, in the case of some, and of mere official arrangement in that of others—cannot be looked on as any Violation of the Parliamentary Guarantee, and therefore does not come within the scope of our Inquiry, and we only allude to these points in order that it may not be supposed that these Complaints have been overlooked.

89. We have only to state, in conclusion, that agreeing as we do in the main parts of this Report, we have all signed it, though in some particulars, appearing in the papers appended to it, we are not agreed.

JOHN MILTON, Secretary,
London, 9th November 1863.

✕ CRANWORTH. (L.S.)
✕ ELLENBOROUGH. (L.S.)
✓ HOTHAM. (L.S.)
✕ J. W. HENLEY. (L.S.)
✓ C. YORKE. (L.S.)
✓ A. CLARKE. (L.S.)
✓ P. M. MELVILL. (L.S.)

I dissent from paragraph 39. The majority of the Commissioners being of opinion, in which I concur, that the denial of Promotion in the case of vacancies in the Native Cavalry and Infantry Regiments, created by Officers having volunteered into the new Line Regiments, is an unnecessary *departure* from the Assurance given by Parliament, it appears to me that no difference in principle exists between their case and those vacancies caused respectively either by Officers having volunteered to serve in the Staff Corps, or by Officers volunteering from the old European Regiments to serve in the new Line Regiments. To regulate promotion by retaining the names of the Officers, who have so left the Regiments, on the Cadres of the Regiments, is in each case alike unjust. I disagree also with paragraphs 47 and 48, because I am unable to affirm, in face of the Report "on the Sanitary State of the Army in India," lately presented to both Houses of Parliament, that the *disadvantage* that Officers remaining with their Regiments in India are under, by making their Promotion depend on Casualties happening either to Officers employed on General Service in or out of India, or to Officers of the Staff Corps, many of whom are employed in Offices Civil or Political rather than Military, is of an unappreciable character; and I do not think that these Officers so remaining with their Regiments have the same *Advantages* as regards Promotion, which they enjoyed under the East India Company, or any counterbalancing benefit.

J. W. HENLEY.

We dissent from paragraph 46, because, with respect to such of the Officers of the new Line Regiments as were brought in from the Native Cavalry and Infantry, we consider that there is no difference in principle between the case of these Officers and that of the Officers brought from the old European Regiments;—that in both cases the vacancies were created by a measure to which the ordinary Rules of

the Army ought not to be considered as applicable,—that no such vacancies would have occurred if there had been no Amalgamation,—and so, that no Officer can complain of the course which was followed, his Promotion not having been retarded by it.

CRANWORTH.
C. YORKE.

We dissent from paragraphs 55 and 56 for the following reasons:—

The circumstances which occasioned these vacancies were very special. But for the premium offered by the Government, it is probable that none of them would have occurred. The qualification, limiting promotion in the case of Lieutenant-colonels to half only of the number who might retire, made the arrangement to that extent less beneficial to the Army than it would have been if there had been no such qualification. Still, the arrangement itself was a great boon. It appears by a Return made by the India Office to the House of Commons on the 27th of July last, that the terms offered have been accepted by 304 Officers, *i.e.* by 134 Lieutenant-colonels, by 93 Majors, and by 77 Captains. A very large number of Officers must have been promoted in consequence of the vacancies caused by these retirements; besides which, the arrangement must have advanced nearly every other Officer more or less in his progress towards Promotion. It is true that the number of Lieutenant-colonelcies to which junior Officers might eventually succeed was, by the terms of the Order, reduced by half the number of Lieutenant-colonels who accepted the terms of retirement; but we cannot understand the Parliamentary Guarantee to have assured to the Indian Officers that the Army should never be reduced; and, if any reduction was to be made, we cannot say that the mode thus adopted was a Violation of the Parliamentary Pledge.

CRANWORTH.
C. YORKE.
P. M. MELVILL.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

MEMORANDUM explanatory of the Measures adopted as regards the OFFICERS of the INDIAN ARMIES.

THE recent measures as to the Indian army, by which the officers of that army are affected, have been framed with a view to three distinct objects:—

1. The amalgamation, as it is called, of the Queen's Indian and general armies, but which, in the shape which the measure has ultimately assumed, is more properly the conversion of the European troops of the Indian army into troops for general service.
2. A change in the organization of the native army.
3. A reduction of the native army.

In carrying these measures into operation, not only did Her Majesty's Government and the Secretary of State for India and the Council of India feel it to be their duty to give full effect to the parliamentary guarantees given to the Indian officers, but it was their anxious wish to show the greatest consideration to the officers and men who would be affected by the alterations. It has been their earnest desire to act in the most liberal spirit compatible with a due regard to the charge which might be imposed on the finances of India.

The guarantees which were given by Parliament to the Indian officers are contained in the Acts* for the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown, and for repealing the power of raising European forces for the Indian army.

In the first Act it was provided that they should be entitled to "the like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the East India Company;" and this pledge was repeated in the subsequent Act.

The measures which have been adopted will now be stated separately, and also the effect which has been produced by them on the different classes of the Indian officers.

AMALGAMATION.

The discontinuance of a separate European force for Indian service was determined on by Parliament, but the details of the measures for effecting this object were left to Her Majesty's Government.

Lists of General Officers.

The Royal Warrant of the 1st of January 1862 provides for a prospective amalgamation of the lists of general and field officers of the British and Indian armies.

All officers of the Indian army who attained the rank of General Officer or Colonel prior to the 17th of February 1861 will be promoted exactly as they stand on the list of the Indian army; but officers of the British or Indian army who attain the rank of Colonel on or after that date are placed on one general list, for promotion to the rank of Major-General.

Amalgamation or Conversion of the European Troops of the East India Company.

Different plans for this purpose were considered; but that which was ultimately adopted was the conversion, by the volunteering of the officers and men, of the Indian Artillery, Indian Engineers, and the European Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian army into Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and twelve new regiments of the Line.

Artillery.

In this arm the number of native gunners has been very much diminished, and that of the Europeans increased. There is no reduction in the number of officers. A considerable change, however, has been effected in the last four or five years in the organization of the corps, which is now assimilated to that of the Royal Artillery, by which change, upon the whole, very

great benefits have been conferred upon the Indian corps.

In 1858 the rank of Major in the Indian regiments of Artillery was abolished, as was that of Second Lieutenant, and the rank of Second Captain was introduced. All existing Majors were promoted at once to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, a considerable number of the senior Lieutenants were promoted to be Captains; all the Second Lieutenants were promoted; and all Captains and subalterns were brought nearer to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

It may be observed that by this change, which was made during the government of the East India Company, the Majors of Artillery gained a great advantage over officers of the corresponding rank in the Cavalry and Infantry, as indeed did all officers of the Artillery, though in a less degree, a result which gave rise to numerous complaints on the part of officers of the other arms of the service.

In 1861 the rank of Colonel Commandant was created, and the number of field officers increased. In Bengal, for instance, in the year 1858, there were—

12 Colonels,
12 Lieutenant-Colonels,
12 Majors.

Total - 36

In the year 1862 there are—

7 Colonels Commandant,
14 Colonels,
28 Lieutenant-Colonels.

Total - 49

The promotion of all officers of the late Indian Artillery will continue to go on, as before, by seniority in the respective lists of their old regiments, as if those regiments still existed.

Officers who have not volunteered for general service are posted to batteries along with others, but they are not liable to serve beyond Indian limits without their own consent.

All officers of the old Indian Artillery retain their right to Indian pensions and retirements.

The number of Colonels' allowances will be gradually diminished, but more than an equivalent is given to the corps generally by the increase in the number of the higher ranks, with the corresponding pay; and a measure is under consideration for offering additional pensions on retirement to a small class of officers who have but slightly participated in the above advantages.

The cost of the additional pay to the Indian Artillery in consequence of these changes, after deducting any saving from reductions, is no less than 75,000*l.* per annum.

Engineers.

The Engineers have been dealt with in a similar way; no reduction has taken place in their numbers, but their organization has been assimilated by the changes in 1858 and 1861 to that of the Royal Engineers; the number of officers of the higher ranks has been increased; and the additional charge on the Indian revenue for the cost of their improved position is 55,000*l.* per annum.

Cavalry and Infantry.

In Bengal there were five new and incomplete regiments of European Cavalry, three old regiments of European Infantry, and three new regiments, of which one had mutinied and been disbanded. In Madras and also in Bombay there were three old Infantry regiments.

After a careful consideration of the number of regiments which it was necessary to add to the English army, in consequence of the increased number of British troops required for India, it was determined to add three of Cavalry and nine of Infantry. The men re-

APP. A.

Despatch to India, 8th July 1858, No. 183.

Despatch to India, 18th Jan 1861, No. 29.

* 21 & 22
Vict. c. 103
23 & 24 Vict.
c. 100.

Despatch to India, 18th Jan 1861, No. 30.

Despatch to India, 18th Jan 1861, No. 28.

APP. A.

maining in all the Indian regiments were not enough to complete the numbers of the new regiments of the Line; but, as far as they volunteered, they formed the foundation of the new corps.

To the officers of the three first regiments of European Cavalry in Bengal, and to those of the three old regiments of Bengal Infantry, and of the three regiments of Infantry in Madras and in Bombay, the option was offered of joining the regiments of the line which were formed from those regiments. Nearly all of them accepted the offer, and volunteered for service in the new line regiments. Vacancies were filled up by officers volunteering for the purpose from other regiments of the Indian armies. All these officers, therefore, have become officers of the Line by their own choice on the usual conditions of that service, but retaining their right to Indian pension and retirement.

In carrying the arrangements for these regiments into execution considerable promotion has taken place.

The number of Indian officers who have joined the new corps is 403. Their names have been left in italics in the cadres of their old regiments, for the reasons which will hereafter be stated in regard to the officers joining the Staff corps.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIVE ARMY.

Many of the most experienced Indian servants are of opinion, and amongst them none more strongly than Sir John Lawrence, that what is called the irregular system of organization of the native regiments is superior in efficiency to what is called the regular system.

In Bengal the regular native army had almost ceased to exist, whilst many regiments had been formed on the irregular system, and had done admirable service during the Mutiny.

On the regular system there were upwards of 20 officers with a regiment, of whom several, however, were withdrawn for Staff employment and other service. With the irregular regiments only three European officers were employed.

It has been determined to adopt, gradually but generally, for the native army the irregular system, and to attach six European officers instead of three to each regiment. By this measure a reduction of the number of officers and a considerable saving will be made, without impairing, it is believed, the efficiency of the regiment.

Staff Corps.

The officers of the irregular corps in the army of the East India Company, as well as those required to fill the various situations in civil and political employment, public works, &c., known under the general name of Staff employment, were taken to a very small extent from the regiments of the line employed in India, but the greater number of them were officers withdrawn from the regular regiments of the Indian army, European and native.

The officers of the Line retained their Staff situations only as long as their regiments remained in India, and therefore were frequently withdrawn from their duties, when they had acquired considerable experience in the performance of them.

With regard to the Indian officers, the evil effect of the system had been long felt, and so strongly represented to the Government, that the question of forming a separate body of officers for Staff service had been frequently considered during the existence of the East India Company. This question was again considered with reference to the altered organization of the native army, and such a body would probably have been formed, even if the local European troops had been retained, as so small a body of officers as that force would have contained could not have supplied the constant drain upon them of officers for Staff service. That force being discontinued, the formation of such a corps was the best, if not the only, mode of supplying a body of officers for Staff service in India.

It was, therefore, determined to form a Staff corps as a separate and distinct corps; and a Royal Warrant was issued early in 1861, constituting the corps, and containing all the regulations as to pay, promotion, &c.

The promotion was to depend on length of service in the army, and in the Staff corps; and, indeed, no other rule could be adopted; for, as the number of Staff situations may vary from time to time, it was impossible to determine on any fixed number or establishment for the Staff corps. Its numbers must be determined, at any period, by the number of the situations of Staff employment required at that time for the public service, with a due allowance for officers on furlough

and sick leave. The promotion of the officers of the Staff corps could not, therefore, be made dependent on vacancies.

A number of years' service in each rank, calculated on about the average time of service in those ranks in the British army, was fixed as that which should entitle an officer to promotion in the Staff corps.

It was then to be considered how the corps should be formed in the first instance.

The officers in Staff employment, both of the Line and Indian corps, were obviously the persons whom it was natural to place in the Staff corps.

As regarded the Line officers, it was necessary to withdraw them from their regiments, and to place them in a corps for Indian service. They are, therefore, to be removed from their regiments, and their places filled up by officers of the Indian army of corresponding rank volunteering for service in the Line.

The case of the Indian officers was different, and required much more careful consideration, because other questions were involved in the method of dealing with them.

They might equally have been employed in Staff situations, if they had been left in their existing position, borne on the strength of their regiments, but withdrawn for Staff employment, according to the usual practice. In such case, not only would they not have been removed from their regiments, but they might in certain circumstances have actually returned to regimental duty, and superseded officers who had never quitted the regiment.

As it seemed desirable, however, that the Indian officers should be placed along with those of the Line in the Staff corps, on its first formation, it was to be considered whether this might be done, without rendering it necessary to remove them altogether from the cadres of their regiments, and to give to the officers who remained the promotion which they would have had if such officers had been removed under ordinary circumstances.

It is obvious that a very considerable and unnecessary expense would be incurred by so large a promotion as this would have caused. There was no need of it for the efficiency of the public service, or of the regiments which were now to be organized upon a different system.

Reference was made to the records to see what had been the practice of the East India Company; and it appeared that they had not invariably given promotion regimentally into all vacancies, even when caused by casualties.

For instance, the Court of Directors, in a Despatch dated the 3d of December 1828, directed the reduction of two Lieutenants, and one Cornet or Ensign in each regiment of local Cavalry and Infantry of the three Presidencies, with instructions that the officers supernumerary to the establishment should continue to serve in their respective rank until absorbed by casualties. The result of this measure was that, until the supernumerary Lieutenants of any regiment had been absorbed, the senior Ensign would not be promoted, on the occurrence of a casualty in that regiment.

Again, on the occasion of the Cabul massacre, when several of the East India Company's regiments lost many officers, the Court of Directors ordered that, in each of five regiments (the 5th Light Cavalry, and the 5th, 27th, 37th, and 54th Native Infantry), the vacancies should be filled up by the transfer of officers from other regiments, who would be placed in the five regiments enumerated, above certain young officers who had been previously posted to those regiments, but who had not been present with them on active service.

The results also of promoting in the room of all officers joining the Staff corps would have been excessively unequal as regards different regiments, and would, undoubtedly, have led to far more unequal supercession than has occurred under the plan adopted by the Government.

For instance, in the 6th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, the senior officer who joined the Staff corps was the last Captain but one in the regiment; whilst in the 7th Regiment, the Major, all the Captains, and the three senior Lieutenants joined the Staff corps. If the names of those who joined the Staff corps had been removed from the list of their regiments, and promotion given in their place, the fourth Lieutenant of the 7th Regiment, who was a cadet of 1852, and a Lieutenant of 1855, would have become a Major, superseding the senior Captain of the 6th Regiment, who is a

Despatches to India, 18th Jan 1861, No. 27, and 10th August 1861, No. 319, para. 27.

Despatch to India, 18th Jan. 1861, No 27.

cadet of 1840, and a Captain of the same date (1852) as that in which the former officer entered the army; and the young Major might, under certain circumstances, have been appointed to the command of the regiment in which the senior Captain served.

The least objectionable course, therefore, appeared to be that the names of the officers joining the Staff corps should be left in the cadres of their old regiments, and their juniors promoted on the occurrence of any contingency affecting these officers, which would have given promotion under the old system. By this course, the junior officers were kept in exactly the same position as if no change had been made in the Indian regiments, except that they were relieved from the possible disadvantage of being superseded by the officers in Staff employment returning to regimental duty,—while the unnecessary expense and inequality of promotion were avoided.

The Staff Corps Warrant, and the draft of the despatches for carrying the arrangements above detailed into effect, were submitted to the law officers of the Crown, who gave their opinion that they were not in the least degree inconsistent with the Parliamentary guarantee to the Indian officers.

It was, therefore, decided that Indian officers should be permitted to join the Staff corps, but that their names should be left in italics in the cadres of their regiments, in order to regulate promotion in those regiments.

The officers, whether of the Line or Indian army, who were actually in Staff employment, were allowed to join the Staff corps; and this number, together with those who were on furlough or sick leave, would have furnished a sufficient number for the Staff corps, according to the principle already mentioned, and it was desirable to avoid the additional charge which would arise from placing officers in the Staff corps, for whom there was no employment.

There were, however, a certain number of officers, and some of them of very good Staff service, who from one circumstance or another, had only recently quitted their Staff employment; and it would have been disadvantageous to the public service to have excluded them. Some extension of the above rule was necessary, with a view to this object; and it was finally settled that officers who had been in Staff employment within the three previous years should be allowed to join the Staff corps. Some limit, of course, was necessary, and this period gave a fair margin.

A second question arose, whether previous Staff service should be allowed to count towards the period of service qualifying for promotion in the Staff corps.

If officers joining the Staff corps on its first formation were to be required actually to serve in the Staff corps the full period necessary for promotion under the provisions of the warrant, many of the seniors of each rank would have been debarred from joining it, as their promotion might thereby have been seriously retarded.

The officers of the Indian army, also, are, generally speaking, of much longer standing in their respective ranks than officers of the same rank in regiments of the Line; and, as officers of both branches of the service were to join, with the rank which they respectively held, if subsequent service only was allowed to reckon towards promotion in the Staff corps, it would have required a much longer period of total army service for the Indian officers, than for those of the Line, to attain a given rank.

In order, therefore, to obviate these two objections, it was determined that previous service in Staff employment should count towards promotion in the Staff corps.

It is undeniable that the promotion given to some of the officers who have joined the Staff corps places them in a higher rank than some of those who were their seniors in their old regiments; but it is only on rare occasions that this supersession would be felt.

Such a result might have occurred in many ways under the old system of promotion, though not practically to the same extent.

A junior officer obtaining brevet rank would always, on general service, command his senior of the same regimental rank. Many subalterns have been noted for promotion to brevet rank as Major, on becoming Captains;—each of such officers, on becoming the junior Captain in his regiment, would receive the brevet rank of Major; and thus, on general service, the junior Captain would take the command over every other Captain in the regiment.

In the case of the promotion of all the Majors of Artillery and Engineers in 1858, above referred to,

every Major in the Cavalry and Infantry was superseded by the late junior Major in those corps.

One of the junior Majors in the Bengal Artillery, although his brevet rank was several years senior to his regimental rank, at once superseded 59 officers of Cavalry and Infantry; and the junior Major of Engineers in Bengal superseded 118 officers of Cavalry and Infantry.

On the formation of new regiments in 1824, out of the two battalions of the native regiments the officers of which had been promoted in one regimental list, the promotion thenceforward was made in separate lists, and this led to officers being frequently superseded in army rank by those who originally were junior to them in the same regimental cadre.

The position of the officers who belonged to the old local European regiments, and who have neither volunteered for the new Line regiments, nor been admitted to the Staff corps, is analogous to that of the officers of the cadres of native regiments who have not been admitted to the Staff corps.

The impossibility, however, of giving promotions in succession to all officers who have left the old cadres, is still more apparent in this case. The new Line regiments are, in fact, with very small exceptions, the old Indian regiments transferred, with the voluntary consent of nearly all the officers and men, to the Line.

In the first European regiment of each Presidency, the following is the mode in which the officers have been disposed of.—

—	Joined new Regiment	Staff Corps.	Staff Employment	Remain	Total.
Bengal Fusiliers -	18	10	5	5	38
Madras - -	30	4	3	4	41
Bombay - -	22	15	—	3	40
Total -	70	29	8	12	119
	29		12		
	99		20		

It can hardly be contended that when, as in one regiment, only one Captain and two Lieutenants remained in the cadre of the regiment (all the rest having joined the Line regiment or Staff corps), the two senior of these officers should become Majors, and the last, a cadet of 1857, become a Captain, over the heads of all officers, from the senior Lieutenant in the Indian army on the day of his promotion, down to the officer immediately above him in the year 1857.

Nor could this promotion, if withheld from the officers of the cadres of the old European regiments, be justly given in the cadres of those other regiments from which officers were taken to fill up vacancies in the new Line regiments.

REDUCTION.

The experience of the late mutiny had shown the danger of a large native army.

The necessity of an increased force of European troops caused an additional expense, which could only be met by a diminution of the expense of the native army; and beyond these considerations, it was indispensably necessary to relieve the finances of India from the heavy military charge of the number of troops which were maintained even before the mutiny.

In Bengal, out of 74 regular regiments, only 12 retained their arms, and have been kept in the service. 62 regular regiments have disappeared, and the numbers of the army have been very largely reduced. By far the greater part of the officers were actually without regiments.

In the Madras and Bombay armies, besides a reduction of the strength of the regiments which are retained, several regiments have been reduced.

In the three armies, the total reduction has been from about 265,000 to 135,000 men.

It was not unreasonable that some reduction should be gradually made in the charge on the Indian revenues, in respect of the pay and allowances of the officers of an army which had been so much reduced; and, with this object, the following measures have been adopted.

Colonels' Allowances.

In order to effect a gradual reduction in this charge, so that it might correspond with the number of regiments to be retained, it was at first proposed to fill up only three out of every four vacancies.

A 2

APP. A.

G.O.G.
10th April
1861, No. 332.
Despatch to
India, 10th
August 1861,
No 319,
para. 32.

Royal
Warrant,
clause 3.

Despatch to
India, 18th
Jan. 1861,
No 27,
para. 8.

APP. A.

Despatch to India, 10th August 1861, No 820, paras. 17 and 18. Despatch to India, 31st July 1862, No 270, paras 12 and 13.

Another arrangement was subsequently sanctioned; but, on further consideration of the probable working of this plan, and to prevent all complaints, it was afterwards arranged that Colonels' allowances should be given, without reference to number of fixed establishment, to all regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of 12 years' standing in that rank.

The term of 12 years fixed for this purpose is about the average period in which, under the old system, a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Madras army attained to Colonels' allowance; but the average was somewhat less in the Bengal and Bombay armies.

Regimental Officers.

With respect to the mode of dealing with regimental officers, in the case of a large reduction, there is no instance in the annals of the Indian army that could serve as a guide. It has so happened that no extensive reduction has ever taken place in that army. The numbers have been gradually increasing with the gradual extension of territory, and any temporary reduction to a small extent has been made by reducing the strength of regiments.

When the English army was reduced at the Peace, in 1818, though to an extent far less than the reduction of the native army in India, several regiments, and especially second battalions, were reduced. The officers of these regiments and battalions were at once placed on the half-pay of their rank, and many of them remained so for life; others, by exchange or otherwise, may have returned to active service.

It can hardly be doubted that the East India Company, if such a case had occurred before they ceased to exercise the powers of the Crown as regards the Indian army, might have acted as the Government of this country did in 1818, and placed the officers of the reduced regiments on an allowance in the nature of half-pay or retired allowance, without any further promotion.

The course, however, which has been pursued is very different, and of a much more liberal character.

To all officers who have been posted to regiments, promotion according to regimental seniority, and to the unposted officers promotion according to general seniority, to the highest rank in the army, has been assured, with the full pay of the rank which they may attain; and to them, as well as to all officers of the late Indian army, their claim to Indian retirements and pensions also is continued.

Retirement.

With a view to meet the case of some of the older officers who had been thrown out of employment by the changes consequent on the mutiny, and to facilitate reduction, a considerable measure of retirement has been given.

In the first place, to every officer entitled to retire on full-pay pension, an additional annuity of 50% was offered. Subsequently, all Lieutenant-Colonels and all Majors were authorized to retire on the pensions of their respective ranks, with an additional sum calculated roughly on the value of their expectancy of Colonel's allowance. Thus, the ten Lieutenant-Colonels who were the seniors in their respective arms and Presidencies were to receive an annual sum of 550%, in addition to the pension of their rank, eleven Lieutenant-Colonels, the next in seniority, an annual sum of 500%, and so on. If field officers to the number of 300 did not avail themselves of this offer, it was to be extended to Captains of 25 years' standing, to the limit of 300. The amount of these extra annuities is 64,560% per annum, beyond the ordinary pensions on which they retired, amounting to 100,807%. The number of officers who availed themselves of these two offers is nearly 300.

Although promotion will be made in the room of all officers retiring in ordinary course, it was considered to be unreasonable that promotions should be made in place of all those who were induced to retire by an extraordinary bonus offered by the Government. Such an extensive scheme of extraordinary retirement, with a large immediate increase of charge, afforded a fitting opportunity for effecting some reduction of establishment and corresponding reduction of expense.

Promotions, therefore, to the full extent of these extraordinary retirements have not been made; one-half only of the number of Lieutenant-Colonels has been

filled up, but promotions have been made in succession to all Majors and Captains.

The number of promotions, actually given in consequence of these retirements, has been as follows:—

49 Lieutenant-Colonels,
87 Majors,
123 Captains,
190 Lieutenants.

Total - 449

and the position of every officer in the army has been improved, in a greater or less degree, by the removal of the officers who have thus retired.

It certainly cannot be questioned that the East India Company might, and, under the circumstances of recent years, ought to, have reduced its native army. It is equally clear that they might have changed the organization of that army.

They might have formed a Staff corps, as, indeed, was contemplated at different times, and might have framed rules for admission into such corps, and for pay and promotion in what would have been, under their administration, a separate and distinct corps. They might have given promotion to officers in it, without reference to the position of officers in other corps, as was done in 1858 in respect to the officers of the Artillery and of the Engineers.

The only measures of reduction which have taken place, by which the interests of existing officers can be affected, are the probable and gradual reduction of Colonels' allowances, the reduction of the number of Lieutenant-Colonels, and the cessation of command allowances and other regimental advantages, which would have been enjoyed by officers, if their regiments were still in existence.

All the measures which have been adopted are either such as have been, on former occasions, taken by the East India Company, or might have been taken under such circumstances as those of recent years.

The general result of the measures, on the officers of the Indian army, may be shortly stated as follows:—

Officers in receipt of Colonels' allowances are unaffected by the above changes.

The officers of Artillery, 670, have, upon the whole, derived great advantage from their new organization.

The same is the case with the officers, 277, of Engineers.

The officers, 1,318, who have joined the Staff corps, have done so of their own free choice, with a full knowledge of the conditions of that service, as have the 403 officers who have joined the Line regiments.

The officers, 300, who have accepted the retirement, have done so in the belief that it was for their advantage.

On the part of the above classes of officers there can be no cause of complaint.

Besides these officers, there are about 360 on Staff duty, who are employed irrespective of their regimental rank.

To 679 young officers, who have been appointed since December 1858, notice was given that their appointments were made subject to any alterations that might be decided upon.

The number of officers in the above classes is about 4,000; and, deducting this number from that of the Indian officers (excluding those in receipt of Colonels' allowances), on the 1st of January 1861, there will remain about 1,500 officers.

To them promotion, up to the highest ranks, with the pay of those ranks, has been assured, in the same manner as if the separate Indian armies had continued to exist.

The whole present amount of the increased pay and of the pensions to Indian officers, by the recent measures, cannot be less than a quarter of a million per annum.

The provision contained in the 35th clause of Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106., and repeated in Act 23 & 24 Vict. c. 102, that a certain proportion of cadetships should be given to sons of persons who had served in India, has, since the discontinuance of direct appointments to India, been carried out in the following manner:—

Ten Queen's cadetships to the Royal Military College at Sandhurst are distributed half-yearly amongst the sons of civil and military officers who have served in India. The expense of maintaining at college the

Despatch to India, 10th August 1861, No 820.

See also page 15

young men so selected is defrayed out of Indian revenues; and a commission without purchase in the British army is given to such of them as may complete the college course.

A plan for the amalgamation of the British and Indian medical services, and for the provision in future of medical officers for the various civil and military medical duties in India, has been considered and approved in the India Office, and is now under the consideration of the Secretary-of-State for War and His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief.

By a recent order, regimental Colonels have been prohibited from continuing to reside in India, drawing the Indian scale of allowance.

The practice which had for some time existed, of permitting Colonels in receipt of off-reckonings (now Colonel's allowance), to reside in India, though unemployed, and to draw allowances on the Indian scale, was a source of expense considerable in itself and liable to indefinite increase. It was clearly within the competence of the East India Company to have abolished this indulgence; and, an urgent necessity having recently arisen for retrenching all needless expenditure, orders were sent out to prohibit this practice prospectively.

Another point was fully considered, namely, that officers who have contributed sums of money towards the bonus by which officers of superior rank to themselves have been induced to retire from the service, may be deprived of the prospect of receiving, in their turn, a similar bonus.

There can be no doubt that this may be the case, to a considerable extent.

It appears that some such practice prevailed at an early period in the Indian army; but, in the time of Lord Cornwallis, on financial grounds, in order "to prevent an unreasonable load of pensions," a declaration was required from officers, upon retirement, "that they had received no pecuniary consideration for quitting the service."

The practice, however, continued to exist, though it did not become very general till of late years.

In 1832, the question of retiring funds was considered by the Court of Directors; but, after much discussion, they, in December 1835, pronounced it "hopeless to

"expect that any fund could be so formed as to meet, "on the one hand, with the general concurrence of the "army, and, on the other, with the sanction of the "authorities at home." They resolved, therefore, to provide for the object contemplated in such schemes, by an enlargement of the retiring regulations. This was done, and what are called the new furlough rules were introduced, by which the greatest advantages were conferred on officers of the army.

In 1837, on an appeal being made to the Home Government on the subject of the declaration as to receiving no pecuniary consideration, they declared that they had never enforced the rule in the case of retirements in England, and they suspended its operation, unless a financial necessity should occur for insisting upon it.

In 1838, when the Bombay Government consented that the paymasters should receive contributions from officers towards retiring funds, the Home Government expressed its disapprobation at their having "consented to receive payment of subscriptions, even "provisionally, or to extend any support whatever to "the plans, which might encourage the service to "expect its sanction;" and a similar communication was made to the Government of Madras.

It is obvious, therefore, that the Home Government carefully guarded themselves against any public recognition of the practice. It was known, precisely as the practice in the British army of giving more than the regulation price is known. Both cases seem to stand exactly on the same footing; in both the practice is voluntary, is known, but not recognized by the Government, and has been decided by Courts of Law to be illegal.

The officers, in all cases, obtained the step with a view to which they contributed. They were not sure of receiving any sum in return; and, in the Cavalry and Infantry, if they did not retire while holding the regimental rank of Major, they never could receive anything from the regiment.

Under these circumstances, it was considered to be impossible that this practice could be included in the Parliamentary guarantee.

India Office,
March 23, 1863.

T. T. P.

APPENDIX B.

SIR, Pall Mall, March 26, 1863.
I AM directed by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the manner in which the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian forces with those of Her general army has been carried out, to request that you will see such of the officers of the late Indian army as you may deem expedient, and will request them to prepare a memorandum, showing under separate heads, the grievances alleged to have been sustained by them through departure from the guarantee given by Parliament, that they should be maintained in all the advantages they possessed while in the service of the late East India Company; and that you will ascertain by what witnesses they are desirous of supporting their statements, and further, that you will obtain their concurrence in a statement of any law, practice, or custom upon which they found their several claims.

I am to add that it is desirable that these statements should be furnished as early as can conveniently be arranged, in order that I may lay them before the Commissioners with the least possible delay.

I have, &c.

Captain Jervis, M.P., JOHN MILTON,
54, St. George's Road, Secretary.
Eccleston Square.

sustained by them through departure from the guarantee given by Parliament that they should be maintained in all the advantages they possessed while in the service of the late East India Company; that I should ascertain by what witnesses they were desirous of supporting their statement; and further, that I should obtain their concurrence in a statement of any law, practice, or custom, upon which they found their several claims, I have the honour to forward to you, for submission to the Commission appointed to inquire into the manner in which the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian forces with those of the general army has been carried out, the statement and memorandum asked for by you by direction of the Commissioners, together with a list of witnesses whom the officers of the late Indian army are anxious should be examined in support of their statement.

I trust that, in case any of the subjects submitted require further elucidation, I may be permitted, on the part of the Indian officers, to send such explanatory statement as may be forwarded to me.

I have, &c.

John Milton, Esq., J. W. JERVIS.
Secretary to the Commission.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

J. P. Willoughby, Esq.
General Tucker.
General Alexander.
General Hancock.
Colonel Sykes, M.P.
Phillip Melvill, Esq.

SIR, 54, St. George's Road, S.W.
April 13, 1863.
WITH reference to your letter of the 26th ultimo, requesting that I should see such of the officers of the late Indian army as I might deem expedient, and request them to prepare a memorandum showing, under separate heads, the grievances alleged to have been

APP. B.

Ordinance.

Lieut.-Col. Smyth, C.B., R.A., Woolwich.
 Captain A. Stewart, R.A., Shenfield, Brentwood, Essex.
 Captain N. Campbell, R.A., Woolwich.
 Lieut.-Col. C. F. North, R.E., 14, St. James' Square, London.
 Captain A. Aytoun, R.A., United Service Club, Edinburgh.
 Captain Sir C. Oakeley, Bart., B. Cavalry, 4, Queen's Parade, Cheltenham.

Cavalry.

Captain Maclean, M. Cavalry, care of Smith, Elder, and Co., 45, Pall Mall.
 B.-Major Dick, B. Cavalry, Dunse, Berwickshire, N.B.
 Captain Moller, Dépôt, 101st Fusiliers, Chatham.
 Captain Revell, Madras N.I., 14, St. James' Square.
 B.-Major Fraser, M.N.I., 42, Castle Street, Aberdeen.
 Captain Calmsac, B.N.I., 38, Nottingham Place, Regent's Park.
 Major B. M. Westropp, B.N.I., Poyle House, Guildford, Surrey.
 Colonel Balfour, 22, Upper Seymour Street, Portman Square.

STATEMENT of the LAW, PRACTICE, and CUSTOM upon which the OFFICERS of the late EAST INDIA COMPANY'S MILITARY FORCES found the Grievances complained of by them in their various Memorials and Petitions.

Act 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, enacts, "That the advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise, secured to the military forces of the East India Company by the Act of the 21st and 22nd years of the Queen, c. 106, sec. 38, 56, and 58, respectively, shall be maintained in any plan for the reorganization of the Indian army, anything in this Act contained notwithstanding."

Sections 38, 56, and 58, of 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, are as follow:—

XXXVIII. Any Writing under the Royal Sign Manual, removing or dismissing any Person holding any Office, Employment, or Commission, Civil or Military, in India, of which, if this Act had not been passed, a Copy would have been required to be transmitted or delivered within Eight Days after being signed by Her Majesty to the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Court of Directors, shall, in lieu thereof, be communicated within the Time aforesaid, to the Secretary of State in Council

LVI. The Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company shall be deemed to be the Indian Military and Naval Forces of Her Majesty, and shall be under the same Obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the same territorial Limits only, for the same Terms only, and be entitled to the like Pay, Pensions, Allowances, and Privileges, and the like Advantages as regards Promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company: Such Forces, and all Persons hereafter enlisting in or entering the same, shall continue and be subject to all Acts of Parliament, Laws of the Governor General of India in Council, and Articles of War, and all other Laws, Regulations, and Provisions relating to the East India Company's Military and Naval Forces respectively, as if Her Majesty's Indian Military and Naval Forces respectively had throughout such Acts, Laws, Articles, Regulations, and Provisions been mentioned or referred to, instead of such Forces of the said Company; and the Pay and Expenses of and incident to Her Majesty's Indian Military and Naval Forces, shall be defrayed out of the Revenues of India.

LVIII. All Persons who at the Time of the Commencement of this Act shall hold any Offices, Employments, or Commissions whatever under the said Company in India, shall thenceforth be deemed to hold such Offices, Employments, and Commissions under Her Majesty, as if they had been appointed under this Act, and shall be paid out of the Revenues of India; and the Transfer of any Person to the Service of Her Majesty shall be deemed to be a Continuance of his previous Service, and shall not prejudice any Claims to Pension, or any Claims on the various Annuity Funds of the several Presidencies in India, which he might have had if this Act had not been passed.

Prior to the year 1757, the military establishment of the East India Company consisted of only a few Companies of Artillery, and European Infantry, with a few hundred natives armed after the manner of the country, for the protection of the several factories.

In January, 1757, on the retaking of Calcutta and re-establishment of the Government, a battalion of Sepoys was ordered to be raised, and officered from the Madras detachment. In the course of that year some other battalions were formed and officered in like manner.

The establishment of a battalion of Native Infantry was then, — one Captain, one Lieutenant, and one Ensign; all other officers were natives.

These two or more battalions did duty together; they took post according to the date of their Captains' commissions, but as that created some confusion in the field,

or on parade, by the frequent changing of corps from one part of the line to the other, the Governor and Council, in April 1764, ordered the battalions to be numbered according to the then rank of their Captains.

In 1773, Lord Clive applied for and obtained field-officers; but up to that time officers, whatever their rank might be, were usually sent out to India in the rank they were to hold. A regular covenant (Appendix No. 1) was drawn up between the Company and each officer, the latter agreeing to serve in India in a certain rank for certain pay, and submitting to certain rules. The favouritism which the Company showed to some of these officers had attracted the notice of the House of Commons, and a Committee which sat in 1773, reported that the Directors had ordered that all promotions should go in all ranks throughout the whole service by seniority. "That the duty and service of an Artillery officer was in its nature so distinct and different from that of all the other branches of the military profession, that the officers could not be removed without evident prejudice to the corps itself; that therefore it ought to be put upon such a footing that the prospect of preferment (though confined to them alone) should give the Commanding Officer a chance, according to his pretensions, of keeping pace with those who rose in the other corps in the service." Vol. iv. p. 602.

In 1774, the Governor-General of Bengal was ordered by the Court of Directors, that if any of the Company's servants, civil or military, should at any time be suspended by him from the execution of his office, or any vacancy should happen by resignation or death, it was their order and direction that the person next in rank in office or rotation should be appointed to supply such vacancy. (Appendix No. 2.)

In the year 1780, each regiment of Sepoys consisted of two battalions, each of 1,000 men. A Major commanded the regiment; a Captain each battalion; a Lieutenant each company; and there were no Ensigns.

In 1781, Captain John Scott, Aide-de-Camp to the Governor-General, having been promoted by him to the rank of Major, over 10 Captains, the Governor-General was severely reprimanded by the Court of Directors, and it was ordered that as these 10 became promoted, they should take precedence of Major Scott; for it was also held, that if a man was once promoted, though wrongly promoted, he could not be ordered to serve in an inferior rank, without a breach of honour.—(Committee, House of Commons, 1782.)

In 1784, by 24 Geo. III. c. 25. sect. 42, it was enacted:—

"That from and after the commencement of this Act, all promotions and advancements of the officers and servants of the said United Company in India, as well civil as military, in their respective lines or professions, under the degrees of the respective Councillors and Commanders-in-Chief, shall be made according to seniority of appointment in a regular progressive succession, unless any of the said Governments and Presidencies shall, on any very urgent occasion, by a vote in Council, see cause to deviate from the said general rule hereby directed to be observed; and on every such occasion the said Government or Presidency shall cause a full and perfect entry to be made upon their minutes of consultation, specifying all the circumstances of the case, and their reasons and inducements at large for making such deviation, and shall transmit the same to the said Court of Directors, by the first opportunity that shall occur, for their order and direction therein; and that all nominations and appointments to be made repugnant or contrary to the directions of this Act, whether the same shall be made by the Court of Directors of the said United Company, or by any of the said Governments or Presidencies (save and except in cases of urgency as aforesaid) shall be null and void."

24 Geo. III. c. 25. was repealed by 33 Geo. III. c. 52. But by the latter Act no order or instructions whatever relating to the civil or military Government of India were to be issued by the Court of Directors, without having been previously submitted to, and approved of, by the Board of Control.

In 1786, the two battalions of each regiment were doubled up into a single battalion of 10 companies, thus giving one Major and two Captains to the battalion, besides subalterns.

Up to the year 1796, although the promotion in India in case of a death, or vacancy, had to be filled by the person next in rotation, nevertheless the position of an officer in the Company's service was, as regarded the Company, still simply that of a contract. A distinct covenant (Appendix No. 3) was still drawn up, differing but slightly from the one previously referred to. If an officer left India, he was supposed to resign the service, and his place was filled up. When no longer able to

fulfil his duty, his covenant was at an end, and his place supplied by another; he was entitled to neither furlough nor pension, and at any time the Company could directly appoint an officer over his head. This caused great dissatisfaction among the officers of the Indian army; and in 1794, a memorial was forwarded by the officers of the Bengal establishment, through Sir Robert Abercrombie, to the Court of Directors. It was received by the Court on the 1st March 1795, and the Government of the day having been induced to take an interest in the case of these officers, it was ordered by the House of Commons, 9th March 1795, that a copy of the memorial should be presented at the bar on the following day. The subject received the due consideration of the Government, and the results of their deliberations were thus summed up by Mr. Dundas,* as President of the Board of Control, in a speech which he made on the 16th June 1795.

"In concluding these observations on the prosperous state of the revenues of the British provinces in India, I am naturally led to the claims of the brave officers of the Company's army, whose services have so much contributed to the extension and security of those possessions. When the Company acted merely as a commercial body, their forces consisted only of a few guards stationed at their factories or seats of trade. With the accession of territory, a larger number of forces became requisite for its defence; and now, when the British power is second to none in Hindostan, its pre-eminence can only be maintained by a formidable military power, adequate both to repel any hostile attack on our own dominions, and to protect those of our allies. Accordingly, our military force in that quarter is not only greater than is maintained in time of peace by Great Britain, but is equal to the establishment kept up by some of the principal military Governments in Europe. The gradations of rank, and the proportion of officers in the Company's service, have not kept pace with the increase of numbers; nor have sufficient regulations been established for the encouragement and reward of long and faithful services. The highest rank in their army is that of Colonel, and the number of that rank is very limited; the elder officers, therefore, cannot look up to those elevated situations which, in other armies, are the reward of long service and tried abilities; and the younger see but a distant and discouraging prospect of arriving at the rank of Colonel, or even to that of field officer. So slow is the progress of promotion, that thirty years' endurance of a climate so hostile to European constitutions, is scarce sufficient to obtain a colonelcy; and neither during that long period, nor after an officer has obtained that highest rank, can he visit his native country without losing his pay and emoluments during his absence. For those who have no other support than the income derived from their profession, and whose ill state of health or impaired constitution may render a temporary return to Europe absolutely necessary, there is not any provision, except such relief as may be obtained from the liberality of the Court of Directors, or the aid of their friends: without which humiliating support, such officers have only the dreadful alternative of dying in India, or lingering in indigence at home. To afford relief to the officers in all these cases will be the principal object of the arrangement for the army in India, at present under consideration, of which I shall just mention the leading principles, viz., that a certain number of general, and a larger proportion of field officers, shall be allowed to each of the military establishments at the several Presidencies; that a comfortable and honourable retreat shall, after a certain number of years' service, be afforded to such officers as may wish to retire, and that officers whose state of health may require a temporary residence in Europe, shall have leave of absence under medical certificates, with the approbation of the Commanders-in-Chief and the Governments in India, without loss of rank or pay. Nor does it seem proper to confine the leave of absence merely to cases of ill-health; but, in order to keep up that love for their native land which is almost universally implanted in every breast, but which long and uninterrupted residence in a foreign climate tends to alienate, a certain proportion of officers, in time of peace, should be allowed to return home, in rotation, for a limited time, in like manner, without loss of pay or rank. An arrangement formed on these principles will, I trust, fully redress the several grievances of which the Company's officers have complained in their memorials which have been laid before this House, and I feel great satisfaction in the reflection that the improved state of the British revenues in India, the reduction effected in the amount of the debts owing there, and in the interest payable on those debts, will enable the Company to carry the regulations proper for these purposes into effect, without any inconvenience to their finances, which will be abundantly compensated by the satisfaction and zeal which the officers of every rank will feel, in the more certain prospect that their exertions in the service of their country will be readily acknowledged and liberally rewarded."

In consequence of this interference of the Government, the Court of Directors issued the following Code of Regulations, sanctioned by the Board of Control in accordance with 33 Geo. III. c. 52., whereby every officer in their service became entitled to a regular furlough,

and an ample retirement, in addition to the promotion by seniority.

DESPATCH of the COURT of DIRECTORS reconstituting the Indian Army.

Our Governor-General in Council at Fort William, in Bengal, dated 15th January 1796.

Para. 1. We have taken into our most serious consideration the state of the Company's military establishments at our several Settlements, together with the memorials which have been addressed to us from the respective corps of officers, and having maturely considered the same, we have resolved that the establishment of the Company's troops for each of the Presidencies in India shall be as follows—

EUROPEAN ARTILLERY.

That each battalion of five companies consist of—

1 Colonel.	20 Sergeants -	} For Bengal.
1 Lieut. Colonel.	20 Corporals -	
1 Major.	40 Gunners -	
5 Captains.	10 Drums and Fifes -	
5 Captain Lieutenants.	280 Matrossis -	
10 Lieutenants.	10 Puckallies -	} For Madras and Bombay.
5 Lieut.-Fireworkers.		
25 Sergeants -	-	
25 Corporals -	-	
50 Gunners -	-	
10 Drums and Fifes -	-	} Non-effective.
310 Matrossis -	-	
STAFF.		
1 Adjutant -	-	} Non-effective.
1 Quartermaster -	-	
1 Paymaster -	-	
1 Surgeon.		} Non-effective.
1 Mate.		
1 Serjeant-Major -	-	
1 Quartermaster-Serjeant -	-	
1 Drill-Serjeant -	-	
1 Drill-Corporal -	-	
1 Drum-Major -	-	
1 Fife-Major -	-	

Each company of Mascars for the service of the Artillery consist of—

- 1 Serang.
- 2 First Tindals.
- 2 Second Tindals.
- 56 Mascars.
- 1 Puckaly.

EUROPEAN INFANTRY.

The battalions on the present establishment to be formed into regiments of 10 companies, each to consist of—

1 Colonel.	} Junior Lieut.-Col. and junior Major to be without companies.	
2 Lieut.-Colonels -		
2 Majors -		
7 Captains.		
1 Captain Lieutenant.		
21 Lieutenants.		
8 Ensigns.		
40 Sergeants.		
50 Corporals.		
22 Drums and Fifes.		
950 Privates.		
20 Puckallies.		
STAFF.		
1 Adjutant -	-	} Non-effective.
1 Quartermaster -	-	
1 Paymaster -	-	
1 Surgeon.		} Non-effective.
1 Mate.		
1 Serjeant-Major -	-	
1 Quartermaster-Serjeant -	-	
1 Drill-Serjeant -	-	
1 Drill-Corporal -	-	
1 Drum-Major -	-	
1 Fife-Major -	-	

NATIVE CAVALRY.

Each regiment of six troops to consist of—

- 2 Captains.
- 2 Captain Lieutenants.
- 6 Lieutenants.
- 3 Cornets.
- 2 Sergeants.
- 6 Subidars.
- 6 Jemidars.
- 18 Havildars.
- 18 Naick's.
- 6 Trumpeters
- 420 Troopers.
- 6 Puckallies.

STAFF.		
1 Adjutant -	-	} Non-effective.
1 Quartermaster -	-	
1 Paymaster -	-	

* Parliamentary History, vol. xxxii. p. 88.

APP. B.

1 Surgeon's Mate.		
1 Serjeant-Major	-	-
1 Quartermaster-Serjeant	-	-
1 Drill-Havildar	-	-
1 Drill-Naick	-	-
1 Trumpeter-Major	-	-
6 Pay-Havildars	-	-
6 Farriers.		
1 Native Doctor.		

Each regiment to be commanded by a field officer.

NATIVE INFANTRY.

The battalions of Native Infantry to be formed into regiments of two battalions each, with 10 companies in each battalion; the regiment to consist of—

1 Colonel.	
2 Lieut.-Colonels	{ Junior Lieut.-Colonel and Junior
2 Majors	- { Major to be without companies.
7 Captains.	
1 Captain Lieutenant.	
22 Lieutenants.	
10 Ensigns.	
2 Serjeants.	
20 Subidars.	
20 Jemidars.	
100 Havildars.	
100 Naicks.	
40 Drums and Fifes.	
1,600 Privates for Bengal.	
1,800 Privates for Madras and Bombay.	
20 Puckallies.	

STAFF.

2 Adjutants	-	-	} Non-effective.
1 Paymaster	-	-	
1 Surgeon.			
2 Mates.			
1 Serjeant-Major	-	-	} Non-effective.
1 Quartermaster-Serjeant	-	-	
2 Native Doctors.			
1 Drum-Major	-	-	} Non-effective.
1 Fife-Major	-	-	
2 Drill-Havildars	-	-	
2 Drill-Naicks	-	-	

2. *The Peace Establishment.*—Your Presidency to be as follows :—

European Artillery ;—Three battalions. The Senior Colonel to be Commandant of the corps, with 30 companies of *Lascars* attached, as at present.

A Brigade Major to be allowed to this corps, as at present.

European Infantry :—Three regiments.

Native Cavalry :—Four regiments, to be commanded by two Lieutenant-Colonels to the two first, and two Majors to the third and fourth regiments. A Brigade Major to be allowed to the Cavalry.

The whole when raised to be commanded by a Colonel Commandant ; but for the present only two regiments to be raised, as directed hereafter.

Native Infantry :—Twelve regiments.

A corps of Engineers to consist of—

1 Colonel, Chief Engineer.
1 Lieutenant-Colonel.
1 Major.
4 Captains.
4 Captain Lieutenants.
8 Lieutenants.
8 Ensigns.
1 Adjutant, non-effective.

3. As it will require much time to form so large a body of Cavalry at your Presidency as four regiments, and as we are resolved to have real and efficient horse, composed of men well trained and the most experienced Cavalry officers, we direct at present you augment your two regiments to six troops each, according to the foregoing establishment.

4. The body guard is to be reduced, and its duties to be done by a detachment from the regiments of Native Cavalry.

5. The necessary establishment of *Lascars*, artificers, doolies, horsekeepers, &c., &c., to the several corps to be allowed.

INVALIDS.

6. The invalids at your Presidency, both European and native, are to continue their present establishment.

7. The non-commissioned officers when wounded to have the same rank in the *Invalids* which they had in their respective corps.

8. Having thus detailed the new peace establishment for your Presidency, we have great satisfaction in acquainting you that, in order to prevent the existence of jealousies between the King's and Company's troops, the Right Honourable Henry Dundas, one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, has engaged to recommend to His Majesty to give every officer of the Company a King's commission of the same date with that which he receives from the Company, with a retrospect founded on the date of the King's commissions they now hold, so as to prevent supercession

by the various recent promotions by general brevet which have taken place in His Majesty's army.

9. To promote the objects of the preceding arrangement, we have resolved to establish the following regulations :—

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS.

Artillery and Engineers.

10. We have agreed that an allowance shall be made by the Company to the Royal Academy at Woolwich, for the education of such a number of cadets as the Company may have occasion to appoint to their different Presidencies ; such cadets to produce a certificate from the Academy before they can be entitled to appointments for the Artillery and Engineer corps.

11. The promotion of officers in the Artillery corps is to proceed by seniority in the whole corps, according to the practice in the King's service.

Native Cavalry.

12. In forming the two regiments of Native Cavalry directed as above, you will of course select such officers for the command of those regiments as have most distinguished themselves in the Cavalry service, attending at the same time as much to seniority as is compatible with the object in view ; but it is not our intention that the Cavalry establishment of field officers shall be completed, nor a Commandant of the corps be appointed, until such time as the whole four regiments are raised.

13. The officers who are now to be selected in consequence of this arrangement for the command of the two regiments must be taken from the rank of Lieutenant-Colonels or Majors, until the Cavalry establishment shall be completed. Those officers are to rise on the general list of the army, according to their original standing in the Infantry ; but after the establishment is completed, the officers in the Cavalry must rise in their own corps only, in the following manner, viz. :—

That promotions of officers in the Native Cavalry at your Presidency do proceed by seniority in their respective regiments until they arrive at the rank of Captains, and afterwards to rise in the whole corps to the rank of Majors and to the command of regiments. The promotion to Majors and command of regiments to be subject to the same principle as in the Infantry in regard to being unfit. [But if officers be superseded, in consequence of being unfit to command, they are to be allowed to retire with the pay of Lieutenant-Colonel of Infantry.]

European Infantry.

14. That the officers be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and afterwards to Colonels and commands of regiments, with the following proviso :—

15. That should the senior Lieutenant-Colonel, or any number of the senior Lieutenant-Colonels, appear to the Government at your Presidency, either upon the representation of the Commander-in-Chief or by any other means, to be unfit for the command of regiments, they are to be passed over, and junior officers promoted. But the reasons for such supercession are to be entered on the records, for the information of the Court of Directors.

16. The same principle to be applied to the promotion of officers of Artillery to the command of battalions and of the corps, to the Chief Engineers, to the Colonel Commandants and officers to command regiments of Cavalry, and to the rank of Major-Generals from that of Colonels.

17. Should any Captains or subalterns obtain leave hereafter to exchange from one regiment to another, they are to come into the regiments to which they are removed as the youngest of their respective ranks, according to the practice of the King's service.

Native Infantry.

18. That promotion do proceed in this corps, as in the European Infantry.

19. That each regiment, in the absence of the Colonel, be under the general command of the senior Lieutenant-Colonel, who is to have the particular command of the first battalion, and the junior Lieutenant-Colonel that of the second battalion.

Paymasters.

20. That to each regiment or battalion one of the officers under the rank of field officer be appointed Paymaster, with proper allowances for the same ; such appointment to be made by the Colonel, or by the majority of votes of the field officers and Captains, according to the practice in the King's service. If the selection is made by the Colonel, he is to be responsible for the conduct of the Paymaster, otherwise the responsibility to rest with the field officers and Captains.

General Officers on the Staff.

21. The limited number of Major-Generals hereafter specified at your Presidency are to be selected by your Government at the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief.

22. The actual appointment of the Major-Generals, as also of the Generals on the Staff, to be in the Governor-General in Council, all of which subject, of course, to the approval of the Court of Directors.

23. If there are not a sufficient number of King's Generals at your Presidency from which to select the proportion hereafter specified for the Staff, in such case the same is to be supplied, *pro tempore*, from the Company's Generals.

24. Ten Major-Generals to be promoted at your Presidency from the senior officers in our army, that is to say, from the Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels of the Artillery, Cavalry, Infantry, and Engineers, according to the dates of their commissions.

25. From these Major-Generals the selections of Generals on the Staff are to be made.

26. If the retrospect to the King's brevet occasions a greater proportion of Major-Generals than the above, in such case the selection for the Staff is to be made from the whole.

27. That six general officers be employed on the Staff at your Presidency, four on the Company's establishment, and two on the King's.

28. These, exclusive of the Commander-in-Chief, will be sufficient in time of peace; the number necessary in war must depend upon circumstances, and be subject to our future orders and directions.

29. That a Brigade-Major and Aide-de-Camp be allowed to each general officer on the Staff.

30. The Generals on the Staff, as also the Major-Generals and Colonels of regiments, to be made from officers on the spot; but this regulation not to take place until the last ships of the season, 1795-6, arrive.

31. We enclose you a list of officers now at home on leave of absence from your Presidency, who are eligible to return to their duty according to the established regulation: in order that they may be appointed to the different corps, if they should arrive at your Presidency previous to the new arrangements taking place, or within their time of leave of absence.

32. You will likewise attend to the situation of such officers as have had permission to come home since the date of your advices of the 14th May last, that they may not lose their proper rank in the new arrangement, and the same with respect to those officers who have had our leave to return to their duty in the course of the last season.

33. Officers eligible by seniority to regiments or similar situations, who are now at home, or who may come home in the present season, and who of course become acquainted with these regulations, but who do not proceed to their duty in 1795-6, can only be appointed to the first vacancies which happen after their arrival in India: but in the meantime they are to serve with such corps as the Commander-in-Chief may think proper, and to receive the pay and allowances of their rank, until vacancies shall fall.

34. Those who come home in any future season on furlough, or with leave, shall be eligible for regiments, in the same manner as if they were in India.

35. All Staff officers whatever are to be on the strength of the regiments or battalions, and promoted accordingly; but in placing those officers, care must be taken to station them according to their proper rank in the service, and not by any brevet or temporary rank they may hold, in consequence of civil employments or Staff appointments.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

36. The pay and allowances to the several officers included in this arrangement are to be fixed agreeable to the table transmitted herewith, subject to the following regulations:—

37. As the promotion in the whole of the Company's army will fully compensate for the diminution of certain allowances, which have occasioned jealousies and discontents between the establishments at the different Presidencies, we have resolved that double full batta to officers be abolished; that the half batta, as now allowed at Bengal, and at the same rates, be made general to all the King's and Company's officers under the other Presidencies, except to Colonels, who are always to be allowed full batta; and that full batta be the highest allowance of that kind to be granted in any situation whatever, except in the case of officers doing duty in the Vizier's dominions, who shall have such an additional allowance as the Bengal Government may deem adequate to defray the extra charges incurred by officers in that particular station.

38. The allowance which has hitherto been made to field officers under the head of Revenue Money Commission, on the revenues or dewannee, is to be discontinued both to the King's and Company's officers.

39. The allowances to Colonels on your establishment, from the bazaar duties are also to be abolished, together with every other extra allowance not specified in the table.

40. As we mean that all the subalterns in our armies at the different Presidencies shall be on the same footing with respect to allowances, we direct that the additional pay of one rupee per day to subalterns at your Presidency be discontinued to all subalterns promoted from cadets, appointed subsequently to the date of this despatch.

41. As in order to make the promotion to the higher rank more extensive, we have established two Lieutenant-Colonels and two Majors to each regiment of European and Native Infantry, it must be understood that the junior Lieutenant-Colonels and junior Majors are to receive the pay of these ranks, but their other allowances are to be those of the next inferior rank.

42. And as the number of officers now attached to the several establishments will not confer any additional rank on many subalterns of long standing, the brevet rank of Captain is to be granted at present to every Lieutenant who has been 15 years in the Company's service, but he is only to receive the pay and emoluments of Lieutenant until he comes upon the regular estab-

lishment, as already detailed. This advanced rank is not to be given in future without our particular orders.

43. The general officers upon the Staff at your Presidency are to receive an aggregate allowance of 4,000 Sonat rupees per month, in addition to their regimental emoluments of pay as Colonel, and their share of the profits arising from clothing, in lieu of all claims whatever in peace and war, except for campaign equipage, carriage, &c., and travelling expenses, for which they are to draw 400 Sonat rupees per month in time of peace, and 1,000 Sonat rupees per month when employed in active service in the field, during war.

44. The allowances to the Brigade Majors and Aides-de-Camp to the general officers on the Staff, are to be the same as those usually made to officers of these descriptions in India, in peace, or in the field during war.

45. The Colonel-Commandant of Artillery, if not appointed a general officer on the Staff, is to have 1,000 Sonat rupees per month, in addition to his allowance as Colonel.

46. The allowances to the Brigade Majors to the Artillery are to be the same as at present.

47. The Colonel-Commandant of Cavalry at your Presidency when this appointment shall be made, is to be allowed, when not a General on the Staff, 600 Sonat rupees per month, in addition to his allowances as Colonel.

48. If the senior officer of Cavalry is not a Colonel, he is to receive 4,000 Sonat rupees per annum, in addition to his pay and allowances.

49. The Chief Engineer at your Presidency is to receive such an addition to his pay and full batta, as will make his allowances equal to those of the Commandant of Artillery.

50. In consideration of the allowances granted to the Chief Engineer, he is to be restricted from having any concern whatever in public buildings or works, or in the materials used therein.

51. The military Auditor-General is to have 40,000 Sicca rupees per annum, besides the pay of his regimental rank, when the office is held by a military officer.

52. All other general Staff officers to have the same allowances as at present.

53. If by the death of the Commander-in-Chief in India, or by his resignation of that office before a successor shall arrive, it shall be found necessary to appoint a provisional Commander-in-Chief at your Presidency, the officers so appointed shall receive 2,000 Sonat rupees per month, in addition to the allowances of his rank, until a new Commander-in-Chief in India arrives.

54. Although the great and permanent advantages which our officers must generally derive from this arrangement are obvious, we yet are aware that there may be some few whose immediate allowances may suffer temporary reduction by it; such temporary reduction can be but of little consequence when compared to the far greater benefits in point of prospect; yet where the allowances at present drawn by any of our officers are materially reduced, and that you conceive they should have relief, we authorize you to give them such relief as you see proper, until they are promoted.

OFF-RECKONINGS.

55. The profits from the off-reckonings of the several corps of Artillery, Infantry, and Cavalry, are to be thrown into one aggregate fund, and the amount to be divided equally between the Colonels of Artillery, Infantry, and Cavalry.

56. The clothing for all the corps is to be supplied by contract, according to the present practice.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

57. That a medical board, consisting of two members, under the denomination of first and second member, be appointed to superintend, under the Commander-in-Chief, or officer commanding the troops at each Presidency, the management of the medical department, and the conduct of all persons employed in it.

58. That the same number of Surgeons that are at present employed in the charge of general hospitals, or at military stations at the different Presidencies, be continued.

59. That the medical gentlemen at the different Presidencies be called upon to declare whether they choose to remain in the situation of Surgeons of the Company's civil department, or to attach themselves to the military line of the service, under a notification that vacancies in the general hospitals will in future be filled by medical gentlemen of the military line only.

60. That the medical gentlemen attached to the Company's troops have the same rank, with respect to the army, which they at present possess.

FURLOUGH.

61. That the following proportion of the Company's officers at each Presidency be allowed to be absent, viz., one-third of the Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors, one-fourth of the Captains and Surgeons to the troops, and one-sixth of the subalterns and Assistant-Surgeons to the army.

62. That the period of furlough be for three years, reckoning from its date to the day of the return of the officer to his respective Presidency.

63. You will observe that though it is to be established as a general rule that in time of peace leave of absence may be granted to the above proportion of officers, yet as those officers are to be absent for three years it will be requisite for the Governments in India, at the commencement of the present arrangement, not to grant leave of absence to the full proportion

APP. B.

APP. B.

immediately, but in such a proportion that nearly an equal number may continue on furlough every year, and consequently the proportion on furlough to be annually granted will be one-third of the proportion allowed to be absent together, regard being had to the number of officers who are compelled to come home on account of sickness.

64. That subalterns be ten years in India before they can be entitled (except in case of certified sickness) to their rotation to be absent on furlough, the same rule to be applicable to Assistant military Surgeons; the furlough to be granted by the Commander-in-Chief at each Presidency, with the approbation of the respective Governments.

65. The regulations relative to furlough and retiring from the service are not to extend to the case of officers who have arrived at the command of regiments; but their leave of absence must rest, as it now does, on the directions of the Commander-in-Chief and our respective Governments, subject to the control of the Court of Directors; and if a general officer, or a Colonel of a regiment, shall return to Great Britain with permission, such general officer's Staff allowances shall cease; but such general officer and Colonel shall have the full pay of Colonel and the profits on the off- reckonings of his regiment during his or their absence; and in respect to the Chief Engineer, when he is permitted to come home, he is to have such an addition to his pay as will be equal to the off- reckonings of the Colonel of a regiment.

66. We have to advise you that we have further resolved, that all officers now at home returning to the Company's service in India, within the leave of absence prescribed by the present established regulation, shall be entitled to the benefit of this arrangement, with respect to receiving their pay on furlough from the 1st January 1795, according to their rank.

67. That no person be entitled to any other benefits under this arrangement, until after his arrival at the Presidency to which he belongs, with the leave of the Court.

RETIRING FROM THE SERVICE.

68. That every officer, after 25 years' service in India, three years for one furlough being included, be allowed to retire with the pay of the rank to which he may have attained; but it must be understood that such pay is to be the same only as that allowed to officers of Infantry.

69. That every officer returning on furlough, and wishing to retire from the service, being qualified as above by the term of his service, be required to make a declaration to that effect, within twelve months after his arrival in England; and in case of his neglecting to make such declaration within the time specified, he must, at the expiration of his furlough, either return to India or be held to have relinquished the service, and not to be entitled to retire on the pay of his rank.

70. That a member of a Medical Board, who shall have been on that station not less than five years, and not less than 20 years in India, including three years for one furlough, be permitted to retire from the service, and allowed 500*l.* per annum.

71. That a Surgeon of a general hospital, who shall have been in that station not less than five years, and whose period of service shall not have been less than 20 years, including three years for one furlough, as above, be permitted to retire from the service, and allowed 300*l.* per annum, for life.

72. That all other Surgeons and Assistant Surgeons attached to the military be permitted to retire from the service on the pay of their rank, after having served in India not less than 20 years, including three years for one furlough.

RATE OF PASSAGES TO OR FROM EUROPE.

73. The demands made in some instances by commanders of the Company's ships, for the passage of officers from India to Europe, and from Europe to India, having been extremely exorbitant, further regulations for securing passages on the Company's ships upon reasonable terms to officers of every description, according to their respective ranks, will, if found necessary, be made; and we have agreed that the subalterns be allowed passage-money, when obliged to come home from sickness with the usual certificates.

RECRUITS.

74. It is our intention to make an humble request to His Majesty, that he will be graciously pleased to issue orders permitting us to recruit the Company's European army, in the same manner and with the same privileges as is done for the British army.

75. A dépôt will be established for the Company's recruits, in which they may be placed under officers who are on furlough, or who are convalescents on leave of absence, not officers who retire from the service with the pay of their rank; excepting only the commanding officer, whose presence being always necessary in this country, may be made by the particular selection of the Court of Directors, under such restrictions as they may deem proper, to this dépôt. We understand recruits for the King's regiments serving in India are likewise to be sent under proper officers.

76. Having thus detailed to you the new arrangements we have thought fit to adopt for our army in India, with such regulations as appear to us to be proper to promote the objects thereof, we have only to desire that you carry the same into effect so far as they relate to your Presidency; and we entertain the most sanguine expectation that all future cause of discontent will be effectually done away, and that our military officers of every description will feel duly impressed with a sense of the protection

which has been extended to them, and the very great regard we have shown to their interest, in thus providing for their immediate rise in our army, by a temporary relaxation from the toils and fatigues naturally attendant upon the profession of arms; and finally, by the provision made for them for their lives, at the period of their retiring to their native country.

77. We are aware that, in a subject of so extensive and complicated a nature, notwithstanding all the pains we have bestowed on it, some errors may have crept into the preceding arrangements, and, if any such shall be stated to you, you will transmit them to us, with your observations upon them; at the same time, as the subject has undergone so much consideration, and the expenses of our military establishments will thereby be greatly increased, we trust you will not be harassed with unfounded applications. Our military servants of every rank will consider with candour the great and important variation which is now made in the service of our army in India; and if any one or more individuals should feel that, in any respect, their own personal situations are not exactly what they might wish, they ought to balance the whole together, and recollect how much, not only each individual in other respects, but the whole service in general, has gained in point of credit, emoluments, and respectability, by the arrangements we have now made.

We are, &c.

(Signed)	STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.	ABRAM ROBERTS.
	D. SCOTT.	CHARLES GRANT.
	JOHN ROBERTS.	GEORGE SMITH.
	LIONEL DARELL.	THOMAS PARRY.
	G. TATEM.	JAMES IRWEN.
	PAUL LE MESURIER.	JOSEPH COTTON.
	HUGH INGLIS.	THOMAS FITZHUGH.
	CHARLES MILLS.	R. THORNTON.

London, 15th January 1796.

In 1799 it was ordered (G. G. O., 5th January of that year), that in the Infantry the officers should be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments, to the rank of Major; and afterwards to the higher ranks, by seniority in the whole of that branch of the service.

In 1817, by G. G. O., 4th November, this regulation was extended to the Cavalry.

In 1824 (G. G. O., 7th June) it was ordered that the entire corps of officers in the Cavalry should be wholly removed from the Infantry, and that their promotion should be made in the Cavalry alone.

By G. G. O., 22nd May, 1816, Lieutenants of 15 years' service were to receive brevet rank of Captain.

In 1832 the Committee of the House of Commons, which was appointed to inquire into the affairs of the East India Company, thus summed up the system then in force, as regarded the promotion of the officers of the Indian army.*

Rank and Promotion.

351. The promotion of officers of the Company's service is regimental to the rank of Major, and afterwards in the Line, whether of Cavalry or Infantry, according to the particular branch of service or Presidency to which an officer may belong. In the Artillery and Engineers the promotion is regimental to the rank of Colonel, as in His Majesty's service.

352. The rank of general officer is attained in the Company's service by the operation of His Majesty's brevet.

353. In the Appendix is an explanation of the nature and operation of the seniority regimental system of the Company's service, the manner in which officers are obtained for new regiments upon an augmentation, and of the difficulties which present themselves in the way of a reduction of the army by whole regiments, and the way in which it is therein thought they might be overcome.

The following Report by Mr. Cabell, then head of the Secret and Political Department of the Court of Directors, is referred to by the Committee, as Appendix B., No. 23 of their Report.

(23.)—REMARKS by Mr. CABELL, dated India Board, 6th August 1832.

SIR,

1. CONFORMABLY to the direction contained in your letter of the 20th February last, I have the honour to submit such observations as have occurred to me in reference to the queries which have been addressed, by order of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, to officers of His Majesty's and the Company's service, in relation to the army of India.

2. It may be proper for me to premise, that during a period of upwards of 32 years, in which I have belonged to the establishment of this office, I served for the first 18 years as Junior and Assistant in the Secret and Political Department, under Mr. Jones; the next 10 years as head of the Military Department; and the last four as head of the Secret and Political Department, in which my service had commenced.

* Appendix to the Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Affairs of the East India Company, 10th August 1832, vol. v., Military.

3. I had consequently few, if any, opportunities of becoming acquainted with the peculiarities of the military system of India, before it became my duty, in the year 1818, to take charge of the correspondence in that department, and to draw the attention of the Board to such part of the proposed replies to the despatches of the local Government, as appeared to be deserving of notice or to call for particular consideration.

4. In the discharge of this duty, from my having to acquire a knowledge of the Indian system from such allusions to it as were found in the current correspondence, and from such materials in print and in MS. as were available to me, I am fully aware of the difficulties which are in the way of an individual who may attempt, for the first time, to enter into the peculiarities which prevail in the strictly seniority promotion of the Company's service, modified, as it was, by the army arrangement of 1796, which introduced the system of regimental rise into the Cavalry and Infantry, up to the rank of Major; promotion then continuing by seniority in the line of Cavalry or Infantry (of the particular Presidency to which the officers belong) to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and Colonel.

5. I had occasion, at an early period, to investigate several claims of rank, arising out of augmentations which had been made to the army; and in order to judge of the merits of these claims, it became necessary to investigate the principles which in India has governed the selection of officers for a new regiment, founded as it is, on the most marked respect and attention which, in India, are paid to the claims of officers to the benefit of promotion, or of higher regimental standing in a newly-raised corps, according to their relative seniority.

6. The investigation of these cases necessarily led to a development of the principle and operation of the seniority regimental system, and also to the practical inconveniences which have been found to result from its introduction, as well as to a consideration of the remedies that might be applied in view to their removal. These were explained in papers prepared for the Board in 1821, from which the following statement of the peculiarities of the system of the Company's service has been principally taken, with such variations, however, as were found necessary to adapt it to the new organization of 1824.

7. The object proposed in entering into these particulars, is to afford facilities to those who may, for the first time, have to enter upon the consideration of these important subjects, without having previously familiarized themselves with the peculiarities of the Indian system. To such the following attempt, it is hoped, may not be unacceptable.

8. To form a clear idea of the system of regimental rise, and to elucidate the questions of rank to which it has given rise, it will be of assistance to confine the attention to an establishment only of four regiments, which shall be of Infantry, and according to the organization adopted in the year 1824.

9. Let these be called regiments A. B. C. and D. in the following scheme of an establishment, as carried into effect in May 1824, under the Court's orders of the 25th November 1823. The small letters of the alphabet are supposed to indicate the order in which the field officers have respectively attained to the rank of Major, and consequently that of their regimental seniority. The Captains and subalterns are only noticed in the scheme by figures, corresponding with the number of officers of each rank allowed by the Court's orders of 25th November 1823, modified as they afterwards were by orders issued in December 1823, reducing two Lieutenants, and one Cornet, Ensign or second Lieutenant, per regiment.

Scheme of an establishment of four regiments of Infantry, according to the Court's orders of 25th November 1823, and as they were subsequently modified.

REGIMENTS.				
	A.	B.	C.	D.
Colonels	a	b	c	d
Lieutenant-Colonels	e	f	g	h
Majors	i	k	m	n
Captains	5	5	5	5
Lieutenants	8	8	8	8
Ensigns	4	4	4	4
Total Officers per regiment	20	20	20	20

Promotion of the field officers by seniority in the line of the whole corps of infantry
 Promotion to the rank of major by seniority in the regiment.

the exact order in which the officers have become, or have claims to become, Colonels of regiments.

12. The letters in the scheme being supposed to indicate the order in which the field officers have respectively attained to the rank of Major, the mode in which their subsequent promotion proceeds, and in which the Captain and subalterns are affected by it, admits of easy explanation.

13. Suppose a casualty in the rank of Colonel by the death of Colonel (a). this does not give promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel (A), who belongs to the same regiment (A.), but to Lieutenant-Colonel (e), the senior regimental Lieutenant-Colonel. The vacancy thereby occasioned in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel is not given to Major (k), who belongs to the same regiment as Lieutenant-Colonel (e), but to Major (i), the senior regimental Major.

14. Promotion now becomes regimental, and therefore the first Captain of regiment (D) to which Major (i) belongs, is promoted to the vacant majority, while the senior Lieutenant and Ensign of regiment (D) are promoted to the rank of Captain and Lieutenant respectively.

15. Suppose next the Colonel (b) occasions a vacancy in the rank of Colonel, it will be evident, from what has been stated, that Lieutenant-Colonel (f) will be the new Colonel, and Major (k) the new Lieutenant-Colonel, and that therefore the regimental promotion will fall this time to regiment (B), to which Major (k) belongs.

16. If Colonel (c) be supposed to occasion the next vacancy, Lieutenant-Colonel (g) will be the new Colonel, and Major (l) the new Lieutenant-Colonel, and regimental promotion will this time fall to regiment (A.) to which Major (l) belongs.

17. The next vacancy in the rank of Colonel will promote Lieutenant-Colonel (h) to the rank of Colonel, and Major (m) to that of Lieutenant-Colonel, and give regimental promotion to regiment (C.)

18. It will be observed that the four vacancies in the rank of Colonel (and it is of no consequence to the Lieutenant-Colonels, Majors, Captains, and subalterns in what order they might have been promoted) have promoted the four senior Lieutenant-Colonels and the four senior Majors, and given regimental promotion successively to the regiments (D), (B), (A), and (C)

19. If the four vacancies had occurred by the death, resignation, or retirement of as many Lieutenant-Colonels instead, of Colonels, precisely the same consequences would have ensued in respect to the promotion of the Majors, and the regimental promotion of the Captains and subalterns, because the senior Major for the time being, in every instance, is promoted to the vacancy in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, from whatever cause it may have arisen, whether from the promotion of a Lieutenant-Colonel, or from a casualty in that rank.

20. The next remark to be made is, that regimental promotion has fallen to the regiments (D), (B.), (A.), and (C.), in the order precisely of the seniority of their respective Majors; and this is the operation which, in the documents received from India, is termed the "line step."

21. The "line step" has, therefore, in this instance, visited the four regiments in the order of the seniority of their respective Majors; and it is easy to perceive that the line step will continue to circulate, in the same order, as long as promotion to the rank of Major is not disturbed by a casualty in that rank.

22. For instance: suppose the relative seniority of the Majors to be as indicated in the scheme before referred to, and that a casualty occurs in regiment (C.) by the death, removal, resignation, or retirement of Major (m). It will be observed that Major (m) is junior to the Majors (i), (k), and (l), and that the line step would, under ordinary circumstances, by vacancies in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel or Colonel, have promoted Majors (i), (k), and (l) before Major (m). The first Captain, therefore, of regiment (C.), in this case, obtains promotion before the first Captains of regiments (D.), (B), and (A), who would otherwise have become Majors before him, by the operation of the line step; but as he, by his promotion to a majority, represented by the seniority (n), is the junior of Majors (k), (l), and (m), regiment (D), from being the first for promotion by the operation of the line step, becomes the last, and the line step will then continue to circulate in this order among the regiments, until by the occurrence of another casualty among the Majors the order of its circulation be again changed.

23. The next point to be considered is the case of an augmentation by whole regiments, and let it be required to provide officers for a fifth regiment, according to the Indian usage, to be denominated (E.)

24. If the relative seniority of the field officers be as indicated in the scheme before referred to, Lieutenant-Colonel (e) will be the Colonel of the new regiment, Major (i) will supply the vacancy in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel occasioned by the removal and promotion of Lieutenant-Colonel (e), and Major (k) will be the Lieutenant-Colonel of the new regiment. This operation will give majorities to the first Captains of the regiments (D.) and (B.), and the Captain who remains the senior by army rank, after these promotions, will be the Major of the new regiment.

25. The relative rank of the new Majors, namely, the two promoted by the operation of the line step and the one transferred into the new regiment, depends upon their seniority as Captains. If the latter is junior to the former, the Major of the new regiment will be junior to all the Majors of the old, who will therefore be promoted before him, and consequently the line step in this case will pass through all the old regiments before it can visit the

3. new, when the Major of the new regiment comes in turn for promotion.

26. If the Major of the new regiment be senior, as Captain, to one or both of the Captains promoted by the line step, the line step in this case will reach the new regiment before the Major or Majors of the old regiments, junior to him as Captain, are promoted, and occasion the slight difference in the circulation of the line step implied in the statement of the fact.

27. When the Major of the new regiment is junior, as Captain, to the officers promoted to majorities, on the augmentation, by the operation of the line step, the first Captains of all the old regiments will, in this case, be in a more favourable situation for line promotion than any officer transferred into the new regiment as first Captain. The senior second Captain would therefore, be selected as first Captain of the new regiment, being the officer whose interest it would be to make the change, and having a preferable claim to removal, as compared with his juniors of the same class.

28. For the same reason the senior third Captain would be transferred into the new regiment as second Captain, the senior fourth Captain as third Captain, and the senior fifth Captain as fourth Captain. The senior first Lieutenant would be the fifth Captain of the new regiment, and the transfer of the remaining Lieutenants would be regulated on the same principle as the Captains; while the senior Ensign would be promoted to the vacant or eighth lieutenantancy in the new regiment, and the other Ensigns obtained and transferred on a similar principle.

29. In this explanation, it is understood that vacancies in the old regiments occasioned by the augmentation are supposed to be filled up, in reckoning the class to which an officer belongs. Thus a second Captain who becomes first Captain in his own regiment, by the promotion of the first to a majority, would be considered as belonging to the Captains of the first class, while those below him would be reckoned as belonging to a class higher than that in which they stood at the commencement of the operation, for every removal that has taken place above them.

30. If the Major of the new regiment had been senior, as Captain, to the Captains promoted to majorities in the old regiments, the senior of the two officers who remained first Captains after those promotions would stand in a better situation in the new regiment as first Captain than in the regiment to which he belonged, and would therefore be transferred, unless there were any officer in another regiment belonging to the class of second Captains who was senior to him, and had therefore a preferable claim to removal. There would be a corresponding variation in the transfer of the junior officers in the case supposed, into the details of which it does not appear to be of importance to enter.

31. Sufficient, it is conceived, has now been stated to show the marked respect which in India is paid to seniority, in a case in which it might be supposed that the officers for a newly-raised regiment might be selected either in subordination to the patronage of the Commander-in-Chief, as in other armies, or in reference to some principle which would have determined the choice of a few officers, at least peculiarly qualified for the charge of men newly raised; but this in India would be considered as an infraction of the established seniority regimental system; and in practice this strict observance of seniority, it is believed, has not been attended with any of the inconveniences that might be supposed likely to result from a rule, which left the selection of officers for the discharge of such important duty, to a sort of chance, over which the Government could exercise no control.

32. The only officer that could be appointed to a newly-raised regiment, on a principle of selection, would be the Lieutenant-Colonel, who is transferable from one regiment to another; and in a case of necessity, the Colonels being generally at home, the Commander-in-Chief could always select a commanding officer for a new regiment from all the Lieutenant-Colonels of that branch of the service (Cavalry or Infantry) then in India. It would also be competent to the Commander-in-Chief to make any selection he might think proper, from among the subalterns of the new regiment, for the situation of Adjutant and of Quartermaster and Interpreter.

33. Deviations have, indeed, on some occasions, been made in India from the method above described in regard to the selection of officers on a seniority system for the new regiments, but these, it is believed, except in one instance, in the formation of a Cavalry regiment from the Infantry at Bombay, have never had reference to any peculiar qualification of the officer for the duties of a newly-raised corps, but merely to avert a case of hardship, in respect to rank, by adhering too exclusively to one particular rule; and in some recent instances, some of the junior Lieutenants and all the Ensigns were re-posted, and had to change their corps, in order that some more fortunate individuals among them should not derive the full advantage to which their regimental standing and the seniority system of selection would otherwise have entitled them. These deviations have been objected to from home as inconsistent with the existing seniority regimental system, unjust towards the individuals who had obtained promotion under it, and productive of inconvenience, by causing a number of officers unnecessarily to change their corps on no ground whatever of public expediency; and it is to be hoped that it will not be repeated.

34. Officers being selected for a new regiment according to their army and not their regimental rank, it has happened that Captains with a brevet commission superior to their regimental rank and senior in the line of Captains, have been promoted into

a majority in a new regiment, when, if the dates of their regimental commissions had been exclusively referred to, there were officers of longer regimental standing as Captains who would have been entitled to the preference.

35. This is one of the cases in which the grant of the brevet rank of Captain to subalterns of fifteen years' standing has been of advantage to individual officers of the Company's service belonging to regiments in which promotion has been unusually slow, by the promotion of a Captain to a majority, under the circumstances above described, and by the advantage which the officers of the regiment under him gain by his removal.

36. Another advantage gained by the Company's officers, by the introduction of this system as a rule of the service in January 1816, is the claim which it will eventually give to Captains so circumstanced, who have not attained to regimental majorities, to be included in His Majesty's brevet, as the brevet Captains of 1795 and 1798 were, by the operation of former brevets, so included. This, however, could not be accomplished without injury to the King's officers of the same standing, if the local rank of Major were not to be conferred upon them in virtue of their brevet commission of Captain, in the same manner as the subalterns of His Majesty's regiments in India, when of fifteen years' standing, are protected by a local commission of Captain, to prevent their being superseded by a Company's officer junior to them as Lieutenant.

37. Casualties known at head-quarters subsequently to the date of the augmentation, though of previous occurrence, are not taken into account in the selection of officers for a new regiment, who are chosen in reference to the army list, as it stood at the date of the augmentation, which corresponds with the date of commission given to the officers promoted by the augmentation. A different practice in this respect formerly prevailed, and casualties were taken into account, in the selection of officers, nearly up to the date on which the formation of the new regiments was published in general orders. The alteration of practice, in this particular, first adopted upon occasion of a Bengal augmentation of 16th December 1814, gave rise to some claims of rank, the adjustment of which was attended with difficulty; but the system now in force appears to be the preferable one, from the certainty by which the troublesome operation of an augmentation arrangement may be performed, without the risk of an extensive revision which the accidental occurrence of a single casualty of a date anterior to the augmentation, and not known at head-quarters when the general order announcing the augmentation was published, would occasion if it were to be taken into account.

38. From what has been stated, it will be evident that the reduction of a regiment, after it has been formed for any considerable length of time, would be a work of extreme delicacy and of considerable difficulty, from the impracticability of providing for the officers of a reduced regiment, on an equitable principle, by returning and distributing them among the officers of the regiments to be retained.

39. Let it be required, for instance, to return the officers of a regiment (E.) about to be reduced, and distribute them as supernumeraries among the regiments (A.), (B.), (C.), and (D.)*

40. Now if the Major of regiment (E.) were to be assigned to regiment (A.) or to either of the other regiments, say, (D), the Major of which stands first for promotion, by the operation of the line step, the Captains of the remaining regiments would gain an undue advantage over the Captains of the regiment in which the Major was seconded, inasmuch as the line step would have to travel through as many of the regiments as there were Majors senior to the Major thus seconded upon them, from which retardation in their promotion all the Captains of the other regiments would escape, unless a first Captain of one of these regiments should be junior to the first Captain of regiment (E.) and he be placed above him. There would then be two regiments in which all the Captains would be depressed a regimental step by the introduction of a supernumerary Major into one, and a senior first Captain into the other, and two regiments in which the Captains (at least those standing in the position of first Captain) would escape from such depression. The second Captain of one of these regiments, however, if junior to the second Captain of the reduced regiment, still to be provided for, would lose a regimental step by his being placed above him; and if he were senior to him, the loss of the regimental step would fall upon the third Captain of the regiment and the officers under him. In the other regiment the loss of a regimental step would fall upon the third or fourth Captain, according as the third Captain of the reduced regiment was senior or junior to the third Captain of the regiment into which he was transferred.

41. Proceeding thus far, it is clear that the four regiments are very unequally affected by the transfer of the reduced officers in the manner above described. In one regiment all the Captains and subalterns lose a regimental step by the introduction of a Major; in the next it might happen that the same consequence would ensue if the first Captain of the reduced regiment were the senior, but if he were the junior, the first Captain would remain as he was, and the loss of the regimental step would devolve upon the second Captain and his juniors. In the next regiment the first and second Captains would escape, and the loss affect the third and fourth Captains and their juniors, unless the third Captain of the reduced regiment were junior to the third Captain of the regiment into which he was transferred, in which case three Captains of this regiment would escape the loss of a

* See the scheme before referred to.

regimental step, and in the remaining regiment four Captains would escape, and the rest of the officers suffer the loss of a step, unless the fourth Captain of the reduced regiment were senior to the fourth Captain of the regiment into which he was transferred.

42. The Bengal Infantry consisting of 76 regiments, the Madras of 54, and the Bombay of 28 regiments, it is evident that in providing for the 18 officers of a reduced regiment, from the Major downwards (for the Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel could be absorbed by a non-promotion on the occurrence of a casualty in those ranks), at either of the Presidencies, there would be several regiments that would escape altogether the loss of a regimental step; and among the 18 regiments, into each of which a reduced officer was placed, the Captains and subalterns of one or perhaps two regiments might sustain the loss of a regimental step, whereas, in the remainder, as many of the Captains and subalterns as were senior to the reduced officer placed among them would sustain no loss by his introduction, while it would fall exclusively on the officers of the regiment his junior. Among, therefore, the regiments into which a reduced officer was introduced, the loss of a regimental step to the officers his juniors would, in some cases, affect only the Ensigns, or a proportion of them; in others, only the Lieutenants and Ensigns, or a proportion of them; while in others the Captains and subalterns would all be affected by the loss, except in the few instances in which the Captains were the seniors of the reduced officers.

43. Supposing the number of regiments to be equal to the number of reduced officers to be provided for, the difficulty would still be great of selecting, without the suspicion of partiality, the particular regiments in which all the officers would suffer the loss of a regimental step, by the introduction of a reduced officer, and those in which they would suffer, and in very different degrees, such a loss; which difficulty would not be diminished, but rather increased, where the number of regiments were in excess of the reduced officers; for in this case there would be a number of regiments, precisely equal to that excess, which would sustain no inconvenience, or only so much inconvenience as was experienced by the other regiments, by the slight retardation in line promotion, occasioned by the absorption of the supernumerary Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel of the reduced regiment; and where the number of regiments were less than the reduced officers to be provided for, the difficulty and hardship upon the officers would be the greater, because in some and in as many regiments as the reduced officers were in excess of the regiments into which they were to be transferred, there would be regiments in which some of the officers would sustain a loss equal to two regimental steps, and in others only one.

44. The suspicion of partiality in the choice of corps into which to introduce the reduced officers might be avoided if it were to be declared beforehand, in a general order, that the reduced officers should be provided for in the regiments in which vacancies occurred by death in positions corresponding with the regimental position of the officers to be provided for, or superior to it, so as that no officer should stand lower than he did before the occurrence of the casualty, by the introduction of an officer above him. But this expedient, though it would exonerate the Government from the performance of a task of considerable difficulty and invidiousness, if they had had to make the selection, would still leave the regiments as unequally affected by the operation as before, and the officers who were deprived of the benefit of a casualty, by the introduction of a reduced officer, would feel the hardship not to be the less, when they suffered in the precise degree in which the casualty was likely to have benefited them, and that there were regiments in which a casualty, known at head-quarters only a few days later, had benefited the officers of the regiment in which it had occurred, from its having happened or become known after the reduced officers had been provided for.

45. This difficulty, however, might be provided for, if the reduced officers were not to be transferred at all into other regiments for purposes of promotion, but retained in a corps by themselves, and promoted therein regimentally, as if the reduction had not taken effect, until they were severally and successively absorbed by the operation of the line step, when the corps would become extinct, by the promotion of the last officer to a majority, and he would become a supernumerary of his rank until promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. The officers of such corps might be employed either upon the Staff or in doing duty with regiments, in lieu of officers so employed, and part of the expense* of retaining such a corps might be met by keeping

* The expense of a reduced regiment, at the commencement of the plan, would be as follows:—

	Per month.	Per month.
1 Major, at - - -	780 rupees	780 rupees.
8 Captains, at - - -	411 "	2,855 "
8 Lieutenants, at - - -	254 "	2,032 "
4 Ensigns, at - - -	200 "	800 "
18 officers to be reduced, the aggregate of whose allowances amount to - - -	- - -	5,667 "
Saving, by the non-appointment of as many Ensigns as there are reduced officers, during the progress of the reduction, which at the commencement would be 18 Ensigns, at 200 rupees per month - - -	- 3,600 "	
Leaving a net expense, in the first instance, equal to - - -	- 2,067 "	

To be gradually reduced as the lieutenantcies and captaincies and majority of the reduced corps become extinct.

vacant as many ensigncies during the progress of the reduction as were equal to the number of reduced officers unextinguished by the plan. The length of time occupied in the accomplishment of such a reduction, the junior of the reduced officers not attaining to his majority within a period much less than about 25 years, has been thought an objection to its adoption, as well as the mixing of officers together on regimental duty belonging to different regimental classes, and the consequent jealousies that might arise among them from cases of apparent supersession, when a junior officer of one class obtained promotion in his regiment before the senior officer of another class who was serving with him.

46. These difficulties, and a few others in the way of the adoption of this plan, into which it is not necessary for the present purpose to enter, are completely obviated by the plan which has been suggested by Colonel Salmond, of accomplishing a reduction by whole regiments (which in point of fact has never been attempted since the introduction of regimental promotion in 1796), by offering to as many officers as are equal to the officers to be reduced, and of the corresponding ranks, to purchase their commissions at such a rate as shall be equivalent to their value, and thereby hold out an inducement to as many officers to retire from the service as would provide places for the reduced officers in other regiments, without detriment to the officers among whom their future promotion would proceed, if the reduced officers themselves should not be willing to avail themselves of the terms offered to their acceptance.

47. This plan, if successfully carried into effect, would remove one of the most serious objections which in practice has been experienced from the system of regimental promotion established in 1796. The equivalent to be offered to the officer of a reduced regiment, or of another regiment willing to exchange with him, should be so fixed as to operate as an inducement to him to come into the arrangement; and if tried in the Infantry in the first instance, where there are the largest proportion of officers to whom the option might be given, and in which, from the reduction that has taken place in the strength of corps, there is a favourable opportunity to reduce their numbers without diminishing from the strength of the army, if that should be deemed objectionable, the plan would meet with a chance of success precisely in proportion to the number of officers to whom the option would have to be given, contrasted with those who would be able to avail themselves of it, while the public interests would be proportionably benefited by the saving to be effected by the reduction of as many regiments as could conveniently be spared from the present expensive scale of establishment.

48. Another inconvenience which has resulted from the introduction of regimental promotion into the seniority service of the Company is the unequal operation, upon particular regiments, of the demand of officers for Staff employ, and on account of officers absent in Europe on sick leave or furlough, the number of which in different regiments also varies very considerably, some regiments having no officer absent from regimental duty on these accounts, while in others the number withdrawn has been so great as to reduce materially the efficiency of the corps; notwithstanding, if the number of these absentees could have been equalized, there was a sufficiency of officers for regimental duty, had they been properly distributed.

49. To remedy this inconvenience, the Court of Directors, in their Orders of the 25th November 1823, prescribed the adoption of a regulation which required that a certain number of officers only should be taken from a regiment for Staff employ; and in a subsequent Order the latitude of selection for these important situations was narrowed still further, by directing, as they did on the 3d December 1828, "that no regiment of Cavalry or Infantry shall have three officers withdrawn for detached employment until all regiments have two, nor four until all have three."

50. The objection to these restrictions is, that it has interfered in some instances with the selection, by the local Governments, of individuals, well calculated by previous training, for duties on which it might be desirable to employ them; but this might be obviated, and it seems desirable that it should, if no other method be resorted to to obviate the difficulty, by empowering the local governments to exercise a discretion in the case supposed, so as to retain the particular officer in the situation the public interests required, provided the grounds on which a deviation were made from the rule in each case were to be publicly recorded at the time.

51. It has been suggested that officers for the Staff might be obtained without difficulty and detriment to the efficiency of regiments, by the formation of as many skeleton corps (on the principle of an augmentation arrangement) as would produce as many officers, or nearly as many, as were required for Staff employ, to be employed either upon the Staff, or in supplying the place of officers withdrawn from other regiments for Staff employ, the strength of the regiments being reduced in a corresponding proportion, the superfluous officers only, or their equivalent, after such reduction, being thrown into as many skeleton corps as were requisite for the purpose.

52. The objections to this plan, independently of the expense which it would involve, are of a nature similar to those which have been just stated to that of retaining officers of a reduced regiment in a corps for promotion, and employing them upon the Staff, or in the place of Staff absentees in a regiment; in addition to which it may be observed, that officers of these corps, when employed to do duty with a regiment, would derive no advantage from casualties in the corps in which they served when employed in field operations or at unhealthy stations. These considerations

APP. B.

seem to offer serious objection against a plan which appears, in other respects, to adapt itself to the peculiarities of the service, from its interfering in no degree whatever with the established system of a seniority regimental promotion, and to be altogether free from every objection of a serious nature, with the exception of those which have been adverted to. The cases, indeed, of apparent supersession to which reference was made in connexion with the plan of retaining officers of a reduced regiment in a corps of promotion, might, however, in many instances, be provided against, by requiring an officer, on his appointment to the Staff, or as the condition of his retaining his appointment, to exchange into a skeleton corps with another officer the same number of removes from promotion as himself.

53. Another remedy which has been suggested for obtaining a more enlarged sphere of selection for staff and other employ, is to strike off officers on the Staff, or the civil Staff only, from the strength of regiments, and to make a promotion in their room.

54. The objection to this plan is, that it interferes with the regularity of promotion, by giving to corps in which there are a large number of Staff absentees, an undue advantage in their promotion, compared with corps in which the Staff absentees are fewer, or in which there are no officers on Staff employ.

55. This would be particularly felt on the first introduction of such a plan, when the officers had been withdrawn by the local government, without contemplating at the time the effect which their being struck off from the strength of their regiments would have upon the officers below them succeeding to their vacancies; but this difficulty might in some degree be obviated, if promotions, on the introduction of such a plan, were to be equalized by a partial transfer of officers from regiments which had no Staff absentees, into regiments which, from the number of Staff officers upon their strength, would otherwise benefit beyond their fair proportion by the change of system. The local government also, if such a plan were to be acted upon, would possess the means of preventing cases of very glaring supersession, by the mode in which they exercised their discretion of selection; but to a Company's officer, it is conceived that any arrangement which interfered, or was likely to interfere, seriously with the seniority promotion to which he has been accustomed, would not be acceptable, and the reasons should be weighty to justify or require the adoption of so important a change in so favourite a feature of the Indian system.

56. Upon the whole, then, it would seem that the Regulation at present in force, the tendency of which is to equalize the number of Staff absentees from regiments, if modified in some such manner as has been suggested, by leaving it discretionary with the local government to deviate from the rule in special cases, the grounds of which to be recorded at the time, seems to be well worth a further trial; since the other remedies which have been suggested to widen the sphere of selection for Staff employ are not altogether free from difficulty, and might be attended with embarrassment.

57. There are two points connected with the seniority promotion of the Company's service which remain to be adverted to.

58. The one has reference to that provision in the Articles of War which empowers a court-martial to inflict loss of rank in instances justifying such a mode of punishment, which, however, could not be carried into effect in respect to a Major of Cavalry or Infantry of the Company's service, without injury to the officers below him, whose promotion depends upon the position which the Major of their regiment occupies upon the succession list for promotion. Thus, if Major (i) of regiment (D) were to be depressed below the seniority represented by Major (m) of regiment (C.), the Captain of regiment (D.), who stood first for promotion, would be superseded by the Captains of regiments (B.), (A.), and (C.), who, but for such depression of Major (i), could not have attained to a majority before him.*

59. The case, it is believed, has never yet arisen in the Company's service; but should it ever become necessary to carry such a sentence into effect, the difficulty might perhaps be obviated in some such way as this: by the non-promotion of Major (i), when his turn for a lieutenant-colonelcy had arrived, keeping him as a supernumerary and unposted Major, until entitled to promotion according to the depressed position assigned to him on the succession list, and promoting the Captain of regiment (D.) to the majority of the regiment, from the date at which Major (i) became a supernumerary Major, under the circumstances above adverted to. The lieutenant-colonelcy would, in this case, remain vacant until the Major who had been depressed on the succession list became entitled to his promotion.

60. The other point relates to the succession to a regiment and share of off- reckonings in the Company's service. By the regulations of 1756, the rank of Colonel was conferred upon the Company's officers, independently of the operation of His Majesty's brevet. In 1804, however, the rule was altered, and Company's officers succeeding to regiments were merely designated Lieutenant-Colonels "Commandant," unless previously, or until promoted to the rank of Colonel by the operation of His Majesty's brevet. The rule was again altered in 1839, and the Lieutenant-Colonels "Commandant" were made Colonels on the 31st June of that year, officers subsequently succeeding to regiments taking rank as Colonels from the date at which they succeeded to a regiment.

* See the scheme before referred to.

61. To prevent the King's officers from being superseded by the promotion of the Company's officers, the King's Lieutenant-Colonels of the same standing in India had conferred upon them the local rank of Colonel from the same date; and it was further arranged, that, on the promotion of a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Company's service to a regiment, the King's Lieutenant-Colonels of the same standing should also obtain the local commission of Colonel from the same date, so as that in no case should a King's Lieutenant-Colonel be superseded by the promotion of a Company's Lieutenant-Colonel of Engineers, Artillery, Cavalry, or Infantry, to a colonelcy.

62. Had there been but one line of promotion in the Company's service from the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel to Colonel, no possible inconvenience could have accrued from the practice of granting the local commission of Colonel to King's Lieutenant-Colonels senior to the Lieutenant-Colonels of the Company's service succeeding to regiments; but as the Company's officers are promoted in four distinct lines of Engineers, Artillery, Cavalry, and Infantry at each Presidency, it has happened that the promotion of a junior Lieutenant-Colonel of one of these lines to the rank of Colonel has occasioned the supersession of Lieutenant-Colonels of other lines, who are senior to Lieutenant-Colonels of His Majesty's service, on whom the local rank of Colonel has been conferred under the operation of the rule just adverted to.

63. The Company's officers complain of this, and with apparent justice, as a serious hardship inflicted upon them; and it must be admitted that the rule in its present form, unless materially modified, is calculated to inflict in its consequences the same description of injury upon the Company's officers as it was designed to prevent the King's officers in any possible case from sustaining.

64. This subject having been referred home for consideration, and being still undecided, it would perhaps be premature to enter more at length into the question in this place.

65. A question might be raised whether the seniority regimental system of the Company's service be as beneficial to the public interests as a system of promotion, which would leave the Government less fettered in respect to the selection of its officers, and afford facilities to the introduction of officers of talent not past the age of activity into the higher situations of command, which, under the present system, is in a great measure regulated by the rule of seniority, although the commands of divisions, of field forces, and of stations are in a measure made by selection from among the officers who, by seniority, have attained to the rank which qualifies them to hold such appointments.

66. To this it might be answered, that, notwithstanding the apparent force of this objection, the seniority system has worked well; and, generally speaking, there has been no deficiency of able men among the Company's officers for the discharge of these important duties. For the command of a corps also, the Government have practically the means of exercising even a species of selection, from which, by the operation of the seniority regimental system, they seem to be in a great degree precluded, inasmuch as the Major of the regiment, if a good officer, could be left in command of his corps, by posting to the regiment a Lieutenant-Colonel employed upon the Staff, and therefore disqualified from taking the command; while the Major, if unfit for the exercise of such a command, could be superseded by the act of posting to the regiment a Lieutenant-Colonel possessing the requisite qualities for such an important station; and even such of the Colonels of regiments as are in India would be available for such a purpose, if the Regulation in force, which disqualifies a Colonel in receipt of off- reckonings from drawing the command-money of his corps, did not operate to discourage many good officers of that rank from remaining in India, which they probably would do if they could receive command-money and off- reckonings at the same time; and by this means there would be a larger proportion of senior officers of the Company's service present with corps, and entitled to exercise the higher commands on field service than there are at present.

67. The facility which is obtained of removing Lieutenant-Colonels from regiment to regiment, under the present system, which restricts the regimental rise to the rank of Major, is considered as an argument against extending the regimental rise to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, as in His Majesty's service, and as was originally proposed for the Company's service in the orders of 8th January 1796.

68. On the other hand, there are those who think that the change would be beneficial, if officers were to rise regimentally to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, by its retaining officers in command of the corps, who, from having always served with it, are better acquainted with the men; while officers really unfit for the exercise of such an important command as that of a regiment might be provided for by a voluntary or even a compulsory transfer to the invalids, in case of necessity.

69. Another advantage supposed to be derived from making the rise regimental to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, is the facility which it would afford of correcting, in an unobtrusive way, one of the evils of the seniority system, which prevents officers from attaining to the important rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, except by travelling, as at present, through a long succession list of Majors; whereas, if the rise were to be regimental to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, a chance casualty in his regiment in that rank would at once promote the Major to the vacant Lieutenant-Colonelcy; and if the Regulation at present in force, which prevents an officer about to retire from the service from receiving a sum of money from the officers below him, who

benefit by, and in consideration of, his retirement, were to be repealed, a great inducement would be held out to the older officers to retire from the service, who from age may be disqualified to exercise the active duties of their profession, and to the younger officers a still stronger inducement to economize their resources, in order to provide the means of a more rapid advancement to the higher ranks, by forming among themselves a regimental fund to buy off the older officers.

70. The great objection in the way of the adoption of this suggestion is, the increase of expense which the additional retirements would occasion, and the difficulty of providing in this country the funds requisite for such payments from the Home Treasury; which latter impediment might be avoided, if officers so bought off were to receive their retiring pension through the channel of the Indian treasuries instead of the Home Treasury, and were to make their own remittances to England for this purpose; but such a condition, even if it were to be acceptable to the officers, which is doubtful, would probably weaken, proportionably, the tie by which the Company's officers are, under the existing provisions of the retiring Regulation, connected with this country.

71. It is not at all improbable, if the impediments which discourage Europeans from settling in India were to be removed, and officers were reduced to the necessity of receiving their retiring allowances in India, or suffering the loss they would sustain upon a remittance to England, that many would relinquish the idea of returning at all to their native country, and thus weaken in that degree the inducement held out by the retiring regulation to the Indian officers to look to an eventual return to England as the ultimate and desirable termination of their services. Different opinions may be entertained as to the advantages or disadvantages of such a result; but it hitherto has been held to be a desirable object in the administration of India to strengthen, in every possible way, the ties which connect an Indian officer with his home in this country, and both the furlough and retiring regulations, in the point of view thus presented, have been considered as particularly advantageous on this account, independently of the individual benefit which they confer upon the officers themselves; and the expenditure which they involve may, in this point of view, be regarded as more than compensated by the home attachments which they keep alive and serve to strengthen.

72. There are a few other deviations from the established seniority system of the service which have been suggested, to which it may be desirable to advert before the remarks in reference to the rank of the Company's officers are closed.

73. One is, that a proportion of the casualties, to the extent of one-sixth, should be at the disposal of the Government, in view to the promotion of deserving officers and qualifying them for situations which their rank, if promoted according to the ordinary rules of the service, would not entitle them to hold. This would involve a more serious departure from the seniority system of the service than has ever been attempted, and if acted upon, should be so restricted, by requiring the qualifications for which an officer was selected for promotion in preference to his juniors to be stated upon the public records, and to render each appointment so made subject to eventual revision from home, and with any other checks that might appear calculated to secure the attainment of the object, in every instance, for which a material departure from the established rules of the service was sanctioned.

74. It seems doubtful, however, whether a rule of the description referred to, however guarded it might be against the possibility of abuse, would be acceptable to the service generally; and it is not clear that a case has been made out to justify or require the adoption of so novel an expedient, when the object of securing the advancement of younger men into the higher ranks could be attained, in a less objectionable way, by allowing officers of corps to buy off their seniors, if willing to retire, on the terms tended to their acceptance.

75. The same remark is not applicable to the suggestion which has been made, that officers of the King's and Company's service might be allowed to exchange their commissions, provided the former had been a sufficient time in India to be safely entrusted with the charge of native troops, and the officers exchanging were nearly of the same age, so as not to afford ground of complaint to the junior officers, that a younger and better life was substituted for the one on which their promotion depended. In the case of a Major, the King's officer transferred into a Company's regiment should be the senior of the officer with whom he exchanged, in order that he might take the place on the succession list vacated by the Company's officer (the King's officer, however, still retaining his superior army rank), so as to prevent the injury which the officers of the regiment would otherwise sustain, if he were, by reason of his inferior rank, to take a lower place on the succession list than that by which their promotion was previously regulated.

76. Another suggestion which has been made is this, that casualties, when a corps is employed upon service, should be supplied only by a promotion from among the officers present, or on their way to join. A rule of this description would operate with some severity upon officers on furlough in this country, who left India at a time when the military operations upon which their regiment was employed could not have been foreseen, or who were obliged to come home for health, and they had not the option, like officers upon the Staff of India, of taking their chance of promotion in common with the rest, or of relinquishing their Staff employment; and if such a rule were to be acted upon, the case of an officer upon furlough should be provided for, at least to the extent of a reservation in favour of such officers, who, on hearing that

their regiment was likely to be employed, hastened to rejoin it, if not compelled to remain by sickness.

77. The suggestion itself seems to be deserving of some consideration, as not involving any very material deviation from the established system, and to whatever extent the deviation is carried, the operation of the rule being in favour of a class of officers who, from their exposure to the chances of war, seem to have the preferable claim to whatever benefit it might confer upon them.

78. The only other suggestion to be noticed under this head is, that native gentlemen should be appointed as officers to corps in common with Europeans.

79. This would not involve any necessary departure from the seniority promotion of the service; but the effect which such a deviation might have upon the minds of the present native commissioned officers, who are junior to the ensigns, and even the cadets attached to corps, ought not to be overlooked; for it would probably be more galling to their feelings to see a native preferred before them, than that European commissioned officers of the lowest grades should take the precedence of the highest commissioned grade at present conferred upon native officers, since this has always been the practice of the Company's service.

80. If these remarks be just, it seems to follow that no very essential variation should be made in the existing system, without due consideration and a clear conception of the consequences likely to follow from a change that might appear to be desirable, but upon trial might be found ill-adapted to the peculiarities of the service. In point of fact, it is conceived, whether the local army of India be a King's or a Company's army, the European commissioned officers must be appointed in the first instance as cadets, like as they are at present, and rise, by a regular system of rotation, to the higher ranks. The Company's military, unlike that of the British army, is meant as a provision for the officers in it independently of their private resources, and to secure besides the means of an eventual comfortable retirement in this country, which, with their retiring pay, should be on a scale sufficiently liberal so as to adapt itself in some measure to the style of living in which the officers in India, from the scale of their allowances, are generally able to afford. Any regulation which would deprive an officer of the certainty of rising to the higher, and indeed the highest ranks to which the Indian officers are eligible, provided their health is spared to them and they conduct themselves well, would be disheartening in the extreme to the officers of a local army, cut off from the society and connexions in England, and be besides prejudicial to the public interests, from depriving the officers of a strong motive to exertion, and which, during the existence of the Company's army, has produced a class of men generally distinguished by their talents and ability, and a few eminent individuals, such as the late Sir Barry Close, Sir Thomas Munro, and Sir D. Ochterlony, and others, of whom the country may justly boast.

81. Any other motives beyond the certainty which a Company's officer possesses of rising to distinction may be superadded to this essential stimulus to exertion, in a local army, with great advantage. The concession of the honours of the Bath, and of personal brevets, to the Company's officers, has been productive, it is believed, of the very best effects; and any additional honours conferred upon the service in this way would be decidedly advantageous to the Indian service.

82. The suggestion that has been made, that the commissions of the Company's general officers should not be local, but extend to all parts of the empire, and that the Company's officers should occasionally be appointed to the chief command, seems strongly to recommend itself for adoption on this ground; and indeed, whatever additional honours could with propriety be conceded to the Company's officers (in this way), would, it is conceived, be well bestowed, and the public service be thereby proportionably benefited.

Promotion.

83. Another very important consideration connected with the constitution of the Company's service is, the chances of promotion afforded to the officers by the scale of relative rank, by which the probabilities of a slower or a quicker rise to the higher ranks is regulated.

84. When it became my duty, some years since, to investigate this subject, in connexion with some claims of rank arising out of a recent augmentation arrangement, I was much struck by the fact, that the Company's officers had derived very essential advantages in their promotion by the large antecedent augmentations, connected as it was with another, brought into notice about the same time, that complaints were notwithstanding made of the slow progress of promotion; and the fact was so far admitted, that to relieve the subalterns of the service, the brevet rank of Captain had been conferred upon all the unpromoted subalterns of fifteen years' standing and upwards.

85. It therefore appeared to me to be an object of some importance to ascertain at what rate promotion had travelled, when unaided by an augmentation of the army.

86. With this view the commissions of a variety of officers in each rank were compared with those which they respectively held in the next inferior rank, and to avoid any disturbing effect from augmentations, the period selected for the comparison of these commissions was between 1804 and 1814, when no augmentation was made to the army.

87. In those ranks which occupied a longer period than 10 years for promotion it was practicable to check the calculation by commissions of Madras officers, in which army there had been no

APP. B.

increase between 1804 and 1818, and where this resource failed, other means were adopted of making the nearest approximation to the truth. The details of this calculation are given in a separate paper.

88. By this calculation * it appeared that the average rise from—

Ensign to Lieutenant was	-	-	6 years
Ditto to Captain	"	-	21 "
Ditto to Major	"	-	33 "
Ditto to Lieutenant-Colonel	"	-	39 "
Ditto to Colonel	"	-	52 "

By means of these data, the rate of casualties as they affect the rise of an officer during his progress through the service was found to be as follows. During the rise of an officer to the rank of Major, the casualty rate varied four different times, and at equal periods.

89. During the first of these periods the casualties affecting the rise of an officer were at the rate annually of four per cent., or 1-25th, during the second period five per cent., or 1-20th; during the third period six per cent., or 1-17th; and during the fourth period seven per cent., or 1-14th. From the rank of Major to Colonel the casualties were eight per cent., or about 1-13th annually † A calculation according to these rates differs from the preceding one only one year in the entire period, and may therefore safely be taken as an indication of the rate of casualties among the officers from death, resignation, dismissal, or retirement, or any other cause which may have occasioned vacancies in corps during the period from which the comparison of commissions was made.

90. The preceding calculation, however, may be considered as liable to one exception: it indicates no more than the rates at which promotion would proceed after as large augmentations to the army as those which were made between 1796 and 1804, during which interval the Infantry of the three Presidencies was nearly doubled. The natural consequence of such a state of circumstances was that the officers of each rank (during the period which succeeded those augmentations) stood relatively higher in the service, than that to which they would otherwise have attained, and the average of ages in each rank was consequently lower than it should be in a calculation intended to illustrate the progress of promotion when unaffected by augmentations. This consideration suggested the following correction in the calculation. The Ensigns were supposed to be affected by casualties annually at the rate of five † per cent., or 1-20th, instead of four per cent.; the Lieutenants and Captains during one-third of their rise to a majority, by casualties, at the rate of six per cent., or 1-17th; during the second third at seven per cent., or 1-14th; and during the remaining third at seven-and-a-half per cent., or 1-13th; and the field officers at eight per cent., or 1-12th. The result even of this correction exhibited no more than a saving of about two years in the rise of an officer from Ensign to Lieutenant-Colonel, and of two years in the rise to Captain and Major ‡.

91. The data thus obtained supplied a ready means of ascertaining with tolerable accuracy, if not with absolute certainty, the comparative advantage or disadvantage of any proposed scale of establishment; and a consideration of the slowness of promotion, exhibited by the preceding calculations, had considerable weight in the determination which was adopted in favour of the arrangement directed by the Court's orders of 25th November 1823.

92. Two modes of accomplishing this relief were suggested. The one on the plan of forming about as many skeleton corps as would have provided for the superfluous officers of regiments, by reducing the number of Lieutenants per regiment from twenty-two to fourteen, and of Ensigns from ten to six, or a reduction

* Promotion, from a comparison of Commissions:—

Ensign to Lieutenant	-	-	6 years.
Lieutenant to Captain	-	-	15 "
Captain to Major	-	-	12 "
Major to Lieut.-Colonel	-	-	6 "
Lieut.-Colonel to Colonel	-	-	13 "
			<u>52</u>

† Promotion, according to casualties, at various rates, from 4 to 8 per cent. —

Ensign to Lieutenant	-	-	6 years.
Lieutenant to Captain	-	-	15 "
Captain to Major	-	-	12 "
Major to Lieut.-Colonel	-	-	6 "
Lieut.-Colonel to Colonel	-	-	12 "
			<u>51</u>

Ensign to Captain	-	-	21 years.
Do. to Major	-	-	33 "
Do. to Lieutenant-Colonel	-	-	39 "
Do. to Colonel	-	-	51 "

‡ It appears that the casualties actually operating upon the service between 1813 and 1830 were, upon an average, at the rate of 5-075 per cent annually.

§ Promotion, according to the corrected rate of casualties —

Ensign to Lieutenant	-	-	8 years.
Lieutenant to Captain	-	-	14 "
Captain to Major	-	-	12 "
Major to Lieut.-Colonel	-	-	5 "
Lieut.-Colonel to Colonel	-	-	12 "
			<u>48</u>

Ensign to Captain	-	-	19 years.
Do. to Major	-	-	31 "
Do. to Lieut.-Colonel	-	-	36 "
Do. to Colonel	-	-	48 "

altogether of 12 officers per regiment.* The officers transferred into these skeleton corps were intended to be employed upon the staff, or to supply the places of officers so employed, and thereby to equalize the number of officers available for regimental duty with each corps in the service.

93. The other, which is the plan that was carried into effect by the Court's orders of 25th November 1823, was to divide the regiments of two battalions each, into regiments of single battalions, giving a Colonel to each single battalion regiment, with an additional Captain, one Lieutenant per regiment being reduced, so as to retain accurately the same number of officers in the rank of Captain and subaltern as before.†

94. The manner in which promotion would have been permanently affected, according to the two schemes, was found to be as follows.‡ The plan of skeleton corps would have had the advantage of a quicker rise by two years to the rank of Captain and Major. In the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel the rise would have been the same according to either scheme, but the plan actually adopted gave a quicker rise by four years to the rank of Colonel, and compared with the scheme then in force, the acceleration altogether in the rise to the rank of Colonel was six years.

95. From this it will appear that the advantage in respect to promotion was decidedly in favour of the plan adopted, independently of the objections already referred to, which appeared to oppose the adoption of the skeleton arrangement; and the arrangement in the point of view here presented must be considered as of a character most beneficial to the service, and calculated to afford that degree of relief to promotion which could not be anticipated from future augmentations, and to put the service on a very improved footing.

96. Since the orders of the 25th November 1823, a further improvement has been effected in the promotion of the service, in regard to future appointments, by a reduction to the extent of two Lieutenants and one Ensign, Cornet, or second Lieutenant per regiment, ordered by the Court on the 3d December 1828. The result, according to the calculation below,§ may be expected to accomplish an acceleration in the rise to each rank, from that of Captain upwards, to the extent of about two years.

97. These calculations appear conclusively to show that the advocates of an increased number of European commissioned officers with native corps lose sight of the effect which such an increase as has been proposed in the lower ranks would have upon promotion, although the officers now in the service would benefit by the change if the Captains and Lieutenants were to be increased. but the prospects of those hereafter entering the service would be proportionably deteriorated, if such an increase were to be made to the lower ranks without a corresponding increase in the higher ranks; and as the resources of India are not more than

* European commissioned officers to a regiment of two battalions, according to the arrangement in force, and as proposed.

Colonel	-	-	1	1
Lieut.-Colonels	-	-	2	2
Majors	-	-	2	2
Captains	-	-	8	8
Lieutenants	-	-	22	14
Ensigns	-	-	10	6
			<u>45</u>	<u>33</u>

† Establishment of Officers for a Regiment of—

		Two Batts.	One Batt.
Colonel	-	-	1
Lieut.-Colonels	-	-	1
Majors	-	-	1
Captains	-	-	5
Lieutenants	-	-	10
Ensigns	-	-	6
			<u>23</u>

Promotion according to the	System in force previously to the Order of 25 Nov. 1823.	By the Court's Orders of 25 Nov. 1823.	By the Plan of Skeleton Corps.
Ensign to Lieutenant	5	5	4
Lieutenant to Capt.	14	12	11
Captain to Major	12	12	12
Major to Lieut.-Col.	5	4	6
Lieut.-Col. to Colonel	12	9	13
	<u>48</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>46</u>
Ensign to Captain	19	17	15
Do. to Major	31	29	27
Do. to Lieut.-Col.	36	33	33
Do. to Colonel	48	42	46

§ Promotion, according to the Orders of—
25 Nov. 1823, 3 Dec 1823.

Ensign to Lieutenant	-	5 years.	4 years.
Lieutenant to Captain	-	12 "	11 "
Captain to Major	-	12 "	12 "
Major to Lieut.-Colonel	-	4 "	4 "
Lieut.-Colonel to Colonel	-	9 "	9 "
		<u>42</u>	<u>40</u>
Ensign to Captain	-	17 years.	15 years.
Do. to Major	-	29 "	27 "
Do. to Lieut.-Colonel	-	33 "	31 "
Do. to Colonel	-	42 "	40 "

equal, and, indeed, are scarcely equal, to the burden of the existing establishment, it is clear that any increase to be made to the number of officers of corps could only be made, if made at all, in the most economical form, by an addition to the lower ranks, which, to the extent to which such addition was carried, would deteriorate in a proportionate degree the prospects of those hereafter entering the service.

98. The officers who are, or have been, supernumeraries of their rank by the reductions ordered on the 3rd of December 1833 will be more than compensated by the loss of allowance which they sustain, from being restricted to the allowances of Cadet, while serving as acting Ensigns, Cornets, or Second Lieutenants, instead of the full allowances of those ranks, by the comparatively quicker rise which intermediately will have taken place, by the reduction in the number of Lieutenants in the manner before adverted to.

99. These remarks have reference to the supposition that an increase of officers with native corps is required, which is a point by no means established. Considering that besides the European commissioned officer with each troop or company there are two native commissioned officers (a subahdar and jemmadar), the service would appear to be sufficiently well provided for by an establishment to that extent, without any further European agency; and when to this is added the financial considerations which oppose an increase of expense, as well as the eventual effect upon promotion, by an addition to the lower, without an increase to the higher ranks, it does seem that the existing establishment is sufficiently ample, and that an increase in the number of European officers does not appear to be necessary or desirable. It was the opinion of the late Sir Thomas Munro that an establishment which would allow of the presence of one European officer with each troop or company is amply sufficient, and the present authorized establishment, if the number of Staff absentees from corps be equalized, as will eventually be the case under the operation of the Court's restrictive Regulation, will be more than sufficient to provide for the presence of a proper number of regimental officers for that purpose.

100. Indeed in reference to the present state of the finances, and the prospective improvement which it would accomplish in respect to the promotion of officers hereafter entering the service, it may be doubted whether the reduction in the rank of subaltern might not be carried still further; but if this be not attempted, a very considerable saving might be effected by a reduction in the number of regiments, on the plan suggested by Colonel Salmond, without any detriment whatever to the eventual promotion of the officers, while the existing numerical amount of Sepoys, which it appears does not admit of further reduction, could be provided for by a proportionate addition to the strength of troops or companies in the regiments retained.

From these remarks of Mr. Cabell it is evident that the Court of Directors not only fully recognized the right that each officer had to promotion by seniority, but also the consequent impossibility of the formation of a Staff corps which would give undue promotion to some officers over others; the impracticability of reducing a cadre of officers; and, lastly, that so long as an officer was able and willing to serve, he could not be placed on half-pay, or have his position or prospects affected unduly in any way. These several questions attracted the serious consideration of the Committee; but Mr. Cabell's remarks were fully supported by Sir Jasper Nicolls, Sir John Malcolm, Sir Robert Scot, and other eminent authorities.*

The seniority system had, however, one serious defect, which affected the officers of the East India Company's army, as well as the Government itself. On the one hand, the Government found that there was growing up in their service a number of officers who, from age and infirmity, could not well fulfil their duties; on the other, the junior officers complained of the extreme slowness of their promotion.

This subject was brought strongly to the notice of the Court of Directors by the following letter from the Government of India:—

MILITARY LETTER from the GOVERNMENT of INDIA (No. 5),
dated 25th April 1829.

1. We have great satisfaction in submitting for the consideration of your Honourable Court the accompanying prospectus of a Military Retiring Fund, which has been laid before us by the Right Honourable the Commander-in-Chief.

2. Feeling a lively interest in the welfare as well as in the efficiency of the army entrusted to his care, his Excellency has observed with regret the injury resulting alike to your service and military servants from the extreme slowness of promotion, in consequence of which an officer has frequently the misfortune to remain in the lower grades of his profession till the proper age for acquiring a practical knowledge of its higher duties is past, and in too many instances attains the rank rendering him eligible to an important command only when a debilitated constitution and impaired energies have to a certain extent incapacitated him for its efficient exercise.

3. Desirous of opposing some check to the progress of so great and increasing an evil, his Excellency, after giving to the subject the most careful consideration, has come to the conclusion that no remedy, under existing circumstances available, would be so effectual as a Retiring Fund, founded on the principle of length of service rather than of actual rank, which, by enabling and inducing a certain number of officers to retire annually, would in some measure prevent the stagnation of promotion incident to a seniority service generally, and to that of the Honourable Company in particular.

4. The proposed fund appears to the Commander-in-Chief unobjectionable in principle, simple in plan, and moderate in its views; and his Excellency is satisfied that its establishment, under the auspices and authority of your Honourable Court, would be hailed as a boon by your Bengal army.

5. Concurring in the view of the subject taken by his Excellency, and recollecting the liberality displayed by your Honourable Court in the instance of the Civil Fund, we most earnestly solicit your favourable consideration of the projected military one; recording, at the same time, our solemn conviction that some such measure is essentially necessary not only to the comfort and well-being of your military servants, but to the efficiency of your army, and consequently to the most vital interests of your service.

No decided reply was made to the above letter until the 6th March 1832.

In the meantime the subject had attracted the notice of the Committee of the House of Commons,* and the necessity for some plan being adopted to remedy the evil complained of was so clearly shown, that the following despatch was sent by the Court of Directors:—

MILITARY DESPATCH to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA (No. 15),
dated 6th March 1832.

We are very solicitous for the comfort of our officers upon retirement, and are therefore disposed cordially to encourage the institution of funds in furtherance of that desirable object.

2 Schemes of a nature similar to that which you have submitted, though differing from it in some points of detail, have been proposed at Madras and at Bombay, and we think it desirable that the funds which may be formed at the three Presidencies should be constituted upon a uniform principle in all respects.

We regret that, in the present state of the Company's affairs, it is not possible for us to aid the funds by a direct contribution, but we are willing not only to bear the increased charge of retired pay that will be consequent upon their establishment, but also to sanction the grant of an interest of 6 per cent per annum on the balances of the several funds and the remittance of the annuities which they may grant through our treasury at the rate of 2½ sicca rupee.

3. The only conditions we require are, that the regulations shall be submitted to us for our approbation; that the amount of the annuities to be granted in each year shall not exceed 7,750*l.*, in the proportions of—

£	-	-	-	Bengal.
3,850	-	-	-	Madras.
2,700	-	-	-	Bombay.
1,200	-	-	-	
£7,750				

which are the amounts contemplated in the several schemes, and that the number of annuities granted in each year shall not exceed 24, in the proportion of 12 at Bengal, 8 at Madras, and 4 at Bombay.

4. These amounts and numbers are, of course, fixed by us with reference to the establishments as they now exist.

5 We shall transmit a copy of this Despatch to the Governments of Madras and Bombay, with instructions to them to communicate with you upon the subject.

In August 1833,† the Adjutant-General of the Bengal Army officially reported that the above plan of a Retiring Fund, although suggested by the officers and approved by the Government of India and by the Court of Directors, was not likely to succeed in Bengal.

In December 1835,‡ the Court of Directors refused to sanction a Retiring Fund, suggested by a Mr. John Curran, of the Mint Department, and transmitted by the Government of India for their approval.

The following were the grounds on which the Court based their refusal to sanction the above fund:—Because it differed in principle and extent from the one given in outline in their Despatch No. 15, dated 6th March 1832, and to which they had expressed their readiness to afford assistance; and because it completely disturbed the system under which retiring pensions to officers and succession of Colonels of regiments to the "off-reckonings" (now called "Colonel's allowances") were regulated.

* Select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Affairs of the East India Company, 1832.—*V.* Military.

† Military Letter from the Government of India to the Court of Directors, No. —, dated 20th of September 1833, forwarding letter from the Adjutant-General of the Bengal Army, No. —, dated 23rd August 1833.

‡ Military Despatch from the Court of Directors to the Government of India, No. 14, dated 23rd December 1835.

* Appendix to Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Affairs of the East India Company, 1833, *lxix.*, &c.

APP. B.

At the same time, in December 1835,* the Court wrote to the Government of India, referring to their Despatch No. 15, of 6th March 1832, in which they had expressed their desire to encourage the institution of a Retiring Fund; and they stated, that, as many obstacles had hitherto prevented the establishment of a "General Retiring Fund," they considered it hopeless to expect that any fund could be so framed as to meet with the "general concurrence of the army," and "with the sanction of the authorities at home."

They adduced the above as their reason for no longer relying on "the formation of such a fund;" and they concluded their letter by resolving that they would themselves "provide for the object contemplated in schemes of that nature," by "an enlargement of the retiring regulations."

In June 1837,† the Court wrote as follows to the Government of Bombay, with reference to a Memorial from a Committee appointed to deliberate on the establishment of a Military Retiring Fund:—

"It is always a source of gratification to us to promote the advantage and comfort of our military servants."

In this letter they again adverted to "the difficulties which stood in the way of the establishment of a general retiring fund;" and again stated that they "regarded the realization of such an object as hopeless." On the above grounds they refused to extend their sanction to the plan transmitted to them.

In September 1837, the Court still further extended their pension regulations, and sent the following Despatch to the Government of India, in reference to the Court's letter, No. 15, of 23rd of December 1835, and to the enlargement of the pension rules at that time vouchsafed by them:—

MILITARY DESPATCH to the GOVERNMENT OF INDIA (No. 5),
dated 20th September 1837.

Reply to Military Letter,
dated 13th January 1837,
No. 6

Submit for Court's Orders a Memorial from Colonel F V Raper, of the 7th Native Infantry, and other officers, praying that any period not exceeding three years actually spent on furlough to Europe may be accounted equivalent to service in India in regard to claim to pension for length of service. State that Government are unable to recommend the prayer of this memorial to the Court's favourable consideration

who should have served in India 23 years (three years' furlough included), whether he had attained that rank regimentally or not, and the full pay of each of the superior ranks of Major, Lieutenant-Colonel, and Colonel, after the completion of an additional period of five years' service for each of those ranks in succession, viz.:—

For Major's pay, 28 years' service (including three years for a furlough).

For Lieutenant-Colonel's pay, 33 years' service (including three years for a furlough).

For Colonel's pay, 38 years' service (including three years for a furlough).

3. Being now of opinion that some additional advantage, in respect to the periods of retirement, may properly be granted to the senior officers, who would have been more especially the immediate objects of benefit from a retiring fund, had such a fund been established, we have resolved that the period of service to qualify an officer for the pay of each advanced rank after that of Captain shall be reduced from five to four years, the periods of service in India required for each rank being, consequently, hereafter as follows, viz.:—Every officer who shall have served 23 years (three years' furlough included) shall be allowed to retire on the pay of a Captain, whether he shall have attained that rank regimentally or not. Every officer who shall have served 27 years (three years' furlough included) shall be allowed to retire on the pay of a Major, whether he shall have attained that rank or not. Every officer who shall have served 31 years (three years' furlough included) shall be allowed to retire on the pay of a Lieutenant-Colonel, whether he shall have attained that rank or not. Every officer who shall have served 35 years (three years' furlough included) shall be allowed to retire on the full pay of a Colonel, whether he shall have attained that rank or not.

4. These arrangements to have effect without prejudice to any claims arising out of the retiring regulations as established in the year 1796.

5. We desire that it may be distinctly understood that the present is a final measure. You will, accordingly, decline to forward

to us any application which may have in view a further extension of the regulations now established with regard to the retirement of our military servants.

Although, on account of the difficulty of establishing a General Retiring Fund satisfactory to the armies of the three Presidencies, as well as to the Court of Directors, the latter had twice enlarged their retirement regulations, and consequently declined to contribute further to any general fund for their army in India, they yet felt that these enlarged regulations would not give that stimulus to promotion which they were anxious to see, and therefore encouraged the formation of Regimental Bonus Funds, viz.:—Subscriptions, on the part of juniors, to induce their seniors to accept of the retiring pensions offered by the Court of Directors. The Bombay Artillery, at a meeting of the Artillery officers at Poona, on the 22nd August 1833, established the retiring fund of that regiment. The Bengal Artillery instituted theirs on the 1st July 1836, and the Madras Artillery theirs in the same year. The Engineer corps and some of the regiments of the Line formed others about this time.

Thus, although the Court of Directors, on the 14th June 1837, distinctly refused to recognize a General Retiring Fund, and continued, in their various subsequent despatches* on this subject, to refer to the Despatch of the 14th June 1837, No. 31, they nevertheless, on the 29th November 1837, as distinctly recognized the Regimental Bonus Funds; and the Governor-General of India published that recognition in his General Order dated Simla, 2nd May 1838.

EXTRACT MILITARY DESPATCH to the GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
(No. 7), dated 29th November 1837.

* * * * *

We see no necessity for interfering with the arrangements which the junior officers of a regiment may make in individual cases for adding to the comforts of a senior officer on his retirement from the service upon the pension to which he may be entitled.

The regulation of 1798, requiring officers, upon retirement, to make oath that they have received no pecuniary consideration for quitting the service, has not been enforced by us in any single case of retirement in England during the period of nearly forty years, which has since elapsed. It was established chiefly upon financial grounds, to prevent (as observed by Lord Cornwallis, when recommending other rules for the same object) "an unreasonable load of pensions." This presumed necessity for the rule has, however, not yet been felt. On the contrary, additional facilities have been required, and have been given, for enabling officers to retire upon full pay. We shall, therefore, continue to suspend the operation of the rule, and officers retiring from time to time will not be called upon to make the declaration, unless the financial necessity to which we have referred (and of which due notice shall be given), shall at a future period be fully realized.

The subject of the Indian retiring funds was specially inquired into by the Royal Commission appointed in 1836 to inquire into the system of purchase and sale of commissions in the army. On this Commission were the Duke of Somerset, Lord Stanley, the late Lord Herbert, &c., and they reported as follows:—

In the Indian army promotion is strictly governed by seniority; it is a system of regimental promotion up to the rank of Major, and exchanges are not permitted. Above the rank of Major officers rise by seniority in a general list; but they have no claim to the command of a regiment unless selected for it by the Commander-in-Chief.

The Indian Government have had recourse to several measures, in order to accelerate promotion in their army. They give liberal pensions to officers retiring, and since the year 1835 they grant allowances in proportion to length of service, irrespective of the rank which the retiring officer may have attained.

The strict adherence to the rule of promotion by seniority has led to the adoption of a practice which is permitted by the authorities though not sanctioned by law, and which produces, as regards retirement, a result somewhat similar to the sale of commissions. The officers of a regiment subscribe amongst themselves and make up a purse, to induce a senior officer to retire. Contributing is optional on the part of every officer; but in most cases a young man would sooner incur pecuniary inconvenience, than withhold his aid from a scheme so popular in the regiment.

The practice of thus making up a purse applies chiefly, it is said, to the rank of Major, though it occurs also in lower ranks. From the evidence given as to the effects of this system, and the unwillingness of officers to retire without a contribution, in addition to the pension allowed to them, it may be inferred that,

* Military Despatches from the Court of Directors to the Government of India, No. 15, dated 23rd December 1835.

† Military Despatch to the Government of Bombay, No. 81, dated 14th June 1837.

* Military Despatches from the Court of Directors—No. 38, dated 10th April 1838, to the Government of Bengal. No. 36, dated 11th April 1838. No. 65, dated 29th August 1838, and No. 66, dated 29th September 1841, to the Government of Madras. No. 118, dated 10th November 1847, to the Government of India.

if the officers of the Indian army were left with no other inducement to retire except the allowance granted by the Government, the regiments would be filled with old officers, and the efficiency of the army would be impaired. With all the advantages which have been derived from this practice and from the liberality of the Indian Government, it nevertheless appears, from the able Report made by the late Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, that the condition of the Indian army and the exigencies of the public service will probably render it necessary to apply the principle of selection, where as yet the rule of seniority has prevailed.

The evidence to which the Commissioners referred pointed out that the privilege of juniors contributing towards the retirement of their senior officers was still fully recognized and concurred in by the Court of Directors, on account of the advantages which the Indian Government obtained thereby, in procuring the services of a more efficient body of commanding officers, and at the same time effecting a great pecuniary saving to the Indian Government in accomplishing that result.

The following evidence on this point was given by Mr. P. Melville, Military Secretary to the Board of Directors:—

656. (*Chairman.*) Is there any system of purchase in the Company's army?—There is no such system; but there is a practice of the officers in a regiment making up a purse to enable a senior officer to retire; that practice has lately been declared by a trial in this country to be contrary to law.

657. (*Mr. Sidney Herbert.*) Has there been any intention of taking steps to legalize that?—The Court of Directors have stated to the Government of India that it was under consideration whether they should apply to Parliament for a bill to alter that provision of the law.

658. (*Chairman.*) Has that system of making up a purse tended to increase promotion?—Promotion from all causes has not increased much; but no doubt it has to a certain extent occasioned acceleration of promotion.

659. That has been universally practised, has it not?—I believe very few officers retire without being induced to do so by their brother officers.

660. (*Sir Harry D. Jones.*) Supposing a Lieutenant-Colonel was entitled to retire upon 800*l.* for length of service, and he was still in a regiment, and they made up a purse for him, would he get the amount of that purse as well as the retiring allowance?—He is entitled to claim his pension, which cannot exceed 456*l.* a year, and he says to his brother officers, I cannot live upon my pension; my 565*l.* or 450*l.* will not maintain me and my family, but I am ready to accept it if you can make up a purse for me; and subscriptions in the regiment do take place with that object.

661. (*Sir H. J. W. Bentinck.*) Do you know what the amount given to a Lieutenant-Colonel is?—It varies very much.

662. What is the maximum sum?—I have heard of 6,000*l.*, but that is an unusually large sum.

663. (*Mr. Sydney Herbert.*) It is a separate bargain with each officer?—Quite so.

664. (*Mr. Edward Ellice.*) As the Court of Directors have informed the Government of India that it is under consideration to apply to Parliament to legalize that system, the Court of Directors must be of opinion that it would tend very much to accelerate promotion in the army?—So far as I know, it is their opinion that it would be disadvantageous to the army to check it. They have themselves stated, as I will read to the Commissioners:—“In the year 1837 the Government of India forwarded to the Court memorials from officers praying that the above order might be recalled. The Government stated that the practice of inducing time-expired officers to retire, although now for the first time brought to notice, had to some extent prevailed, and they expressed their opinion that such a practice must conduce to the contentment of the officers and to the efficiency of the army. The Government of India at the same time earnestly recommended ‘that the amount of consideration to induce retirement, as well as the mode in which the sum should in each case be raised, may be left as much as possible unshackled by any fixed rules, being firmly persuaded that such details will be more satisfactorily and more easily adjusted by the parties concerned.’ The Court of Directors replied, that they saw no necessity for interfering with the arrangements which the junior officers of a regiment may make in individual cases for adding to the comforts of a senior officer on his retirement from the service upon the pension to which he may be entitled. The regulation of 1798,” they observed, “requiring officers upon retirement to make oath that they have received no pecuniary consideration for quitting the service, has not been enforced by us in any single case of retirement in England during the period of nearly 40 years which has since elapsed.” It was established chiefly upon financial grounds, to prevent (as observed by Lord Cornwallis, when recommending other rules for the same object) an unreasonable load of pensions. This presumed necessity for the rule has, however, not yet been felt; on the contrary, additional facilities have been required, and have been given for enabling officers to retire upon full pay. We shall, therefore, continue to suspend the operation of the rule; and officers retiring from time to time will not be called upon to make the declaration, unless the financial necessity to which we have referred (and of which

“due notice shall be given) shall at a future period be fully realized.”

665. (*Chairman.*) In that memorandum which you have read it is stated that additional facilities had been latterly given for retirement. To what additional facilities does that refer?—The grant of pensions for length of service, irrespective of rank.

666. When was that?—In the year 1835.

667. That was done with the view of increasing the retirement?—It was.

668. (*Mr. Sydney Herbert.*) The results of that are included in the 200,000*l.* a year?—Yes, they are.

669. (*Chairman.*) Can you give any opinion as to the feelings of the officers in the army upon this subject of encouraging retirement by making up a purse?—I have no doubt, from their opinions expressed to me, that the officers are most anxious that it should be continued.

670. (*Mr. Sydney Herbert.*) Has it ever been expressed that it was viewed as a hardship upon the juniors that they were compelled, by the pressure of opinion in their regiment, to contribute to this purse?—I have heard that officers have stated that their private means were not sufficient, and that it was an ungracious position in which to be placed.

671. Are there any instances that you are aware of of officers successfully refusing to contribute?—Yes.

672. How many?—I have heard of them occasionally, but only as exceptions.

673. Are they sufficiently frequent that a man might do it without being ill-looked upon?—The feeling in the regiment would be this, that if he himself desired to retire, they would not assist him in the least afterwards.

674. I apprehend that they make a purse, not for the benefit of the officer that goes, but to get a step?—Very true, but there is this feeling in the regiment. If an officer, who has contributed for one or two purses, himself falls sick, and he is certain to be placed on the retired list immediately, the officers would still make up a purse for him. The feeling, on the other hand, as to one who has refused to contribute for steps, would be to let him take his own course.

675. (*Sir De Lacy Evans.*) Are there any instances of young officers who, supposing that they are obliged to do so, have, in order to comply with this custom, been compelled to raise money at a high rate of interest, and have thereby become seriously embarrassed?—I fear that there are instances of that.

676. (*Chairman.*) In the Artillery, is there the same system of making up a purse?—Yes; and it is more successful in the Artillery than in any other branch of the service, because they have a larger number of officers to unite together for that object.

677. Viewing it on the part of the Government of India, do you think that this system is, upon the whole, advantageous to the army or not?—I have no doubt that it is advantageous upon the whole, though there are instances in which it is disadvantageous.

678. Though there are some cases of hardship to officers, and therefore occasionally some discontent, upon the whole you consider it advantageous?—Undoubtedly.

679. (*Mr. Edward Ellice.*) You think that it is beneficial with a view to the efficiency of the service?—Yes.

This evidence of Mr Melville was fully corroborated by that of Sir Charles Trevelyan, K.C.B., and Lieutenant Sir Richard Hussey Vivian, K.C.B.

In 1858, it having been deemed advisable by Her Majesty's Government to transfer the forces of the East India Company to the Crown, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the organization of the army then serving in the pay, and under the control and management of the Honourable the East India Company, and to report as to the terms on which it was to be transferred to the Crown. The Commission consisted of the then Secretary of State for War, General Peel, the Commander-in-Chief H. B. Highness the Duke of Cambridge; the President of the Board of Control, Lord Stanley, &c. They did not report till the 7th March 1859, and in the interval the 21st & 22nd Vict. c. 106. had been enacted; when they did so, they thus summed up the terms on which the army of the East India Company had been transferred to the Crown.

Your Majesty's Commissioners observe, that the 56th clause of the Act for the better government of India, assures to the forces which now belong to your Majesty's Indian army, “the like pay, pensions, allowances and privileges, and like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company.”

The privileges and advantages thus referred to are detailed in the Appendix,* but may be briefly stated to consist in a prescriptive right to rise strictly by seniority to the rank and emoluments of Colonel of a regiment, with the option of returning before attaining that position, or after various periods of service, on a scale of pay or pension considerably higher than that granted to officers of your Majesty's army of the line. No change, therefore, can be made which would in any way disturb the system of promotion by seniority as affecting officers now in the

* Entered in extenso, as Appendix No. 4 of this statement.

casualty among these Colonels or Lieutenant-Colonels of Infantry (European or Native), the step of Colonel or Lieutenant-Colonel falls respectively to the senior Lieutenant-Colonel, or Major of the branch of the army to which the officer becoming a casualty belongs; and not to the regiment to which he may have been temporarily posted. The step of Major, however, falls to the senior Captain of the regiment to which the Major thus promoted belongs.

11. Prior to the late promotion orders under the Royal Warrant of 1854, any Infantry officer having reached the top of the general line or regimental list of Infantry Lieutenant-Colonels of either of the three armies, received, on occasion of a casualty occurring amongst the regimental Infantry Colonels, the rank of regimental Colonel, and with it all the rights and emoluments of that rank; but still, if belonging to the Madras and Bombay Infantries, until he became Colonel in the army by another line of advancement (to be hereafter fully described), he only ranked and served in the army of India as Lieutenant-Colonel, and was called "Lieutenant-Colonel Commandant;" the designation "Commandant" affixed, meaning a regimental Colonel, without the right to rank and command in the army as Colonel. This rule obtained equally in the Cavalry, and other branches of the armies of the three Presidencies; and was established under the order of 1836; declaring that advancement to the grade of army Colonel, should be regulated by the promotion of the senior Lieutenant-Colonel of the Bengal Infantry to the rank of regimental Colonel, in the general line or regimental list of the Infantry; but the provisions of this order were by the G. O. G. G. of 21st September 1855, declared to be cancelled.

12. The three Cavalry branches of the Indian army consisted 1 Colonel (up to the 1st May, 1857) of Native Cavalry alone, comprising 21 regiments, 10 of which belonged to the Bengal army, 1 Major, 7 Captains, 9 Lieutenants, 4 Cornets, and altogether 483 Cavalry officers.

Subsequently to the mutiny, however, the 10 regiments of Native Cavalry in Bengal were disbanded, and 5 regiments of European Cavalry substituted in their room, so that the Cavalry of the Bengal army is at present entirely European; the officers of the 10 native regiments being also transferred, each regiment of European Cavalry thus received 46 officers, double the number of officers fixed for a native regiment. The Cavalry of Madras and Bombay (entirely native), comprise together (as previously) 11 regiments, each with 23 officers; the whole number of officers for the Cavalry of the three armies (483 in grades as per margin) remaining the same as before the mutiny. In all the Native Cavalry corps, the regimental rise of the officers is carried on separately in each regiment, from cornet up to the grade of Major; advancement in the European regiments being carried on separately up to that grade in the two wings, until such time as the officers of both are absorbed by becoming field officers; but all officers posted since the union of the double set of officers, rising in one list to the grade of Major. After that rank, however, all the Cavalry field officers, of each army (in numbers as per margin) fall into one line of promotion: rising to the regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and Colonel, by seniority, in the same way as already explained for the Infantry.

Ranks.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.
Colonels -	10	8	3	21
Lieut.-Colonels -	10	8	3	21
Majors -	10	8	3	21
Total Field Officers	30	24	9	63
Captains -	70	66	21	147
Lieutenants -	90	72	27	189
Cornets -	40	32	12	84
Total Captains & subalterns -	200	160	60	420
Total of all grades	230	184	69	483

13. The established organization of the officers of the Artilleries of India was, up to the 27th August, 1858, based on the proportions of officers allowed to the Infantry, the fixed establishment being equal to the number allowed for 24 regiments of Infantry; but on that date, in partial assimilation of the grades and numbers of officers of the Artillery of India with those of the Royal Artillery, the ranks of Major and Second Lieutenant were abolished, the existing Majors being converted into Lieutenant-

Colonels, and only one grade of subalterns retained. The rank of Second Captain was at the same time introduced, the number of Captains being reduced from 168 to 144, so as to meet the additions made in the former rank; and these changes resulted in an increase of the whole number of officers, so that the Artillery of the three armies of India may now be considered as having 23 officers for each of the 24 battalions, instead of 26, as previously, and as in the Native Infantry regiments at the present date; the whole number of officers of the three Artillery Corps being therefore at present 696, in grades as per margin. The proportions of the different grades are equal in the three Artilleries, and therefore difference in number of officers does not appear to have rendered military advancement unequal to any great degree; but the augmentations given to the Bengal and Bombay Artilleries on two occasions (1826 and 1845), without proportionate advantages being given to the Madras Artillery, have occasioned serious derangement in the advancement of the Captains and subalterns of the latter corps. Regimental advancement is regulated separately in all three Artilleries, by seniority, the junior Lieutenant of each corps rising by succession up to the grade of regimental Colonel, without reference to the rate of promotion in other corps; and by the new rules under the Royal Warrant of 1854, any officer on attaining this rank regimentally, now also succeeds to the like rank in the army; whereas previously, the rank of Colonel in the army could only be attained by officers of Artillery, in the same way as explained for the other branches.

Officers of Artillery.				
Ranks.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.
Colonels -	12	7	5	24
Lieut.-Colonels -	24	14	10	48
Majors -	-	-	-	-
Captains -	72	42	30	144
2nd Captains -	72	42	30	144
Lieutenants -	168	98	70	336
Officers -	348	203	145	696

14. Simultaneously with the re-organization of the officers of Artillery in August 1858, changes similar in nature, but less extensive, were made in the three Engineer corps of the Indian army, the ranks of Major and Second Lieutenant being abolished, and that of Second Captain introduced; but, instead of the number of officers for each of the 11 battalions of Engineers being increased to 29 (as for each of the battalions of Artillery), there are only 27. The increase under this change was in fact only one officer per battalion of Engineers, the present number of subalterns in each, being therefore only 12 (two less than in the Artillery battalions), whilst the number of Captains and superior officers is the same; making up altogether 297 officers for the three Engineer corps, in grades as per margin. All these officers roll separately in each corps, from the junior Lieutenant up to Colonel; for example, the officers of the Bengal Engineers rise in succession through all grades, up to that of regimental Colonel, without regard to the relative rise in the five other corps of Artillery and Engineers, each of the six corps being entirely independent of the others; and under the changes made in consequence of the Royal Warrant of 1854, promotion to the grade of Colonel regimentally, now carries with it as in the other branches, the army rank of Colonel.

Officers of Engineers.				
Ranks.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.
Colonels -	5	3	3	11
Lieut.-Colonels -	10	6	6	22
Captains -	30	18	18	66
2nd Captains -	30	18	18	66
Lieutenants -	60	36	36	132
Total -	135	81	81	297

15. We have thus endeavoured to explain the system of regimental succession in the different arms of the Indian service, guaranteed to them in full integrity, by which the officers of each are certain of rising from the junior grade of Ensign, Cornet, and Lieutenant in their particular regiment and branch, to the pay and emolument of the highest regimental rank of Colonel, without hindrance from the promotions made in other branches. The following table showing the establishment of officers for the several branches of each of the three armies, as the same stood on 1st September 1853, exhibits also the numbers and grades of officers in each of the twelve corps.

13. The established organization of the officers of the Artilleries of India was, up to the 27th August, 1858, based on the proportions of officers allowed to the Infantry, the fixed establishment being equal to the number allowed for 24 regiments of Infantry; but on that date, in partial assimilation of the grades and numbers of officers of the Artillery of India with those of the Royal Artillery, the ranks of Major and Second Lieutenant were abolished, the existing Majors being converted into Lieutenant-

Armies.	Branches.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Majors.	Captains.	2nd Captains.	Lieutenants.	Cornets and Ensigns.	Total.	
BENGAL.	Artillery	12	24	-	72	72	168	-	248	
	Engineers	5	10	-	30	30	60	-	135	
	Cavalry	Europeans	8	8	8	56	-	72	32	184
		Natives	2	2	2	14	-	18	8	46
	Infantry	Europeans	10	12	12	84	-	132	60	310
		Natives	68	68	68	476	-	743	340	1,768
Total of Bengal Army		105	124	90	732	102	1,198	440	2,791	

APP. B.

Armies,		Branches.	Colonels.	Lieut.-Colonels.	Majors.	Captains.	2nd Captains.	Lieutenants.	Cornets and Ensigns.	Total.	
MADRAS.	Artillery	- - - -	7	14	- -	42	42	98	- -	203	
	Engineers	- - - -	3	6	- -	18	18	36	- -	81	
	Cavalry	Europeans	- - - -	8	8	8	56	- -	72	32	184
		Natives	- - - -	4	6	6	42	- -	66	30	154
	Infantry	Europeans	- - - -	52	52	52	364	- -	572	263	1,352
		Natives	- - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total of Madras Army			74	86	66	522	60	844	322	1,974	
BOMBAY.	Artillery	- - - -	5	10	- -	30	30	70	- -	145	
	Engineers	- - - -	3	6	- -	18	18	36	- -	81	
	Cavalry	Europeans	- - - -	3	3	3	21	- -	27	12	69
		Natives	- - - -	4	6	6	42	- -	66	30	154
	Infantry	Europeans	- - - -	29	29	29	203	- -	319	145	754
		Natives	- - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total of Bombay Army			44	54	38	314	48	518	187	1,203	
Grand Total of Indian Army			223	264	294	1,568	210	2,560	949	5,968	

When, therefore, in 1858, the advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise, then enjoyed by the military forces of the East India Company, were secured to them by the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 38, 56, and 58, the advantages as to pay were those laid down in App. No. 4; the advantages as to pensions were the retiring regulations of 1835, 1837, and 1854; the advantages as to privileges were that every officer could look forward to employment on the Staff, and to increase his chance of promotion by contributions for the purpose of inducing his seniors to retire; and his advantage as to promotion was, that no man could obtain substantive rank over his head, as guaranteed by the regulations of 1796.

It is submitted, by the officers of the Indian Artillery and Engineers, that Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106 was departed from in the following case:—On the 1st April 1858, the Governor-General of India, and on the 21st of May 1858, Lord Ellenborough, then President of the Board of Control, directed the attention of the Court of Directors to the necessity of an immediate consideration of the disadvantageous position of the officers of Engineers and Artillery, in the Company's service, in relation to that of the officers of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers.

On the 26th May 1858, the Court of Directors wrote to the Earl of Ellenborough to express their grateful sense of his Lordship's prompt recognition of the claims of the officers of the Company's Engineers and Artillery, to rank corresponding to that enjoyed by the officers of the Royal Engineers and Artillery serving in India:—adding, that it would be seen how pressing was the necessity for the measures proposed, in order to prevent injurious supersessions, which hurt the feelings of officers, and tended to interfere with that cordial co-operation which should always exist amongst them on service.

The sanction of the Secretary of State for War and of the Commander-in-Chief having been obtained, the following despatch was written by the Court of Directors to the Governor-General of India:—

MILITARY DEPARTMENT (No 183) of 1858, our GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA in Council.

1. We have given full and anxious consideration to the important subject of the relative rank held by officers of the Royal Engineers and Royal Artillery as compared with that of officers of the Company's Engineers and Artillery, as brought to our notice in numerous memorials, and in the letter from the Governor-General, dated 1st April 1858.

2. There are three points of differences in the two services which affect relative rank, viz:—

1st. In the Royal Service, Captains rise to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel regimentally, whilst in the Company's service there is the intermediate grade of Major.

2nd. In the Royal Service there are two grades of Captains, whilst in the Company's service there is only one grade.

3rd. In the Royal Service there is only one grade of subaltern, whilst in the Company's service there are two grades viz:—1st Lieutenant and 2nd Lieutenant.

3. On the first point we have resolved that the distinction between the two services shall be forthwith corrected; and that, accordingly, the regimental Majors in the Company's Engineers

and Artillery shall, on the receipt of this despatch, be promoted to the regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel with dates of rank from the dates of their regimental majorities; and that the commissions of the present Lieutenant-Colonels be ante-dated, in like manner to the dates of their regimental majorities; but without any retrospect as to pay and allowances; and that as vacancies occur, Captains of Artillery and Engineers shall succeed to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in their respective corps.

4. * * * * *

5. * * * * *

6. On the third point, viz., the grades of subaltern, we have resolved that the grade of 2nd Lieutenant shall be abolished, so that subalterns of Engineers and Artillery of the Queen's and Company's services shall take rank together, according to the dates of their first commissions. You will therefore issue to the present Lieutenants and 2nd Lieutenants, commissions as Lieutenants with date of rank from their first commissions, but without retrospect as to allowances, and hereafter, all appointed to these corps are to be commissioned as Lieutenants.

7. * * * * *

We are,
Your affectionate friends,

(Signed) F. CURRIE, and ten other Directors.

London, 8th July 1858.

By section 58 of the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106 all persons who at the time of the commencement of that Act, held any office, employment, or commission whatever, under the said Company in India, were henceforth to be deemed to hold such offices, employments, and commissions under Her Majesty, as if they had been appointed under the Act, and the transfer of anyone to the service of Her Majesty was to be deemed to be a continuance of his previous service, and was not to prejudice any claims to pension, or any claims on the various annuity funds of the several Presidencies of India, which he might have had if this Act had not been passed. By section 59, "All Orders, Regulations and Directions lawfully given or made before the commencement of this Act by the Court of Directors or by the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, shall remain in force, but the same shall, from and after the commencement of this Act, be deemed to be the Orders, Regulations, and Directions under this Act, and take effect and be construed and be subject to alteration or revocation accordingly." Under the provision of paras. 74 and 75, which refer to the dates from which the Act was to commence, and to take effect in England and in India, the Act had no effect in England until the 4th September 1858, nor in India till the date of its proclamation, viz., 1st November 1858. Consequently, the Orders of the Court of Directors promulgated in India on a date preceding either of these dates, in respect of the grant of commissions to, and alterations of dates of rank of the officers of Artillery and Engineers of their service; that is, their orders published by the Governor-General or the 27th August 1858, could in no way be affected by the Act, save by way of confirming the officers concerned in the enjoyment of the advantages of the commission so conferred on them. Nevertheless, on the 23rd July 1859, the Governor-General of India, under instructions from the Secretary of State for India, bearing date 14th

June 1859, thus rescinded by general order, the grant of the retrospective rank conferred by the Honourable Court of Directors, on their Artillery and Engineer officers.

His Excellency the Governor-General in Council is pleased to direct the publication of the following extract, paragraphs 1 to 4 from a military letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council, No. 199, dated 14th June 1859.

1. In reference to the despatch now under reply, I have reconsidered in Council the previous correspondence on the subject of inconveniences which have arisen from the operation of that part of the measure ordered by the late Court of Directors, for altering the organization of the Artillery and Engineer corps, by which the commissions of the Majors of those regiments, who were made Lieutenant-Colonels, as well as those of existing Lieutenant-Colonels, were ante-dated to the dates respectively on which they originally became Majors.

2. By my despatch, No. 67, dated March 1859, you were informed that the special consideration of the adjustment of rank in the Artillery and Engineer corps would be deferred until the full effects of the application to Her Majesty's Indian Forces of the Royal Warrant of the 14th of October 1858, shall have been reported.

3. In consideration, however, of your further communications "As a remedy, on this subject, of your strong recommendation, and the only one, coinciding with that of His Excellency which, in our opinion, will be effectual, we strongly recommend that, as the general supersession of officers of Cavalry suggested by the Commander-in-Chief and Infantry of the three Presidencies, which the back rank given has been occasioned by the ante-dating of the Lieut.-Colonels commissions of Majors and Lieutenant-Colonels, when introducing the recent changes in the organization of the Artillery and Engineer corps be cancelled." Engineer corps, Her Majesty's Government have determined to cancel the back rank given, under the orders of the late Court of Directors, dated 8th July, 1858, No. 183, to the Lieutenant-Colonels of Artillery and Engineers of the three Presidencies, and to the Lieutenants of those corps, respectively, and to direct that, following the rule which was adopted when the rank of Major was abolished in the Royal Artillery, their promotion shall take effect only from the date of the new organization coming into operation.

4. You are accordingly authorized to carry this decision into immediate effect.

With reference to the authority conveyed in the above communication, His Excellency the Governor-General in Council is pleased to declare that the rank assigned to the several Lieutenant-Colonels and Lieutenants of Artillery and Engineers at the three Presidencies, under the operation of the Government General order, No. 1,238, of the 27th August 1858,* shall be considered as cancelled, and that the commissions of the several Lieutenant-Colonels and Lieutenants promoted in consequence of the abolition of the grades of Major and 2nd Lieutenant, shall bear date the 27th August 1858.

In the year 1860 was passed the 23 & 24 Vict. c 100, and on the 10th April 1861, the following general order amalgamating the Army of India with the line, was published by the Governor-General of India in Council.—The Calcutta Gazette Extraordinary, Monday, 22nd April 1861.

(No. 332 of 1861.)

General Order by His Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council.

Fort William, Military Department,
10th April 1861.

His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, publishes, for general information, Her Majesty's warrant, dated the 16th of January last, for the formation of Staff corps in each of the Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, and the subjoined despatches, recently received from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, announcing the Queen's gracious intentions regarding the officers and men of Her Majesty's Indian forces.

2. Her Majesty's Government have laid down the general principles of this important measure; but, considering that various questions and points of detail, affecting the interests of the army, might arise, which could be best considered in India, have intrusted the Governor-General of India in Council, in communication with his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India, with full discretion to act as may be deemed best for the public service, and have authorized him to frame such orders as may be necessary to give full effect to the intentions of Her Majesty's Government.

3. The Governor-General in Council has now the satisfaction of announcing to the European officers and men of the Indian forces, the conditions prescribed and the offers made to them upon their amalgamation with Her Majesty's general forces; whereby two armies will be united, which severally have rendered the most signal services to their Queen and country.

4. Her Majesty's Government have expressed an anxious desire

to preserve the proud recollections of distinguished service which belong especially to the older regiments of each Presidency, and to incorporate with Her Majesty's army, corps which have so greatly contributed to the acquisition and maintenance of Her Majesty's dominions in the east.

5. In order to effect these measures consistently with the determination which has been previously made known to the army, that no man shall have his present terms of service altered except with his own consent, the Governor-General in Council, under the authority of Her Majesty's Government, hereby offers to all warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, without exception, belonging to the European Artillery, Infantry, and Sappers and Miners of the three Presidencies, to the European Cavalry in Bengal, including the Lahore Light Horse, to the German soldiers of the 3rd Bombay European regiment, and to all men in the depôts of the Indian forces at Dum-Dum, Barrackpore, and other stations, the option of accepting general service on the ordinary conditions of soldiers enlisted for the Artillery, Infantry, and Cavalry of Her Majesty's line army, with a bounty, to all who are not of warrant rank, at the rates to be presently stated.

6. Soldiers who now volunteer will have the option of choosing whether their future pensions shall be reckoned according to the regulations of Her Majesty's army or according to those of the Indian forces. Their choice may be declared at any time within three months of the date of volunteering.

Soldiers who now volunteer will have the privilege of counting their past service towards completion of their contract service and for pension, under whichever regulations they may choose.

7. The non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the Artillery of each Presidency, who, under the above conditions, may be willing to transfer their services absolutely to the royal regiments of Artillery of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, will be formed into new troops and batteries, composed of men serving under the same conditions as those of the Royal Artillery. The soldiers who may decline to accept the offer now made will be formed into batteries, which will remain under their original conditions, and as the numbers of the men diminished by casualties, the batteries will be gradually diminished in number, and will finally disappear.

8. Non-commissioned officers and men who have been transferred from other corps to the corps of Sappers and Miners, and who may now volunteer under the conditions of Her Majesty's general service, will receive the rates of bounty stated in paragraph 20. The acceptance of bounty will not involve their removal from the Sappers and Miners. Those who decline to accept the offer now made may continue with that corps on their present conditions.

9. The European Cavalry will be formed into three regiments of Light Dragoons of Her Majesty's general army, to consist of the men who may now volunteer on the conditions of general service, and these men will have the option of joining any one of the three regiments of Light Dragoons to be now formed. These will be designated respectively the 19th, 20th, and 21st regiments of Light Dragoons.

10. The non-commissioned officers and men of the European Cavalry and the Lahore Light Horse, who may prefer the existing conditions of Indian service, will be placed in a regiment of Cavalry to be formed for that purpose as a local regiment, with officers selected from those who may not volunteer for line service.

11. It is desired by Her Majesty's Government to maintain, as integral regiments, the three oldest European Infantry regiments of the Bengal Presidency, and all of the three regiments of the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, and to keep the men who are now in each of those corps, and who may volunteer for Her Majesty's general service, in the regiments which, when transferred to the line, will represent those to which they now respectively belong.

12. The men of the 4th and 6th Bengal European regiments, and the men of the Bengal European Infantry of the depôt at Barrackpore, will be allowed to volunteer for any of the three new regiments of the line in Bengal. The men of the Bengal European Light Cavalry of the depôt at Barrackpore, will be allowed to volunteer for any one of the three new regiments of the Cavalry of the line. The men of the Cavalry and Infantry arm of the depôt at Barrackpore who do not volunteer, will join the local regiment of their arm.

13. Her Majesty having graciously determined to mark her estimation of the services of her Indian armies, by conferring the designation of "Royal" upon three of the European regiments, and by selecting for this honour one regiment from each Presidency—the selection of which has been left by Her Majesty to the judgment and discretion of the Government of India,—the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council has much gratification in announcing that the following regiments will henceforward bear the honourable designation of "Royal" regiments:—

The 1st Bengal Fusiliers.
The 1st Madras Fusiliers.
The 1st Bombay Fusiliers.

14. The three older regiments in the several Presidencies, will thus be converted into regiments of Her Majesty's general army, and will be numbered and designated as follows:—

The 101st Regiment of Foot (Royal Bengal Fusiliers).

APP. B.

Non-commissioned officers and men
Despatch 27 para. 11.
Despatch 28, paras 1, 7, 10, 19, 22, 23, 26
Despatch 29, para. 10.

Despatch 29, paras. 2, 10, 12.

Despatch 30, para. 14.

Despatch 28, para. 19.

Despatch 28, paras. 10, 21

Despatch 28, paras 10, 11, 17, 23, 26.

Despatch 28, para. 10.

Despatch 28, paras 17, 23, 26 98.

- B. The 103d Regiment of Foot (Royal Bombay Fusiliers).
The 104th Regiment of Foot (Bengal Fusiliers).
The 105th Regiment of Foot (Madras Light Infantry).
The 106th Regiment of Foot (Bombay Light Infantry).
The 107th Regiment of Foot (Bengal Infantry).
The 108th Regiment of Foot (Madras Infantry).
The 109th Regiment of Foot (Bombay Infantry).

15. The corps transferred to Her Majesty's service will retain all honorary distinctions which they have won; these will be borne on appointments and colours, or in the Army List in such manner as Her Majesty's Government may think best suited to the arm of the service to which the corps belong.

16. The non-commissioned officers and men of the Infantry who may prefer the conditions of Indian service, will be placed in one or more regiments of Infantry, to be formed as local regiments in each Presidency, with officers selected from those who may not volunteer for line service.

17. In the Artillery, Cavalry (including the Lahore Light Horse), and Infantry of the Indian forces, there are many men who volunteered from regiments of the line. To these men the Governor-General in Council allows the option of returning to the regiments, whether of Cavalry or Infantry, from which they volunteered, if those regiments are now in India, or of transferring to other regiments of British Cavalry or Infantry serving in India, or to the regiments to be now retained of the arm to which such men belong. The men of this class electing to be transferred to British regiments serving in India will not receive bounty, having received it on entering the Indian service. To those who accept the conditions of Her Majesty's general service now offered bounty will be given on the same terms as to the other men in the Indian service. The volunteers here alluded to will be further allowed the option of discharge, if unwilling to remain in the service. Those who prefer the existing conditions of the Indian service will be allowed to remain with a local regiment.

18. The non-commissioned officers of Artillery, of the 4th and 5th Bengal European Cavalry, and of the 4th and 6th Bengal European Infantry, who volunteer for the new regiments of the line, will carry their rank with them, and be supernumeraries in the regiments for which they volunteer, being made effective in their respective ranks as vacancies occur, in the proportion of three appointments to four vacancies.

19. To the warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men employed in the several departments of the army, to the non-commissioned officers serving with native regiments, and to all other men borne on the unattached list in Bengal, and the lists of effective supernumeraries in Madras and Bombay, the Governor-General in Council offers the option of accepting the conditions of Her Majesty's general service, according to the arm of the service to which they belong, with bounty to all men not of warrant rank, who under the usual conditions of service, would be entitled to bounty, or of remaining on the conditions of the Indian service, if they prefer to do so

20. The rates of bounty to be issued will be as follows—

	Rs.
To men who have more than 4 years to serve from the 18th February 1861 - - - -	50
To men who have more than 3 and less than 4 years to serve from the same date - - - -	40
To men who have more than 2 and less than 3 years to serve from the same date - - - -	30
To men who have more than 1 and less than 2 years to serve from the same date - - - -	20
To men who have one year or less to serve from the same date - - - -	10

Any expense caused to a man by his transfer will be reimbursed to him. No kit, or compensation in lieu of kit, will be given.

21. The immediate issue of bounty to men volunteering is hereby authorized, on their making the declaration appended to this general order before a justice of the peace or magistrate.

22. The earliest measures will be taken in the three Presidencies, under the orders of their Excellencies the Commanders-in-Chief, to ascertain the wishes of the men; and the result will be reported to the Government of India without delay. The Commander-in-Chief in India may take the necessary measures for carrying out the final arrangements for the new constitution of the European forces of Her Majesty's Indian army, and for the disposal of the men who do not volunteer.

23. In the execution of the measures to bring about the proposed amalgamation, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that the pledge that due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces shall be scrupulously adhered to.

24. Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to give to every officer of her Indian armies a Royal Commission, under the sign manual, conferring rank and command in Her Majesty's army in any part of the world. Nominal rolls of all the officers of the armies of the three Presidencies will be immediately transmitted by the several Governments of India to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, in order to the preparation of the new commissions.

25. In order to carry out to the full extent the plan which has been determined upon by Her Majesty's Government for the assimilation and ultimate consolidation of the Indian regiments of Artillery with the Royal Artillery, the organization of the

Indian regiments will be as follows:—The Bengal Artillery will be formed into seven brigades, the Madras Artillery into four brigades, and the Bombay Artillery into three brigades, in all 14 brigades, each with the strength of officers detailed in the margin. Regimental promotions in the Artillery requisite to complete the formation of brigades on the new organization will be made without delay, with effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the despatches by the Government of India.

26. The officers of Artillery holding appointments in the Ordnance Department, including Superintendents of Ordnance manufacturing establishments, will be seconded, and the promotions consequent thereupon will be made from the same date.

27. Under the Royal Artillery organization, the Colonel's allowance is drawn by Colonels Commandant, and of these there will be seven only under the new organization, in place of 12 who now draw Colonel's allowance in Bengal; in Madras, four in place of seven; and in Bombay, three in place of five.

Eventually the assimilation will be carried out in this respect also. The five officers who will be supernumerary in Bengal, the three in Madras, and the two in Bombay, will continue to receive Colonel's allowance; and the necessary reduction will be gradually carried out, by promoting only three officers to every four vacancies in the number of those receiving Colonel's allowance, until the supernumeraries shall have been absorbed.

28. The Colonels now to be made Colonels Commandant, and the Colonels in excess of the new establishment, who are also in receipt of the Colonel's allowance, will take regimental rank as Colonels Commandant from the date on which they respectively received the Colonel's allowance. All general officers not being on the new fixed establishment of Colonels Commandant, and not drawing Colonel's allowance, will be supernumerary or unattached, as at present.

29. Colonels of Artillery, under the new organization, who not being Colonels Commandant, will not draw Colonel's allowance, will be permitted to draw in India the pay and allowances fixed for the rank of regimental Colonel (excepting the Colonel's allowance). On furlough they will receive the furlough pay of Colonel, viz. 25s. a day, and they will enjoy the privileges of regimental Colonels, in being permitted to reside in England, if not required in India, without forfeiting their position on the effective list.

30. Artillery officers willing to serve out of India, and who may be permitted to do so, will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery, and will draw the pay and allowances fixed by Her Majesty's regulations for that arm of the service, according to the situation and locality in which they may be serving, but their promotion will continue to go on in their original regiments.

31. The existing regiments of Artillery in the three Presidencies of India will remain distinct from each other and from the Royal Artillery, so long as any officers now in them shall continue to be borne on their rolls.

32. For the batteries formed of men who may accept the condition of Her Majesty's Royal Artillery, officers will be provided from the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Artillery regiments respectively; and they will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery concurrent with those which they now respectively hold in their regiments. For the batteries which may be formed on the conditions of the Indian service, officers will be provided from the same regiments.

33. No new appointments will be made to the Indian regiments of Artillery, but hereafter, on the occurrence of vacancies in any of the three Indian regiments, or in the Royal Artillery, appointments of young officers will be made to the Royal Artillery.

34. After all the subalterns in any of the Indian regiments of Artillery shall have been promoted, on the occurrence of the next vacancy in the grade of Second Captain in that corps, the senior subaltern of the Royal Artillery shall be promoted to that grade.

35. The same process will be followed in each grade successively, until all the officers of the Indian regiments of Artillery have been absorbed, after which the whole corps will be Royal Artillery.

36. The Engineer corps of Her Majesty's Indian forces will be immediately formed into three battalions for Bengal, and two each for Madras and Bombay, of the following strength respectively:—

1 Colonel Commandant,	8 Captains.
2 Colonels,	8 Second Captains,
5 Lieutenant-Colonels	24 Lieutenants,

37. The promotions in the Engineer regiments requisite to complete the formation of battalions on the new organization, will be made without delay with effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the despatches by the Government of India.

38. The Colonels of the Engineers who will become supernumerary under the new organization in the three Presidencies, will receive the regimental rank of Colonel Commandant from the date on which they came into the receipt of the Colonel's allowance, and will continue to receive that allowance. Their number will be reduced to that fixed by the new organization, by omitting to fill up one out of every four vacancies.

39. Colonels of Engineers, not being Colonels Commandant, will be in the same position as Colonels of Artillery, as described in paragraph 29 above.

2 Colonels,
4 Lieut.-
Colonels,
8 Captains,
9 Second
Captains,
including
an Adjutant,
24 Lieuts.

48 Total.
Despatch 27,
para. 6.

Despatch 29,
paras. 4, 5.

Despatch 29,
para. 6.

Despatch 29,
para. 7.

Despatch 29,
para. 8, 1.

Despatch 29,
paras. 10, 11.

Despatch 29,
para. 2, 11,
111.

Despatch 29,
para. 3, IV.

Despatch 29,
para. 3, V.

Despatch 29,
para. 6.

Despatch
para. 8.

Despatch
para. 9.

General
tenor of
Despatch 28.

Despatch 28,
para. 10.

Despatch 28,
para. 9.

Commis-
sioned
officers.
Despatch 27,
para. 3.

Despatch 31,
paras. 2, 4.

Despat
29,
para. 2, VI.
1 Colonel
Commandant.

All general officers not being on the new fixed establishment of Colonels Commandant, and not drawing Colonel's allowance, will be supernumerary or unattached, as at present.

40. Officers of the Indian Engineers will receive commissions in the Royal Engineers, but will rise by seniority in their respective regiments.

41. They will not be required to serve out of India unless at their own request, but will be eligible to serve anywhere, receiving the pay and allowances fixed for Royal Engineers in similar positions.

ch 30, 42. The places of Engineer officers of the Indian service who k. may elect, and who may be permitted to serve out of India on the above terms, will be filled up by officers of the Royal Engineers who may be willing to undertake the several duties required from Engineer officers in the Public Works Department,

ch 30, 43. The Engineer corps of the several Presidencies will s. continue to be, as at present, principally corps of officers having no European soldiers attached to them. But Engineer officers may be posted, as at present, as far as they can be made available, to the corps of native Sappers, which will be maintained on its present footing.

ch 30, 44. All fresh appointments of young officers will be made to the Royal Engineers, and when all the subalterns of any of the three Indian regiments shall have become Captains, the next vacancy in that regiment will cause the promotion of the senior subaltern of Royal Engineers, and the same process will be followed in the higher grades until all the officers of the Engineers shall have disappeared.

ch 27 45. Officers of Engineers now in Staff employ other than appointments in the Public Works or Survey Departments, and officers of Artillery now in Staff employ other than appointments with batteries of Native Artillery, or in the Ordnance Department, or as Superintendents of Ordnance manufacturing establishments in India, will be required to exercise the option of joining the Staff corps, or of not joining it in the same way as officers of Infantry or Cavalry, as hereafter explained. Officers of the Indian Artillery and Engineers now on Staff employ, who may not elect to join the Staff corps, and officers of the Indian Artillery and Engineers in general, will, in common with the rest of the army, be available for any duty to which they may be appointed.

sch 27, 46. The general gradation list of general and other officers of l. the armies of the three Presidencies, and their promotion therein will remain exactly as at present.

sch 27, 47. The promotion of field officers of Cavalry and Infantry will s. go on as usual, in separate regimental gradation lists of "Majors," "Lieutenant-Colonels," and "Colonels;" but a gradual reduction will be made in the number of regimental Colonels entitled to Colonel's allowance, in due proportion to the reduction in the number of regiments.

sch 27 48. The extent of this reduction will be determined hereafter; s. but, in pursuance of the instructions given in Despatch No. 27, paragraph 8, the Governor-General in Council now announces that the reduction will be commenced at once in Bengal, by promoting only three Lieutenant-Colonels for every four vacancies in the rank of Colonel regimentally, in the Cavalry and Infantry respectively. This arrangement will commence to operate from the 18th of February 1861, and will not include vacancies which occurred previous to that date.

sch 27, 49. The course of promotion of officers who belong to regi- 13. ments will, as heretofore, go on to the regimental rank of Major inclusive, and that of unposted officers as directed in the General Orders, No. 1,637 of 1859, No. 1,115 of 1860, and No. 214, 12th March 1861.

sch 27, 50. All the officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian 13. forces will be placed on two general lists of Cavalry and Infantry 23. respectively for each Presidency; those below the rank of Lieuten- 14, 16. ant-Colonel will, however, retain their places in the cadres of their old regiments, for the purpose of regulating promotion, as hereafter explained. These general lists will be distinct from that of the Staff corps, and form the existing gradation lists of each Presidency, and the gradation list of officers of all arms of the three Presidencies. From these two general lists officers of Cavalry and Infantry will be invited to volunteer for Her Majesty's general service, to the number required for the new regiments of Cavalry and Infantry respectively, according as such officers belong to either branch of the service. Those officers who may not be appointed to the new regiments of Her Majesty's line service, or to the Staff corps, will continue to be available as heretofore for their present duty, or for any other duty to which they may be appointed by Government. The general lists will be immediately formed in the three Presidencies, and measures

will be taken by the several Governments to ascertain the wishes of officers in regard to volunteering for Her Majesty's general service.

sch 28, 51. The officers of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Bengal Cavalry will 20. be permitted to volunteer for general service in the three regiments respectively representing those to which they now belong; and any vacancies that may then remain in the cadres of officers on the establishment of a Dragoon regiment, as laid down in paragraph 55, will be filled up in the 19th Light Dragoons by volunteers from the remaining officers of the Bengal Cavalry, in the 20th and 21st Light Dragoons by volunteers from the officers of the Madras and Bombay Cavalry respectively. In the event of vacancies still remaining in any of the three regiments, they will be filled by officers who may volunteer, selected from the general lists of Cavalry in the three Presidencies.

7186.

52. It is necessary that the officers of the three general service regiments of European Infantry to be now formed in each of the three Presidencies, should be generally under the conditions of service of line officers; and it is desired that they should be taken from among the officers of the Indian armies, and, as far as possible, from the old regiments, which will be respectively represented by the new.

53. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that such

of the officers as may have belonged to the three older local regiments shall be appointed respectively to the new regiments, representing those to which they belonged, and that it should be secured to them that they shall hold a position in the new regiments as far as possible the same as that which they held in the old ones.

54. Such of the German officers now attached to the 3rd Bombay European regiment, as may desire it, will receive commissions in their present grades in the 109th Foot.

55. The new regiments will consist of cadres of the strength noted in the margin,* exclusive of regimental Staff. From the officers who may volunteer for general service the number who may be required to fill up these cadres will be appointed by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India, subject to the approval of the Government of India. These officers will eventually receive new commissions from Her Majesty, bearing the same dates respectively as the commissions which they now hold.

56. The system of purchase, as practised in the Queen's army, is not to be introduced into these regiments. They will be seniority corps; but, in the promotion to field officers, the fitness and efficiency of the officers will be taken into account.

57. The commanding officers of the two reduced Bengal European Cavalry and Infantry regiments, the 4th and 5th Bengal Light Cavalry, and the 4th and 6th Bengal Infantry, are allowed to keep their command allowances for one year, unless otherwise provided for.

58. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that, notwithstanding the formation of the two general lists of Cavalry and Infantry in the several Presidencies, and of the Staff corps, the names of all officers shall continue to be borne on the cadres of their former regiments. Officers joining the Staff corps, or the new line regiments will, by so doing, forego promotion in their former cadres, and their names will continue to be borne on their former cadres, in *vacuus*, only for the purpose of regulating the promotion of their juniors; but by joining the Staff corps, or the new line regiments, officers will not prejudice their claims on the military and orphan funds and to retiring pensions under the Indian regulations.

59. Thus, the promotion of officers who do not join the Staff corps or the new line regiments will continue, as heretofore, to depend on their position in their former cadres; and the rise of officers in the new regiments, and in the Staff corps, will be entirely irrespective of their position in their former cadres, but will depend in the one case on their promotion in the new regiments, and in the other on their length of service.

60. The same rule will apply to promotion in the regimental gradation list of field officers, on which the names of officers transferred will be placed in the same position which they would have held had they not joined the Staff corps or volunteered for the new Line regiments. Thus, until the death or retirement of such officers, their names will remain on the rolls of the Indian army to regulate the promotion of their juniors.

NOTE.—The following illustration will show the operation of the new system:—

No. of Old Cadres.	General List.	Present Position.	101st Fusiliers	Cadre of Old 10th Native Infantry.
10th N I	Captains A	(101st Fusiliers)	Captains *	Captains *
4th "	" B	(General duties)	" "	" "
1st "	" C	(Staff Corps)	" "	" "
20th "	" D	(General duties)	" A	" "
1st "	" E	Do. - -	" "	" "
10th "	" F	(Staff Corps)	" "	" "
3rd "	" G	(101st Fusiliers)	" G	" "
	" &c.		" "	" "
			" "	" "
			" "	" "
20th "	Lieuts. H	(General duties)	Lieuts. K	Lieut. I (14 years service.)
10th "	" I	Do. - -	" M	" "
1st "	" J	Do. - -	" "	Lieut. F (12 years service.)
			" "	" "
			" "	" "
1st "	" K	(101st Fusiliers)	" "	" "
2d "	" L	(General duties)	" "	Lieut. M.
10th "	" M	(101st Fusiliers)	" "	" "
2d "	" N	(General duties)	" &c.	" "
4th "	" O	Do. - -	" "	" "
20th "	" P	Do. - -	" "	" "
3rd "	" Q	Do. - -	" "	" &c.
	" &c.		" "	" "

* CAVALRY.

1 Lieut.-Colonel.
2 Majors.
9 Captains } Including one
9 Lieutenants } troop for the
9 Cornets } depôt.
A Colonel will hereafter be appointed to each regiment.

INFANTRY.

1 Lieut.-Colonel.
2 Majors.
12 Captains } Including two
14 Lieutenants } companies at
10 Ensigns } the depôt.
A Colonel will hereafter be appointed to each regiment.

D

APP. B.

Despatch 23 para. 13.

Despatch 28 para. 15.

Despatch 23 para. 23.

Despatch 23 para. 15, 20.

Despatch 28 para. 14, and instructions.

Despatch 27 paras. 13, 14.

Despatch 27 paras. 13, 14.

Despatch 27 paras. 13, 14.

APP. B.

Suppose A to retire from the 101st Fusiliers, then K, the senior Lieutenant in that regiment, becomes Captain in it, and his name is included amongst the Captains on the general list; G, a Captain in the 101st, rising one step in the graduation of the corps; also I, the senior Lieutenant in the cadre of the old 10th Native Infantry, to which A belonged, becomes Captain, standing above K in the general list. Thus, the retirement of one officer has given two effective steps. But J, who stood before K in his former cadre, remains a Lieutenant.

Next, suppose C to retire from the Staff corps; no officer in that corps is promoted; but J, the senior Lieutenant on the cadre of the old 1st Native Infantry, to which C belonged, is promoted.

Now, suppose E to retire, then K would be promoted (nominally) in his old cadre, he being already a Captain in the 101st Fusiliers. Thus, in fact, E's retirement has given no effective step.

Again, suppose F to retire; then, as he is actually only a Lieutenant on his former cadre, he gives no step; the only result is, that M becomes senior Lieutenant on his old cadre.

Lastly, suppose G to retire; then M becomes Captain in the 101st Fusiliers, and on the general list; and Q also becomes a substantive Captain on the general list.

Also note, that F, an officer of 12 years' service, by joining the Staff corps, passed over I, his senior in the army, and in his former cadre.

The General List will then stand thus:—

Captains B	Lieutenants H
D	L
&c.	N
I	O
K	P
J	&c.
M	
Q	

Despatch 27,
paras. 4, 5, 13

61. It is intended by Her Majesty's Government that the regular Native Infantry regiments in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, and the regular Native Cavalry regiments in Madras, shall eventually be officered on the irregular system; and, therefore, that the number of their European officers shall eventually be fewer than at present. This change will be effected gradually, and each regiment, after the change shall have been made in it, will be officered from the general lists and from the Staff corps; and, as far as may be practicable, officers will be allowed to continue to serve with the regiments to which they have been attached.

62. It will be the anxious desire of the Government of India to carry out this important change, with due regard to the interest and claims of all officers now serving with the regular Native regiments of the army; and, meanwhile, officers commanding regiments, and all officers serving with them, will continue to draw the allowances they now receive.

63. The position and claims of the field officers of the army who are now unemployed, and for whom it may be difficult to find suitable employment under the new system, are also under consideration by the Governor-General in Council.

Despatch 27,
para. 4.

64. It is intended that the irregular regiments of Cavalry and Infantry in the three Presidencies shall each have six officers, besides the medical officer.

Despatch 27,
paras 12, 34,
Despatch 28,
para. 14.

65. It will be observed, that, in the Despatches, No. 27, paragraphs 12 and 34, and No. 28, paragraph 14, it is distinctly announced that the present and prospective advantages which officers now in the service derive from the Military and Orphan Funds, will be secured to them; and, further, that the retiring pensions, under the Indian regulations, will be scrupulously preserved. Officers ordered to serve out of India with their regiments will be allowed to count such service in completion of the period required, under the Indian regulations, for the several rates of pension. Officers who may serve out of India under any other conditions will be allowed to count for pension, in addition to their service in India, one year for every two years of their service out of India.

Staff Corps:
Royal
Warrant,
clause 1.
Despatch 27,
para. 6.

66. The organization and regulations of the Staff corps to be formed in the several Presidencies are given in full detail in the Royal Warrant, and the Despatch, No. 27, now published. The object of forming the Staff corps is to supply a body of officers for service in India, by whom various offices and appointments, hitherto held by officers borne on the strength of the several corps of the Indian forces, shall in future be held; it having been resolved that the practice of withdrawing officers for such employment, while remaining on the strength of their regiments, be discontinued; and that, ultimately, all officers selected for such employment be transferred to Staff corps.

Royal
Warrant,
clause 1.

67. These corps will be denominated the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Staff Corps, respectively, and will consist of such officers as may be required for employment therein, and may be selected by the Governments of the several Presidencies, with the approval of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Royal
Warrant,
clause 2.
Despatch 27,
para. 6.

68. Officers of the British and Indian armies, now on Staff employ in India, not having the substantive rank of Colonel, are eligible for admission to the Staff corps; and officers of either service, under the rank of field-officer, not now on the Staff, may, now or hereafter, become candidates.

69. Officers at present holding civil and political appointments of every description, and appointments in all public offices and departments; officers holding military appointments on the general and personal Staff, and the appointments of Commandant, Second in Command, and Adjutant of irregular and local corps; of Adjutant, and Interpreter, and Quartermaster of existing local European and Native regiments; will be held to be now on Staff employ, and will be eligible, under the conditions hereafter noted, to have their names placed on the list of the Staff corps; but, officers doing duty with irregular and local regiments will not be regarded as being in Staff employ.

70. So soon as the proposed changes in the organization of the regular native regiments shall have come into operation, the whole of the officers who will be permanently attached to them will be held to be on Staff employ.

71. There will then be, as at present, two great divisions of employment for officers of the Staff corps:—

1. Purely military, as in regiments of the Native army.
2. Various civil appointments, as political, public works, &c.

There will also be, practically, many subdivisions of employment, for each of which there will be, as at present, separate departmental lists.

72. Officers of the Indian army, now holding Staff appointments, of any description, will have the option of joining the Staff corps, if they do not possess the substantive rank of Colonel, or of continuing in Staff employment, whatever their regimental rank, without joining the Staff corps; and, in the latter case, they will not, as heretofore, be required to vacate their appointments on the attainment of a certain regimental rank. This paragraph does not affect the provisions of paragraph 45.

73. Officers of the Indian army, not now on the Staff, not having the substantive rank of Colonel, but who, within the last three years, or who, at the commencement of their present unexpired furlough, may have served permanently on the Staff, and who may make application within the next six months, will be considered eligible to join the Staff corps on the same terms as those now on Staff employ; provided always, that they have passed the prescribed examination in Hindostanee, and that they did not lose their appointments through misconduct, and are not otherwise disqualified.

74. Officers of the British army, now in Staff employment, will have the option of declaring their desire to be transferred to the Staff corps, with the consent of the Commander-in-Chief in India, within six months from the date of the notification of the Royal Warrant in India; or of retaining their appointments on their present footing, if their services are required by Government, for the unexpired portion of a period of five years from the date of their appointment, unless the regiments to which they belong shall be previously removed from the Indian establishment.

75. Those whose tenure of Staff appointments, at the time of transfer to the Staff corps, shall have exceeded one year, will not be subjected to probation, or to any introductory test other than those already prescribed for any department in which they may be serving; but officers who may have held their appointments for less than one year will not be transferred permanently to the Staff corps, unless they possess the requisite qualifications to be hereafter laid down, and shall have completed the period of probation to be prescribed. The option of joining the Staff corps will be open to those officers only who may be considered by the Governments under which they are serving to be in all respects fit for the Staff corps.

76. Appointments on the general Staff of the army specified in the margin, can only be held for five years; they may be held by officers of the Staff corps, or by other officers of either army, but will be subject henceforward to the limitations as to rank, which are laid down in the "Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army," in clauses 30 to 33 of the section entitled "Duties of General and other Officers employed upon the Staff of the Army."

77. Officers now holding such appointments will not be required to vacate them for a period of two years from this date, or a period of seven years from the date of their appointment.

78. Officers not having the substantive rank of Colonel, now holding appointments on the Staff, as defined in paragraph 69, will at once be called upon to declare whether or not they desire to join the Staff corps. To enable such officers to avail themselves of the advantages in the way of promotion, notified in paragraphs 84 and 85, they must communicate their decision to the Adjutant General within six months of the date of the publication of the Royal Warrant in India.

79. The selection of officers hereafter, for the Staff corps, will rest with the Governments in India, but no officer serving with any regiment will be admitted on probation without the consent of the Commander-in-Chief, or without a certificate from the commanding officer of his regiment, that he has efficiently performed his regimental duty for the period prescribed in paragraph 80.

80. For the future, officers not on the Staff will not be eligible for the Staff corps unless they be below the rank of regimental Field Officer, and have served three years with a regiment, of which two must have been in India, and have passed the prescribed examination in Hindostanee. They will not be permanently

appointed to the Staff corps, unless after due probation, they shall pass the prescribed tests for the branch of the Indian service for which they may be selected. This rule applies equally to officers of the British and Indian armies.

81. A subsequent notification will prescribe the period of probation, and the tests of qualification in the several departments.

82. The promotion of officers while on probation will go on in their respective regiments.

83. Officers of the British army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belong.

84. The promotion of officers of the Staff corps will be regulated as follows :—

Ensigns, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will have the rank of Lieutenant. Other officers will have the rank which they may hold in their regiments.

Officers of twelve years' service, of which four must have been in the Staff corps, will become Captains. After twenty years' service, of which six must have been in the Staff corps, they will become Majors. After twenty-six years' service, of which eight must have been in the Staff corps, they will become Lieutenant-Colonels.

Five years' service in the Staff corps, as Lieutenant-Colonel, will entitle the officer so employed to the brevet rank of Colonel.

85. Officers now in Staff employment will be allowed to count, to the extent laid down in the Royal Warrant, as noted in the preceding paragraph, their past services towards promotion, as if it had been performed in the Staff corps. One step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it according to the above rules. An interval of two years, at least, must intervene between each succeeding step. But these privileges will be restricted to those officers who, whether now in India or on leave out of India, may declare their desire to be transferred to the Staff corps, within six months of the date of the notification of the Warrant in India.

86. The officers referred to in paragraph 73, will also be allowed this privilege, should they be permitted to join the Staff corps.

87. The past service on the Staff, counting for promotion in the Staff corps, will include any service of a permanent nature which an officer now on the Staff may, from the date of his first arrival in India, have passed on the Staff.

88. Officers of the Staff corps, under the substantive rank of field officer, will be allowed to exchange with regimental officers of the line of the same rank, on the recommendation of the Governments of the several Presidencies, with the concurrence of the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India, and subject to the confirmation of Her Majesty. But it is to be understood that the regimental officer entering the Staff corps by exchange will not necessarily assume the Staff appointment held by the officer with whom he exchanges. He will merely enter the Staff corps on being found qualified for the department of the Staff on which the Government may desire to employ him. Officers of the Staff corps exchanging into a regiment will become the juniors of their regimental rank.

89. An officer of the Staff corps, whose name is borne on the cadre of an Indian regiment, exchanging from the Staff corps with an officer of a British regiment, other than the new line regiments about to be formed, will give an effective step in the cadre of his former regiment.

90. It will be discretionary with the Governments in India, as at present, to employ the officers of the Staff corps in such manner as they may think best, in the situations for which their respective qualifications may render them most fitted. The appointments and promotions in the several departments will rest, as at present, with the Governments in India, and will be made irrespectively of the rank which the officer may hold in the Staff corps. Those appointments, promotions, and recommendations now in the gift of the Commanders-in-Chief remain as heretofore.

91. Officers of the Staff corps of one Presidency may, with the sanction of the Government of India, be employed in any other Presidency.

92. Unattached officers of the Indian service are eligible for the Staff corps on the same terms as other Indian officers.

93. Officers of the Staff corps, while on furlough, will draw the pay of their rank, as laid down in the clause of the Royal Warrant for officers out of India, and in case of sickness will have the privilege of drawing for six months the allowances of officers on sick leave in India. They will be allowed to retain their appointments during short periods of leave, not exceeding 20 months, during which time they will only receive the unemployed pay of their rank. With the above exceptions, the officers of the Staff corps will be under the new furlough regulations of the Indian army.

94. A certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps will receive Colonel's allowance. Eventually the number will be fixed in the proportion of one for every 30 officers on the Staff corps, but this number can only be filled up as the establishment of Colonels on the old footing diminishes, so that the aggregate number of officers receiving Colonel's allowance at one time shall never exceed the regulated number of Colonel's allowance for each Presidency.

95. Officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the regulations of the Indian service. Officers of the British army entering the Staff corps will be allowed to retire on the following scale of pension, provided that not less than half of the required periods of service shall have been passed in the Staff corps :—

SCALE.	£	s.	d.
	Per annum.		
After 20 years' service in India	-	191	12 0
" 24 " " "	-	292	0 0
" 28 " " "	-	365	0 0
" 32 " " "	-	456	5 0

These periods of service will include the proportions of leave of absence in India or elsewhere, laid down in the new furlough Regulations, viz. :—

2 years in 20 years' service.
3 " 25 " "
4 " 30 " "

96. All officers of the Staff corps in England who may not wish to retire, but are unable to return to India, and officers removed from the effective list of the Staff corps who may not be entitled to retire on the above scale of pension, may, provided they have served three years in India in the Staff corps, be placed on a half-pay list, on the same rate of half-pay and on the same conditions as officers of a similar rank in the British army. Officers belonging to the Indian forces who may avail themselves of this privilege, will give an effective step in the cadres of their regiments. Officers placed on half-pay will be eligible to return to effective service, either in the Staff corps, or in regiments of the line. In the former case their names will not be restored to their old cadres.

97. No unemployed general officer of the Staff corps, who is not required by the Governments in India to remain there, will be allowed to receive pay on the Indian scale for a longer period than three years. At the expiration of that period he will be restricted to the pay fixed for officers of his rank "out of India." This rule in no way affects the Colonel's allowance.

98. Officers of the Staff corps under the rank of Major-General, whom the Governments of India may not see fit to employ in any capacity, will not be allowed to draw pay for more than four years, of which one year may be on the Indian scale, and three years on the scale fixed for officers "out of India," after which period they will be placed on half-pay, or on pension according to the scale of their rank, if entitled thereto.

99. The pay of officers of the Staff corps whilst unemployed has been fixed at the following rates :—

	WHILST REQUIRED TO REMAIN IN INDIA.			OUT OF INDIA.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	£	s.	d.
General officers -	1,295	5	0	per mensem	-	1 5 0
Brevet - colonel and lieutenant-colonel -	827	14	0	" "	-	1 0 0
Major -	640	14	0	" "	-	0 16 0
Captain -	374	1	6	" "	-	0 10 6
Lieutenant -	225	12	0	" "	-	0 6 6

100. The pay and allowances to be established for the several Staff appointments, in all departments of Staff employ, will be announced in a subsequent notification, and, meanwhile, the Staff salary and other allowances of all appointments will remain unchanged.

101. Officers of the Staff corps are eligible for brevet rank, and will take their places on the general gradation list in common with the rest of the army. Those holding military appointments will take military command according to their army rank, but officers whilst holding only civil appointments will not be entitled to assume such command. Civil appointments are those in any civil branch of the army, or under the civil administration of Government.

102. Officers of the Staff corps will succeed to Colonel's allowance according to their seniority as Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff corps. Lieutenant-colonels entering the Staff corps on its first establishment will take rank for Colonel's allowance according to the dates of their commissions as substantive Lieutenant-Colonels. All officers entering the Staff corps will take with them the substantive rank they held at the time of joining it. Should two officers of the same rank enter the Staff corps, and be promoted on the same day, they will stand in the corps according to the dates of their previous substantive commissions. But officers of the Staff corps will take precedence and exercise command among each other, according to their army rank.

103. All promotions in the Staff corps, in the case of officers who may join the Staff corps within six months of the publication of the Royal Warrant, will take effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the Warrant in India.

104. The power of removing officers from the effective list of the Staff corps will be exercised by Her Majesty through the Secretary of State for India.

105. The provisions of paragraph 90 are also applicable to appointments in the Ordnance, Survey, and Public Works Departments.

APP. B.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 9 Despatch 27, para. 29.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 10, Despatch 27, para. 31.

Despatch 27, para. 33

Despatch 27, para. 33.

Royal Warrant, clause 8, Despatch 27, para. 31.

Despatch 27, para. 23.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, paras 4, 5.

Royal Warrant clause 7,

APP. B.
Despatch 81,
paras. 6, 6.

106. The promotion of officers of the Indian armies, on the occurrence of vacancies, will be notified, as heretofore, by the Governments of India, in the "Official Gazette," and will be stated to be "subject to Her Majesty's approval." Periodical lists of these promotions will be submitted to the Secretary of State for India, that measures may be taken, for the preparation and signature of corresponding commissions. Pending the receipt of these commissions the officers provisionally promoted by the Indian Governments will enjoy the pay, provision, and privileges of the rank to which they may have been advanced.

(Signed) H. J. H. BACH, Major-General,
Secretary to the Government of India.

ROYAL WARRANT.

VICTORIA R.

WHEREAS it is expedient to provide a body of officers for our service in India, by whom various offices and appointments hitherto held by officers borne on the strength of the several corps or regiments of our forces in India shall in future be held; and whereas our Secretary of State for India in Council has resolved to charge upon the revenues of India the sum necessary to provide the pay, half-pay, and pensions of such body of officers, on the scale herein-after contained; and our will and pleasure is, that a corps be formed in each of the Presidencies of our Indian dominions, to be denominated the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Staff corps, respectively, to consist of such officers as may be required for such employment, and are selected for such purpose by our Governments in India, with the approbation of our Secretary of State for India in Council.

It is also our will and pleasure that all officers now holding, or who immediately before the commencement of their present unexpired furlough, may have held such appointments, and, in future, officers belonging to any of our land forces serving in India, under the rank of regimental field officer, who shall have served three years with a regiment, of which two shall have been in India, shall be eligible to enter such Staff corps; but such officers will not be permanently transferred to the Staff corps unless fully qualified, and until they shall have passed such periods of probation as may be determined on for the branch of the Indian service for which they may be selected. Officers will receive commissions in the Staff corps on their names being submitted to us by our Secretary of State for India.

It is our further will and pleasure that the promotion and pay of the Staff corps shall be regulated as follows:—

1. Ensigns, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, to have the rank of Lieutenant. Other officers to have the rank which they may hold in their regiments.

2. Promotion in the Staff corps to be governed by length of service.

Officers after 12 years' service, of which four must have been in the Staff corps, to become Captains.

After 20 years' service, of which six must have been in the Staff corps, to become Majors.

After 26 years' service, of which eight must have been in the Staff corps, to become Lieutenant-Colonels.

Five years' service in the Staff corps as Lieutenant-Colonel to entitle the officer so employed to the brevet rank of Colonel.

3. Officers now in Staff employment in India, joining the Staff corps on its formation, shall count their previous Staff service towards promotion to the following extent:—

One step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it, according to the above rules. An interval of two years at least must intervene between each succeeding step.

4. Officers in the Staff corps will be eligible for brevet rank in common with the rest of the army.

5. Officers of the Staff corps holding military appointments, will take military command according to their army rank; but officers, whilst holding only civil appointments, will not be entitled to assume such command.

6. Exchanges may be allowed between officers of the Staff corps under the substantive rank of field officer, and regimental officers of the same rank, on the recommendation of the Indian Governments. Officers of the Staff corps exchanging into a regiment will become the juniors of their regimental rank.

7. The power of removing officers from the effective list of the Staff corps will be exercised by us through our Secretary of State for India.

8. Officers of the Staff corps will receive pay according to the following scale:—

WHILST REQUIRED TO REMAIN IN INDIA.		OUT OF INDIA.	
	R ^s . a. p.		£ s. d.
General officers -	1,295 5 0 per mensem	-	1 5 0 per diem.
Brevet - colonel and Lieutenant			
Colonel -	827 14 0	"	- 1 0 0
Major -	640 14 0	"	- 0 16 0
Captain -	374 1 6	"	- 0 10 6
Lieutenant -	225 12 0	"	- 0 6 6

Every officer when in active employment will also receive, in addition to the above pay, such a sum as will make his total pay and allowances up to the sum assigned by the Governments in India, with the approval of the Secretary of State for India in

Council, as the consolidated pay of the office which he may hold. Eventually a certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps will receive Colonel's allowance.

9. Officers of the Staff corps will be allowed to retire on the following scale of pension, provided that not less than half of the required periods of service shall have been passed in the Staff corps:—

SCALE.

	£	s.	d.	
After 20 years' service in India -	191	12	0	per annum.
" 24 " " -	292	0	0	"
" 28 " " -	365	0	0	"
" 32 " " -	456	5	0	"

Officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the regulations of the Indian service.

10. Officers of the Staff corps in England who may not wish to retire, but who are unable to return to India, and officers removed from the effective list who may not be entitled to retire on the above scale of pension, will be placed on a half-pay list, provided they have served three years in India in the Staff corps on the same rate of half-pay, and on the same conditions as officers of a similar rank in our army.

11. It is also our will and pleasure that this warrant shall be administered and interpreted by our Secretary of State for India in Council, who shall be the sole and standing authority upon the matters therein contained.

Given at our Court at Windsor, this 16th day of January 1861, in the twenty-fourth year of our reign.

By Her Majesty's command,
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

DESPATCH, No. 27.

(Military, No. 27.)

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council.

My Lord, India Office, London, 18th January 1861.

I have the honour to forward for your information and guidance, copies of a royal warrant, authorizing the formation of Staff corps for each of the three Presidencies in India. You will cause the institution of these corps to be notified in such manner as may seem to you best calculated to make the provisions contained in the Warrant generally known, and to afford to such officers as may wish to join the new corps the opportunity of doing so.

2. I proceed, at the same time, to communicate to your Lordship the general views of Her Majesty's Government as to the measures to be adopted in reference to the officers of Her Majesty's Indian army.

3. In the execution of those measures, the pledge that due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces will be scrupulously adhered to.

4. The events of the late mutiny have impressed upon Her Majesty's Government the absolute necessity of a large reduction of the native army; and, with a view to that economy which is imperatively called for by the state of Indian finance, it appears to them that the number of officers hitherto attached to the native regiments, organized on what is called the regular system, may be considerably reduced. Your Lordship has recommended that six European officers should be employed with those regiments which are formed on the irregular system, and your Lordship has already received the sanction of Her Majesty's Government to this arrangement. I am of opinion that a very considerable saving will thus be effected, as nearly one-half the charge of a regular regiment consists of the pay and allowances of its officers. I am inclined to believe, also, that the efficiency of the regiments will in no respect suffer, whilst an opportunity will be given of raising the character of position of the native officers, and, probably, of affording an opening for the employment of natives of higher position, which I consider to be an object of considerable importance.

5. The irregular native regiments, both of Infantry and Cavalry, have hitherto been officered by officers specially appointed to them. There is also a large number of appointments of different kinds, political, civil, &c., held by officers, and comprehended under the general name of Staff employment. For both these descriptions of employment, officers, though borne on the strength of their regiments, have been taken. Indeed, the number of officers borne on the strength of regiments has been increased beyond that required for regimental duty, expressly in order to allow of their being so taken away. In addition to this, application was some years ago made by the Government in India to the Home Government, that officers in the regiments of the line stationed in India might be similarly employed, and arrangements were made as to the number and rank of the officers of such regiments, in order to allow of this being done.

6. This system of withdrawing officers for such employment, while permanently remaining on the strength of their regiments, has been condemned by various high authorities as impairing the efficiency of the regiments; and it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that it should be discontinued, and that, ultimately, all officers selected for such employment should be transferred to Staff corps, which will be formed expressly for this service. There will be, as at present, two great divisions of employment for officers of the Staff corps:—

- 1st. Purely military, as in regiments of the native army.
- 2nd. Various civil appointments, as political, public works, &c.

General Order, paras. 66, 67.

General Order, paras. 68, 72, 73, 75, 80, 86.

General Order, para. 84.

General Order, para. 84.

General Order, para. 85.

General Order, para. 101.
General Order, para. 101.

General Order, para. 88.

General Order, para. 104.

General Order, paras. 93, 99.

General Order, para. 90.

General Order, para. 85.

General Order, para. 86.

General Order, para. 23.

General Order, paras. 61, 6.

General Order, para. 61.

General Order, para. 66.

General Order, para. 71.

There will also be practically many sub-divisions of employment, for each of which there may be, as at present separate departmental lists.

The Staff corps will be drawn from the two classes of officers which at present furnish officers for Staff employment, viz., the officers of Her Majesty's general army serving in India, and those of Her Indian army.

7. The list of general officers of the Indian Army and their Promotion will remain exactly as at present. It will be desirable to provide for the early consolidation of the list of officers attaining this rank in the general and Indian branches of Her Majesty's service, but this subject requires further consideration, and will form the subject of a separate Despatch.

8. The promotion of field officers will go on as usual, in separate lists of " Majors," " Lieutenant-Colonels," and " Colonels regimentally " of Cavalry and Infantry; but a gradual reduction will be made in the number of regimental Colonels entitled to Colonel's allowances, in due proportion to the reduction in the number of regiments. The extent to which this reduction is to be carried will be determined hereafter; but it must be commenced at once in Bengal, by promoting only three Lieutenant-Colonels for every four vacancies in the rank of Colonel regimentally.

9. Officers of the Royal or Indian corps of Engineers who may be employed in the Public Works or Survey Departments, and officers of the Royal or Indian regiments of Artillery doing duty with batteries of native Artillery, or employed in the Ordnance Department, or as Superintendents of Ordnance manufacturing establishments in India, will not be required to relinquish their regimental position; but Artillery officers holding appointments in the Ordnance Department will be seconded, and officers of either of these regiments accepting any other description of Staff employ than those above specified will be subject to the same rules as officers of Infantry or Cavalry of the line or local services respectively.

10. The Act 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, of the last Session of Parliament, prohibits the further enlistment of troops for the local European army of India; and under the operation of that Act, the European regiments of the local army would in course of time be extinguished. But it is the desire of Her Majesty's Government to preserve, in the ranks of the British Army, the names and traditions of certain of the older European regiments of the late East India Company's service, and to convert these regiments at once into regiments of Her Majesty's line army.

11. The details of the measures by which this object is to be effected are communicated to you in a separate Despatch of this date; and it is sufficient to state here that no soldier of the local army will have the conditions of his service altered without his own consent; and that the proper establishment of officers for the converted regiments will be filled up with officers of the local army who may volunteer to transfer their services to the line, and who will thenceforth rise by seniority in the regiments to which they may be posted.

12. The present and prospective advantage which these officers derive from the Military and Orphan Funds will be secured to them, and they will be allowed retiring pensions under the present rule (two years' future service out of India counting as one year in India in completion of the service required for the several grades of pension).

13. In my Despatch, No. 31 of this date, you are informed that commissions from Her Majesty, conferring rank and command in Her armies, will be given to all the European commissioned officers of Her Majesty's Indian army; but these commissions, like those which they now hold from the Commander-in-Chief in India, will not contain an appointment to particular regiments. The European commissioned officers of Cavalry and Infantry will be placed on two general lists of Cavalry and Infantry for each Presidency. Those officers who may not join the Staff corps or regiments of the line will be available for any duty to which they may be appointed, either continuing to serve with the regiments to which they have been attached, or in Staff employment, or otherwise, at the discretion of the Governments of India. The promotion of officers who have been posted to regiments will go on to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, in conformity with the usages of the Indian army, by regimental seniority, and that of unposted officers in the manner specified in my Despatches, Nos. 343 of 30th September 1859, paragraph 5, and 287 of 31st July 1860.

14. Officers of the local army who may be transferred to the Staff corps will thenceforward be promoted under the rules of that corps. Their names, however (which may be printed in *stakes* in the army list), will remain on the rolls of the Indian army, and the promotion of the officers who do not join the Staff corps will be unaffected by their removal, and will be made in the same manner as if these officers had not joined the Staff corps. The same rule will apply to promotions in the general lists of field officers, on which the names or officers so transferred will be placed in the same position which they would have held had they not joined the Staff corps. Thus, until the death or retirement of such officers, their names will remain on the rolls of the Indian army, to regulate the promotion of their juniors.

15. Appointments on the general Staff of the army, specified in the margin, can only be held for five years, either by officers of the Staff corps or by other officers, and will be subject to the limitations as to the rank of the officers holding them, which are laid down in the " Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army,"

in clauses 30 to 33 of the section entitled " Duties of General and other Officers employed upon the Staff of the Army."

16. Officers of regiments of the line now in Staff employment other than the appointments specified in the margin, will have the option of joining the Staff corps, with the consent of the Commander-in-Chief in India, within six months from the date of the notification of the Warrant in India, or of retaining their appointments on their present footing, if their services are required by your Government, for the unexpired term of a period of five years from the date of their appointment, unless the regiment to which they belong shall be previously removed from the Indian establishment.

17. Officers in the local army holding such appointments, if they do not join the Staff corps, may be allowed to continue in Staff employment without vacating their appointments on the attainment of a certain rank, or will be at the disposal of Government for such other service as they may be competent to perform.

18. Officers now holding Staff appointments, who have held them for short periods only, will not be transferred permanently to the Staff corps unless they shall possess the requisite qualifications, and until they shall have completed the period of probation that may be prescribed for the department in which they may be serving.

19. The option of joining the Staff corps, referred to in the foregoing paragraphs, will be open to those officers only who may have fulfilled the conditions prescribed for original appointments previously to their being transferred to it, and who may be considered by your Government to be in all respects fit for the Staff corps.

20. The selection of officers for the Staff corps will rest with the Governments in India. No officer, however, should be admitted on probation without the consent of the Commander-in-Chief, and without a certificate from the commanding officer of his regiment that he has efficiently performed his regimental duty for the prescribed period. I desire that, after communication with the Governments of Madras and Bombay, your Government will prepare a scheme of the tests and periods of probation suitable for the several departments of military and civil Staff employment.

21. The promotion of officers while on probation will go on in their respective regiments. Officers of the British army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belonged.

22. It will be discretionary with the Governments of India to employ the officers of the Staff corps, in such manner as they may think best, in the situations for which their respective qualifications may render them most fitted. The appointments and promotions in the several departments will rest with the Governments in India, and will be made irrespectively of the rank which the officer may hold in the Staff corps.

23. Officers of the Staff corps, whilst employed, will receive, in addition to the pay of their rank, such a sum as will make up the salary and allowances which may be assigned to the office which they hold. When unemployed they will receive pay, or half-pay, on the scale fixed in the Warrant, according to their military rank. It is desirable that you should at once prepare a list of all officers in Staff employ, and of the situations filled by them, with the amount of salary which you consider suitable for each appointment respectively.

24. The aggregate number of officers of the Staff corps will be strictly limited, with a due allowance for furlough and sick leave, to the number of appointments which the Governments of India require to be filled by officers of that corps.

25. In these, as in all other matters, the proceedings of the Governments in India will be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

26. It is provided in the Warrant that officers now in Staff employment in India, on joining the Staff corps on its formation, may count, to a certain extent, their past Staff service, towards promotion only, as if it had been performed in the Staff corps. This privilege will be restricted to those officers who may join the Staff corps within six months of the date of the notification of the Warrant in India.

27. The exchange permitted by the 6th rule of the Warrant between officers of the Staff corps under the substantive rank of field officer and regimental officers of the same rank, can only be made with the sanction of the Government and Commander-in-Chief in India, and will be subject to confirmation by Her Majesty. No officer will be allowed to exchange into the Staff corps unless he be duly qualified for the department of the Staff on which the Government desire to employ him.

28. Officers of the Staff corps of one Presidency may, with the sanction of the Government of India, be employed in any other Presidency.

29. The periods of service specified in the 9th rule, as a title to pensions of various amounts, will include the proportions of leave of absence in India or elsewhere, laid down in the new furlough regulations, viz. :—

2	years	in	20	years'	service.
3	"	"	25	"	"
4	"	"	30	"	"

30. The 8th rule provides that a certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps shall receive Colonel's allowance. Eventually the number will be fixed in the proportion of one for every thirty officers on the Staff corps, but this number can only be filled up as the establishment of Colonels on the old footing

APP. B.

Department.
Brigade-
Majors
and Fort,
Adjutants,
Personal
Staff.
General
Order,
para. 74.

General
Order,
para. 72.

General
Order,
para. 75.

General
Order,
paras. 77, 80.

General
Order,
para. 79, 80,
81.

General
Order,
paras. 82, 83.

General
Order,
para. 90.

General
Order,
paras. 99, 100.

General
Order,
paras. 73, 67,
85.

General
Order,
para. 88.

General
Order,
para. 91.

General
Order,
para. 95.

General
Order,
para. 94.

APP. B.

General
Order,
para. 91.

diminishes, so that the aggregate number of officers receiving Colonel's allowance at one time shall never exceed the regulated number of Colonel's allowance for each Presidency.

31. The 10th rule specifies the circumstances and conditions under which an officer of the Staff corps may be placed on a half-pay list, analogous to that of a regiment of the British army. Such officers will be eligible to return to the effective service either in the Staff corps or in regiments of the line, and will enjoy all the privileges of officers on the half-pay of the British army.

General
Order,
para. 93.

32. Officers of the Staff corps while on furlough will draw the pay of their rank, as laid down in the clause of the Royal Warrant for officers out of India, and in case of sickness will have the privilege of drawing for six months the allowance of officers in India. They will be allowed to retain their appointments during short periods of leave, not exceeding 20 months, during which time they will only receive the unemployed pay of their rank. With the above exceptions, the officers of the Staff corps will be under the new furlough regulations of the Indian army.

General
Order,
paras. 97, 98.

33. No unemployed general officer of the Staff corps, who is not required by the Government in India to remain there, will be allowed to receive pay on the Indian scale for a longer period than three years. No unemployed officer of the Staff corps under the rank of Major-General will be allowed to draw pay for a longer period than one year on the Indian scale, and three years on the lower scale, after which period he will be placed on half-pay.

General
Order,
para. 65.

34. The best method of dealing with the Military and Orphan Funds of the three Presidencies is now under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. The Governments of India will be prepared to assume the liabilities of the funds, as far as may be requisite to maintain existing pensions, and to secure to the subscribers and their families the benefits to which they are entitled under the present system.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

DESPATCH No. 28.

(Military.—No. 28.)

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council.

India Office, London,
18th January 1861.

My Lord,
In my Military Despatch No. 348, dated 5th September, paragraph 15, I communicated to you the intention of Her Majesty's Government that "the European non-commissioned officers and soldiers who have enlisted for the Indian forces up to the present time will continue to serve in India during the term of their engagement, on precisely the same conditions and with the same privileges in regard to pension as they now enjoy, and that, at the expiration of their contract period of service, they will, if fit, be permitted to re-enlist for general service, with the privilege of counting their past service for pension under the Regulations of Her Majesty's army." And in reiterating that pledge in my Despatch No. 414 of the 31st October, I added that it is not contemplated by Her Majesty's Government to transfer any soldier of Her Majesty's Indian forces, without his own consent, to a regiment of the line.

General
Order,
para. 6.

2. At that time it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to retain for the present the existing designations of the European regiments of Her Majesty's Indian army, to recruit such of them as are to be retained permanently with men raised for general service, on the ordinary conditions of Infantry and Cavalry soldiers enlisted for Her Majesty's line army; and when all the soldiers engaged for local service had been replaced by general service men, to complete the assimilation of these regiments with the regiments of Infantry and Cavalry respectively of the British service.

General
Order,
para. 4.

3. Her Majesty's Government were anxious to preserve the proud recollections of distinguished service which belong especially to the older regiments of each Presidency, and to incorporate in Her Majesty's army those corps which have so greatly contributed to the acquisition and maintenance of Her Majesty's dominions in the East.

4. They were not unaware that some difficulties might have been found from placing in the same regiment men under different conditions of service; but fully relying on the steady behaviour of the men, they felt confident that by judicious conduct on the part of the officers any bad result might be avoided.

5. They were of opinion that in this manner the discontinuance of a local force might gradually be effected with the least disturbance of the existing positions and relations of officers and men.

6. Objections, however, have been raised to this course on legal grounds, and Her Majesty's Government have consequently determined on the adoption of the plan which I shall now proceed to explain to your Lordship.

General
Order,
para. 5.

7. They are unwilling, by allowing the local corps to die out, which would be the necessary consequence of merely ceasing to fill up their numbers by recruits, that the names of such corps as the three older regiments of each Presidency should cease to be borne on the rolls of Her Majesty's army, whilst they feel it to be indispensable that no man, except with his own consent, should have his present terms of service altered.

8. The first object will be attained by maintaining these regiments as regiments of the line, the second by retaining in a local corps such men as prefer to continue their service only in India.

9. Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to sanction the necessary increase of the establishment of Her army; and orders are transmitted herewith from His Royal Highness the General Commanding-in-Chief to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India, who will take the necessary measures for this purpose which depend on him.

10. The plan which they have determined upon is as follows:—

To offer to the non-commissioned officers and men of the 1st Bengal Fusiliers the usual bounty given to a man volunteering from one regiment to another, if they are willing to accept service on the terms of Her Majesty's Line forces, and to form a regiment of the Line from such volunteers, with the addition of such men of good character of the 4th and 6th regiments of Bengal European Infantry as may volunteer to be transferred to it on similar terms and with similar bounty.

The men who may not volunteer on these terms will be transferred to the 4th regiment of European Infantry, which will remain a local corps.

To make to the non-commissioned officers and men of the 2nd Bengal Fusiliers and of the 3rd Bengal European Infantry a similar offer to that made to the 1st Bengal Fusiliers, and to pursue a similar course in forming from them two new regiments of the Line.

11. The men of the 1st and 2nd Bengal Fusiliers and of the 3rd Bengal Regiment of Infantry who volunteer for Line service will be kept in the regiments representing those to which they respectively belong, and those who volunteer from the 4th and 6th regiments must be divided, so as to equalize, as far as possible, the number in each of the three Line regiments. If the numbers fall short of 850 in each regiment, the complement can be made up by men from regiments leaving India or by recruits.

12. If the men declining these terms are more than enough to fill up the 4th Bengal European regiment, the 6th Bengal European regiment must likewise be retained as a local regiment.

13. It is necessary that the officers of these three general service regiments should be generally under the conditions of service of Line officers, and that they should be permanently attached to their regiments. It is considered to be desirable that they should be taken from among the officers of the local armies, and, as far as possible, from the old regiments, which will be respectively represented by the new ones.

14. By my Despatch of this date, No. 27, you have been directed to place all the officers of the European and Native regular Infantry and Cavalry of each Presidency on general lists, and you will invite, from these lists, the number of officers required for the new Line regiments to volunteer for general service in these regiments on the same conditions as Line officers, except that the system of purchase which prevails in the army of the Line will not be allowed in these regiments. The present and prospective advantages which officers derive from the Military and Orphan Funds will be secured to them, and they will be allowed retiring pensions under the Indian Regulations, counting their service in India in full, and one year for every two years of their future service out of India, in completion of the periods of service required under those regulations for the several grades of pension.

15. These officers will be formed into cadres of the strength noted in the margin,* exclusive of regimental Staff, and will be appointed by the Commander-in-Chief to do duty with the several new regiments, and they will eventually receive new commissions from Her Majesty in those regiments, bearing the same dates respectively as the commissions which they now hold. Such of them as may have belonged to the three older local regiments will be appointed respectively to the new regiments representing those to which they belonged, and it shall be secured to them that they shall hold a position in the new regiments as far as possible the same as that which they held in the old ones.

16. The names of these officers will remain on the general list, printed in *italics*, to regulate the promotion of their juniors in precisely the same way as if they had been transferred to the Staff corps, under the conditions detailed in my separate Despatch on this subject.

17. The three older regiments of the Bengal Presidency will be thus converted into regiments of Her Majesty's general army, and will be numbered and designated as follows:—

The 101st Regiment of Foot (or 1st Bengal Fusiliers).
The 104th Regiment of Foot (or 2nd Bengal Fusiliers).
The 107th Regiment of Foot.

They will be permitted to bear on their colours and appointments the honorary distinctions won by the regiments of the Indian army which they will respectively represent.

18. In my Despatch No. 374, dated 9th October, you were directed to form into three regiments of European Light Cavalry the five existing regiments of that arm in the Bengal Presidency, and, assuming this consolidation to have been completed, measures will now be taken, analogous to those above prescribed, for the conversion of these regiments into three regiments of Light Dragoons of Her Majesty's general army.

* 1 Lieut.-Colonel.
2 Majors.
12 Captains
14 Lieutenants } Including two companies at the depot.
10 Ensigns
A Colonel will be appointed hereafter to each regiment.

19. Such of the non-commissioned officers and men of each of the three regiments as may accept the offer of bounty on the conditions of general service will form the basis of a new regiment of Dragoons, which will be made up hereafter to the complement of 500 sabres. The three regiments will be respectively designated as follows:—

- 19th (Light) Dragoons (now 1st Bengal European Light Cavalry).
- 20th (Light) Dragoons (now 2nd Bengal European Light Cavalry).
- 21st (Light) Dragoons (now 3rd Bengal European Light Cavalry).

20. The officers of the three regiments, having been placed on a general list under the instructions of my Despatch of this date, No. 27, will be permitted to volunteer for general service in the regiments representing those to which they formerly belonged, and any vacancies that may then remain in the cadres of officers, calculated on the establishment of a Dragoon regiment, as per margin,* exclusive of regimental Staff, will be filled up in the following manner:—

The 19th Light Dragoons by volunteers from the remaining officers of the Bengal Cavalry.

The 20th and 21st Light Dragoons by volunteers from the officers of the Madras and Bombay Cavalry, respectively.

21. The non-commissioned officers and men who may prefer the conditions of local service will be placed in the 4th Bengal European Light Cavalry, which will be re-formed for that purpose, with the officers who belonged to it, as a local regiment.

22. The measures for the conversion of the European regiments in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies into regiments of the Line will be similar to those prescribed for adoption in Bengal, but with such modifications as circumstances render necessary.

23. At Madras the non-commissioned officers and soldiers accepting the conditions of general service will be formed into three regiments of the Line, which will be designated as follows:—

- 102nd Regiment of Foot (or Madras Fusiliers).
- 105th Regiment of Foot (or Madras Light Infantry).
- 108th Regiment of Foot.

and they will bear on their colours and appointments any honorary distinctions belonging to the old regiments which they will respectively represent.

24. The men who may not accept the offer of bounty will be placed in a separate corps for local service, which may be designated the Madras European Regiment.

25. To this corps officers of the three European regiments who may not volunteer for general service, and, if required, other officers from the general list will be appointed to do duty.

26. In the Bombay Presidency the three new regiments of the Line will be formed, in the manner above described, of volunteers from the three existing regiments of European Infantry, including the German soldiers of the 3rd European Regiment, who will also be permitted to volunteer, and will be designated respectively, —

- The 103rd Regiment of Foot (or Bombay Fusiliers).
- The 106th Regiment of Foot.
- The 108th Regiment of Foot.

They will bear on their colours any honorary distinctions which have been won respectively by the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Bombay European Regiments.

27. The men who may not accept the offer of bounty will be placed in a separate corps for local service, which may be designated the Bombay European Regiment.

28. Officers will be provided for these regiments in the manner above described with reference to Bengal and Madras, except that, in the formation of a cadre of officers for the 109th Bombay Regiment of Foot, the claims of the German officers whom, after receipt of my Despatch No. 154, of the 5th September, the Government of Bombay may have thought it necessary to retain with the 3rd European Regiment, will be considered. Such of these officers as may desire it will receive commissions in their present grades in the 109th Foot.

29. The new regiments added, in the manner above described, to the establishment of Her Majesty's army, will be available for general service, and will be 12 in number, as follows:—

- 19th Regiment of (Light) Dragoons.
- 20th Regiment of (Light) Dragoons.
- 21st Regiment of (Light) Dragoons.
- 101st Regiment of Foot (or 1st Bengal Fusiliers).
- 102nd Regiment of Foot (or Madras Fusiliers).
- 103rd Regiment of Foot (or Bombay Fusiliers).
- 104th Regiment of Foot (or 2nd Bengal Fusiliers).
- 105th Regiment of Foot (or Madras Light Infantry).
- 106th Regiment of Foot.
- 107th Regiment of Foot.
- 108th Regiment of Foot.
- 109th Regiment of Foot.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

* 1 Lieut.-Colonel.
3 Majors.
9 Captains
9 Lieutenants } Including one troop for the depot.
9 Cornets
A Colonel will hereafter be appointed to each regiment.

DESPATCH No. 29.
(Military.—No. 29.)

To His EXCELLENCY the Right Honourable the GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA in Council.

India Office, London,
18th January, 1861.

I HAVE the honour to communicate to your Excellency the details of a plan which has been determined upon by Her Majesty's Government for the assimilation and ultimate consolidation of the Indian regiments of Artillery with that of the Royal Artillery. It provides the means of maintaining the efficiency of the Artillery force of India, while it involves no interference with the present course of promotion in either service.

2. The following are the conditions of the plan which has been determined upon:—

I. That the existing regiments of Artillery in the three Presidencies of India shall remain distinct from each other and from the Royal Artillery as long as any of the officers now in them shall continue to be borne on their rolls. General Order, para. 31.

II. That no new appointments shall be made to the three Indian regiments. General Order, para. 33.

III. That on the occurrence of vacancies in any of the three Indian regiments, or in the Royal Artillery, appointments of young officers should be made to the Royal Artillery.

IV. That after all the subalterns in any of the Indian regiments of Artillery have been promoted, on the occurrence of the next vacancy in the grade of Second Captain in that corps, the senior subaltern of the Royal Artillery should be promoted to that grade. General Order, para. 34.

V. That the same process should be followed in each grade successively until all the Indian regiments of Artillery have disappeared, after which the whole corps will be Royal Artillery. General Order, para. 35.

VI. That in order to carry out this measure to the full extent, the organization of Indian regiments of Artillery will be assimilated to that of the Royal Artillery. The Bengal Artillery will be formed into seven brigades, the Madras Artillery into four brigades, and the Bombay Artillery into three brigades, in all fourteen brigades with the strength of officers detailed in the margin, which is believed to be the establishment of a brigade of Royal Artillery. General Order, para. 25.
1 Colonel
1 Commandant
2 Colonels
4 Lt.-Cols
8 Captains
9 Second Captains, including an Adjutant
24 Lieuts.

3. The assimilation of the Indian with the Royal Artillery involve considerable alterations of rank. Thus, in Bengal, seven of the Colonels will become Colonels-Commandant, nine Lieutenant-Colonels will become Colonels, thirteen Captains will become Lieutenant-Colonels, and three Captains and nine Second Captains will become supernumerary. This will cause a stoppage of promotion in the grades of Second Captain and Lieutenant. But there are at present four Lieutenant-Colonels, four Captains, and nine Second Captains in the Ordnance Department, and these, being seconded in accordance with the instructions in the 9th paragraph of my Despatch No. 27, dated this day, will more than compensate for the absorption of the three Captains and nine Second Captains above mentioned.

4. Under the Royal Artillery organization the Colonel's allowance is drawn only by Colonels-Commandant, and of these there will be seven only, in place of twelve, who now draw Colonel's allowance in the Bengal Artillery. General Order, para. 27.

5. Eventually the assimilation must be carried out in this respect also. The five officers who will be supernumerary will continue to receive that allowance, and this necessary reduction, will be gradually carried out by permitting the succession of only three officers to every four vacancies in the number of those receiving Colonel's allowance until the supernumeraries shall have been absorbed. General Order, para. 27.

6. Colonels of Artillery under the new organization, who not being Colonels-Commandant, will not draw Colonel's allowance will be permitted to draw in India the pay and allowance fixed for the rank of regimental Colonel (excepting the Colonel's allowance). On furlough they will receive the furlough pay of Colonel, viz., 25s. a day, and they will enjoy the privileges of regimental Colonels in being permitted to reside in England, if not required in India, without forfeiting their position on the effective list. General Order, para. 29.

7. Such of the officers as may be willing to serve out of India, and may be permitted to do so, will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery, and will draw the pay and allowances fixed by Her Majesty's regulations for that arm of the service, according to the situation and locality in which they may be serving, but their promotion will continue to go on in their original regiments. They will be permitted to reckon one year's service towards retiring pension on the Indian scale, for every two years of employment out of India.

8. I have lately carefully considered the best mode of keeping up in efficiency the strength of batteries and companies of Artillery required for service in India.

9. The number of men of the local Artillery was much reduced under the operation of the General Order of 20th June 1859, which offered the option of discharge to all soldiers of the late East India Company's service.

10. At Bombay the establishment of European Artillery has been subsequently recruited to very nearly its proper complement, but in Bengal and Madras the numbers are still much below the establishment. The enlistment of recruits for local service, to complete the establishment, is prohibited by the late Act of Parliament, and there are legal objections to filling up the

APP. B.

vacancies with men enlisted for the Royal Artillery. Under these circumstances, it appears advisable to separate at once the men of the local Artillery who are willing to transfer their services absolutely to the Royal regiments of Artillery, from those who may prefer the conditions of local service. To the former you are authorized to offer the usual bounty on their transfer to the Royal Artillery, and the volunteers who may accept these conditions will be formed into new troops or batteries of Royal Artillery, which will be filled up by recruits enlisted for that regiment, of whom a large number are now under training at Woolwich, and will be ready for embarkation in the course of next summer.

General Order, para. 32.

11. Officers will be provided for these batteries from the officers of the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Artillery respectively, and will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery, concurrent with those which they now respectively hold in their regiments.

General Order, para. 7.

12. The soldiers of the Indian Artillery who may decline to accept the offer will be formed into batteries, which will remain under their original designations and conditions; and, as the numbers of the men diminish by casualties, or by completion of their period of service, they will be consolidated into a smaller number of batteries, and will finally disappear.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

DESPATCH, No. 30.

(Military.—No. 30.)

To His EXCELLENCY the Right Honourable the GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA in Council.

India Office, London,
18th January, 1861.

My Lord,

IN continuation of my Despatch, No. 29, of this date, on the subject of the assimilation of the Indian regiments of Artillery with that of the Royal Artillery, I have the honour to communicate to you the following plan for the assimilation of the regiments of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Engineers, with that of the Royal Engineers.

2. In the case of these regiments it will be necessary to deal with the officers only, as there are no Engineer soldiers in India under that designation, and the regiments of native Sappers and Miners must continue as at present, on the footing of local corps, having the requisite complement of commissioned and non-commissioned officers appointed to do duty with them.

3. The process by which the local regiments of Engineers will die out, and their places be filled by officers appointed to the Royal Engineers, is precisely similar to that already described for the Artillery.

General Order, para. 44.

4. All fresh appointments will be made to the Royal Engineers, and when all the subalterns of any of the three Indian regiments have become Captains, the next vacancy in that regiment will cause the promotion of the senior subaltern of Royal Engineers, and the same process will be followed in the higher grades until all the local officers have disappeared.

5. The ultimate effect of this measure will be to add seven battalions of officers to the Royal Engineers, of which three will take the place of the Bengal regiment, and two each will be in substitution for those of Madras and Bombay.

General Order, para. 36.

6. The Engineer corps of Her Majesty's Indian forces will be immediately formed into three battalions for Bengal, and two each for Madras and Bombay, of the established strength of a battalion of Royal Engineers, as follows.—

- 1 Colonel Commandant.
- 2 Colonels.
- 5 Lieutenant-Colonels.
- 8 Captains.
- 8 Second Captains.
- 24 Lieutenants.

7. The effect of this measure will be to give considerable promotion in the existing regiments. In Bengal the number of field officers will be increased from 15 to 24; in Madras and Bombay, from 9 to 16; in Bengal, three Colonels will become Colonels-Commandant, four Lieutenant-Colonels will become Colonels, nine Captains will become Lieutenant-Colonels, three Second Captains will become Captains, and three Lieutenants will become supernumerary. In Madras and Bombay, two Colonels will become Colonels-Commandant, three Lieutenant-Colonels will become Colonels, seven Captains will become Lieutenant-Colonels, five Second Captains will become Captains, and three Lieutenants will become Second Captains.

General Order, para. 38.

8. On the other hand, the Bengal corps will lose two Colonels' allowances, and the Madras and Bombay corps will each lose one Colonel's allowance. The number of officers receiving these allowances will be reduced to that fixed by the new organization, by omitting to fill up one out of any four vacancies, in the manner prescribed for the Artillery in my Despatch No. 29.

General Order, para. 39.

9. Colonels of Engineers, not being Colonels-Commandant, will be in the same position as Colonels of Artillery, as described in the 6th paragraph of my Despatch above quoted.

General Order, para. 40.

10. All the officers of the Indian Engineers will receive commissions in the Royal Engineers, but, as before explained, will rise by seniority in their respective regiments.

General Order, para. 41.

11. They will not be required to serve out of India, unless at their own request, but will be eligible to serve anywhere, receiving the pay and allowances fixed for Royal Engineers in similar

positions, and counting one year towards retiring pension, on the Indian scale, for every two years' service out of India.

12. The places of Indian Engineer officers who may elect, and who may be permitted to serve out of India on the above terms will be filled up with officers of the Royal Engineers who may be willing to undertake the several duties required from Engineer officers in the Department of Public Works.

13. The Engineer corps of the several Presidencies will continue to be, as at present, principally corps of officers, having no European soldiers attached to them; but Engineer officers may be posted, as at present, as far as they can be made available, to the corps of native Sappers, which must be maintained on the present footing, which in many points resembles that of irregular native Infantry.

14. It is very desirable to continue the practice of posting a large number of European non-commissioned officers to the native companies of Sappers and Miners. These men have hitherto been obtained by selection from the men enlisted for Artillery and Infantry, and have been liable to be remanded to their regiments on misbehaviour.

15. The men so selected have undergone a special course of training at Chatham, and after serving in India with the Sappers and Miners, and acquiring some knowledge of the native language, a portion of them who were able to pass the requisite examination were appointed overseers in the Public Works Department.

16. I have communicated with His Royal Highness the General Commanding-in-Chief regarding the best method of providing men for this duty, and for keeping up the supply of vacancies in the Public Works Department, a considerable portion of whom have hitherto been drawn from the local European Sappers. His Royal Highness is of opinion that it would be advisable to try the experiment of obtaining volunteers from the Royal Engineers; such men, as volunteers, being required to sign a declaration of their willingness to be remanded, in the event of their being guilty of gross misconduct, to the Royal Artillery in India, as there are no companies of Royal Engineers in that country. Should a difficulty arise in obtaining sufficient volunteers from the Royal Engineers, volunteers may be taken from the Line, and trained at Chatham, like the Engineer soldiers, who have hitherto been selected from the Artillery and Infantry recruits of the Indian forces.

17. These men could be remanded, in the event of any misconduct, to any Line regiment in India.

18. A further communication on this subject will be made to you hereafter; and in the meantime I request that you will furnish me with an estimate of the number of men required to be supplied annually for the above purpose.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

DESPATCH No. 31.

(Military.—No. 31.)

To His EXCELLENCY the Right Honourable the GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA in Council.

India Office, London,
18th January, 1861.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge your Excellency's Despatch No. 264, dated 8th October, informing me that you have decided on discontinuing the issue of commissions by the Governments in India to the European officers of Her Majesty's Indian armies; and submitting for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government whether the form of commission issued by the Commander-in-Chief in India should be modified, and whether the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces should not be placed on the same footing in respect to their commissions as the officers of Her Majesty's Line army.

2. These questions having been considered by Her Majesty's Government, I have to convey to you their approval of the discontinuance of the issue of local commissions to the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces; and to intimate to you that Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to give to every officer of her Indian armies a Royal Commission in substitution for those which he now holds from the Governments of India and from the Commanders-in-Chief. But whereas the commissions heretofore issued by the Governments of India usually appointed the officers named therein to particular Indian regiments, the commissions about to be granted by Her Majesty will, like those now granted by the Commander-in-Chief in India, confer rank and command in Her Majesty's army in any part of the world, but will not appoint the officers holding them to any particular corps or arm of the service.

3. A form of the commission to be adopted for this purpose is forwarded for your information.

4. In order to the preparation of these commissions, I desire to be furnished immediately with nominal rolls, showing the dates of the commissions held severally by all the officers of the armies of the three Presidencies.

5. The promotion of officers of the Indian armies on the occurrence of vacancies will be notified, as heretofore, by the Governments in India in the Official Gazette, and will be stated to be "subject to Her Majesty's approval."

6. A list of the promotions made in each Presidency will be submitted twice a month to this office, in order that measures may be taken for the preparation and signature of corresponding com-

missions; and, pending the receipt of these commissions, the officers provisionally promoted by the Indian Government will enjoy the pay, provision, and privileges of the rank to which they may have been advanced.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

It is submitted that these General Orders are incompatible with the guarantees given to the Indian army by the 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106., 23 & 24 Vict. cap. 100.

On the 2nd January 1860 the late General Sir James Outram, Bart., G.C.B., President of the Council in India, in his Minute on the question of the amalgamation of the Indian and Royal Armies, made the following remarks:—

58. I have stated that the proposed amalgamation would inflict grievous and unmerited injuries on the six thousand gentlemen who now officer the local army, and a little consideration will prove that I am right.

59. These men entered the service on the implied understanding that they would succeed an order of seniority to regimental "off reckonings," in periods ranging, according to individual good or ill luck, from thirty to forty-five years of service. Will faith be kept with them in this respect? Can faith be kept with them in this respect under the proposed amalgamation plan?

60. They entered the service on an implied guarantee that they should never be superseded in regimental or line promotion, either by the introduction of the purchase system, or by irregular promotion based on the principle of selection. Can faith possibly be kept with them in this respect under the proposed amalgamation plan?

61. All in the service have been allowed authoritatively to make arrangements for purchasing out their seniors, and these arrangements, and the retiring funds which have been established in consequence, though not actually sanctioned by the law, cannot justly be interfered with. Relying on this understanding, they have regularly subscribed to funds, the object of which is to accelerate promotion by providing bonuses out of the common purse to officers willing to retire before they have earned their off-reckonings. And they have done so in the confident hope that when ill-health or other considerations should lead to their own retirement, they would, as a matter of course, receive bonuses equal in amount to those paid to their predecessors. Will the regulations and whole machinery of the Land be altered to meet the equitable claims of these men? or will their funds be broken up, and all the prospective advantage for which they have monthly made pecuniary sacrifices be absolutely denied them?

The following protests against the above General Orders, were entered by Members of the Council of India:

DISSENT BY MR. WILLOUGHBY.

Although I retain all my objections to the policy of amalgamation, or, I should rather say, the extinction of the local forces in India, I have not the slightest desire to interpose any obstacle to the measure being carried out honestly and fairly, according to the declared intentions of Parliament.

The Council for India was, however, created for the express purpose of exercising a vigilant control over the expenditure of India, and I consider it to be my duty as a member of that Council, first, to take care that the proposed changes are consistent with and do not go beyond the Act; second, that they do not impose undue charges on India; and thirdly, that they do not violate the Parliamentary guarantee of the rights and privileges of the officers of the local armies of India.

On all these grounds I regret to be obliged to record my dissent to the resolutions passed on the 17th instant, in communication with the Secretary of State for War, concurring in a Royal Warrant authorizing the formation of Staff corps in India at each of the three Presidencies, unlimited in numbers, and therefore in expense; abolishing the present regimental organization of the native army, and substituting in its place the "irregular system," and prescribing an entirely new mode, as yet unsanctioned by Parliament, for providing the European officers which are required for the native forces.

* * * * *

4th. Claims to compensation to a large amount, will probably be preferred by those who have expended large sums in purchasing out their seniors in full confidence that they would be indemnified by their juniors on their own retirement. This system was as much sanctioned and recognized in India as the purchase system in England. I have known officers pay 1,000*l.*, 2,000*l.*, and 3,000*l.* in this way, and now that the system is suddenly arrested by the change in our military policy in India, those affected by it appear to me to have as good and valid a claim to consideration, as the officers of the royal army would possess, were their system of purchase abruptly interfered with, and the validity of their claim under the contingency supposed, has been generally admitted.

DISSENT BY COLONEL DURAND.

I dissent from the resolution, the Warrant, and the Despatches brought before the Council by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, on the 8th January 1861, for the following reasons:—

1. Because the Bill passed last Session for carrying out the

principle that "it is not expedient that a separate European force should be continued for the local service of Her Majesty in India," does not authorize the creation of monster Staff corps as a means for the extinction of the regimental organization of the Indian native forces, and for the arbitrary alteration of the relative position of every officer in the Indian armies. Such dislocation of an organization, sanctioned by Parliament, by long usage, and by the example of the British and foreign armies, being not only unnecessary, costly, and contrary to the recommendations of Her Majesty's Viceroy in India, but incompatible with a *bona fide* fulfilment of clause 56 of 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, and of the pledge with which the Bill passed last Session closes.

2. Because the Bill in question does not sanction the obliteration of the vested rights of officers, authoritatively sanctioned by the letter of the Court of Directors, No 20, of the 14th February 1837, and which for above 60 years have had free action. The hard-earned savings of many officers have been invested in purchasing out senior officers, with the reasonable expectation of profiting, in their turn, when they retired. To many the obliteration of such vested rights must prove ruinous, and where not ruinous, it will deprive many officers and their families of a provision which they would have enjoyed but for the change now introduced by Government, without the due notice promised to the Indian armies.

By clause 56, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, it was enacted that the military forces of the East India Company should be entitled to the like allowances and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company.

Lord Derby as Prime Minister, in introducing the bill into the House of Lords, thus explained its meaning:—"The bill also provides, as far as it relates to individuals and bodies, that they shall have reserved to them all the rights, privileges, and expectations which they were led to form at the time of their admission into the service."

But what was the effect of the General Orders of the 10th April 1861?

1st The Colonels' allowances in the Artillery were to be reduced in Bengal from 12 to 7; in Madras, from 7 to 4; in Bombay, from 5 to 3. In the Engineers the number was to be reduced, by omitting to fill up one vacancy out of every four. In the Cavalry and Infantry a similar reduction was to take place, until the minimum should be reached.

In the ordnance corps the force was not reduced, but the number of Colonels' allowances were, as stated above.

2nd. A Staff corps was formed, which completely altered the seniority system hitherto respected in the Indian army, and annihilated the regimental retiring funds.

These subjects had been carefully inquired into and reported upon by a Committee, of which Lord Hotham was chairman, appointed 30th July 1860, to prepare suggestions as to the various detailed measures which it might be advisable to take, for effecting the amalgamation of the European forces of the Indian army with the general army of the Crown.

Had certain regulations which were to supersede those then in existence, or one Royal Warrant to alter another already in force, been submitted to the Committee in question although such a step might have occasioned hardships to individuals, the welfare of the State could alone have been considered and individual interests must have succumbed. But in this instance the interests of individual officers had been recognized and guaranteed by an Act of Parliament. So long therefore as that Act was in force, this guarantee could not be disregarded, nor could the interests thereby secured, be, in any way, interfered with. On this account the Committee thus qualified their recommendation for the formation of the proposed Staff corps. [NOTE.—The italics are not in the original.]

5. We do not understand in what manner any change can be introduced into the existing system of promotion in the local army of India, without an infringement upon the guarantee contained in the 56th and 58th clauses of the "Government of India," Act of 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106).

Every officer of the Indian army (excepting only the Ensigns appointed during the last year) is on the rolls of a regiment; and whether the regiment be standing complete and perfect in all parts, as in the armies of Madras and Bombay, or consist of nothing more than a "cadre" of officers without men, as is the case to a large extent in the army of Bengal, still the right of all the officers to the "like advantages, as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the Company," has been deliberately and comprehensively guaranteed, and cannot now be denied.

We consider that under this pledge the promotion of the officers of the three armies, after the Staff corps has been formed, must of necessity be allowed to proceed exactly on the same principles

APP. B.

as before; nor can the volunteering of individuals here and there into the Line cause any difference. The "cadres" must be preserved throughout the entire army, and promotion must go forward regularly and in the established order. We conclude that new appointments will be made only at the bottom of the list, and under different conditions. The local system, therefore, will be gradually approaching towards its ultimate extinction. The process will be slow, but, though very possibly means many hereafter be found of hastening it, we can at the present moment only suggest that it be left to itself, and to work itself out in the course of time.

The formation of the Staff corps will of course occasion a great number of vacancies in every regiment, and it may be a question whether these should be wholly or only partially filled up in the ordinary course of promotion.

We consider that it is necessary for the efficiency of the service to keep the regimental establishments complete. It should be observed, however, that of the Captains, two in each native Infantry regiment, and four in each European, have been allowed specially for Staff and detached service; and, when the non-regimental duties are otherwise provided for, a reduction of the established number of Captains to five in the native, and to one for each troop or Company in the European regiments, may very properly be effected.

In filling up the vacancies occasioned by the drafting off to the Staff list, regard must be paid to the inequality of promotion in the several regiments that must arise if arrangements be not made to meet and correct it. Probably the Indian Government will be able to effect such arrangements without much difficulty, by applying the principles which have been laid down and are well understood in raising new regiments, and generally in all army augmentations.

* * * * *

With respect to the future promotion of those officers of the existing local army who may be transferred to the Staff corps on its first formation, we observe that a great number of the officers at the head of each rank of the local army are at present on the Staff. Many, we have no doubt, are holding appointments and performing duties of so important a nature, that it would be very inconvenient for the Government to dispense with their services immediately. To obviate, therefore, the probability of such officers supposing that they may be injured by the transfer to the Staff corps, and, therefore hesitating to consent to it, we think that the advantages of regimental rise which they at present possess should be secured to them, that is to say, that their names should be retained, as if they were seconded, on the rolls of their regiments; and when their turn arrives by regimental rise, they should receive the step, if they have not previously gained it by length of service. This process will, it is true, cause the promotion of two men on one vacancy, but one of the two promotions will be without any additional charge, and it will not occasion any disturbance in the regular advance of other officers. It will, therefore, be of no moment to any but the individual concerned.

* * * * *

The same furlough and retiring regulations as are in force for the Indian army generally, will always be applicable equally to the Staff corps, but provision must be made for such officers as may be deprived of their appointments or employment, otherwise than by their own conduct or choice.

* * * * *

No officer to be permanently appointed to any situation on the Staff (save the purely military appointments, or to a civil or detached appointment of any description), without being transferred to the Staff list, and struck off the strength of his regiment.

* * * * *

6. Taking it for granted that inducements would only be held out to the old officers of the Indian army to leave the service, three modes of inducing them to do so of their own accord appear to offer; but all of them, if made use of to any extent (and it appears useless in a large army to make any effort in this direction, unless to induce the retirement of a considerable number), involve a large outlay,

They are,

1st. The formation of a senior list, to which a certain number of the old officers now in receipt of Colonels' allowances might be removed without prejudice to their incomes.

2nd. The offer of an increased rate of pension (say 150l. or 200l. per annum extra), to a certain number of officers of upwards of 32 years' service in India.

3rd. The payment of a bonus down to officers of 32 years' service and upwards, who would at once retire on their pensions.

7. If the present organization is maintained, we feel some difficulty in suggesting that promotions shall not be made in room of every one of these retirements.

For instance, the Artillery and Engineers certainly will require as many field officers as at present; and if one or more of their field officers retired in consequence of the advantage offered to them, we conceive it would be absolutely requisite to promote in room of those retiring.

And so with any corps that is maintained.

But even in the Bengal Native Infantry regiments that have mutinied, or in the Madras and Bombay armies, should any regi-

ments of those Presidencies be reduced, there is a great difficulty and some hardship in not giving promotions in full, in room of those who retire. The whole of the field officers of the Cavalry and Infantry of each Presidency, whether belonging to European or native regiments, are in one line for promotion, and any stoppage of promotion in these grades affects every regiment of the branch in which the stoppage takes place in that Presidency.

We will suppose that 20 Lieutenant-Colonels of the Bengal Infantry accepted an offer of increased pension and retired, and that Government decided, as they by an outlay of money, had procured these extraordinary retirements, and the greater number of the Bengal regiments were only "cadres" of officers, that they would only fill up half the vacancies thus caused, and leave the Commander-in-Chief to arrange that field officers should be removed to other corps for duty, if it so happened that an existing regiment had a vacancy, while a non-existing regiment had a field officer available for duty.

So far, the actual requirements of the service would be met; but the whole of the Bengal Infantry would have lost 10 of the 80 lieutenant-colonels they had hitherto possessed, and promotion to that grade would become so much the slower than at present; and this disadvantage would fall just as much on the European and existing native regiments, as on the officers of those corps that have disappeared.

Again, if a Major retired and his place was not filled up, his regiment would have lost his step, for every Major has a position in the line which ensures his promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel in a certain period (about five to seven years from the time he becomes a Major); and on his becoming a Lieutenant-Colonel, the senior Captain of his regiment becomes a Major, and the whole corps obtains a step. They would lose this, and, being without a Major at all, we do not understand how it could well be arranged that they should ever again have a promotion to the rank of Major, or again share in the advantage of line promotion.

These arguments apply to Madras and Bombay in common with Bengal, with the additional reason, that, in these two Presidencies, at present, all the regiments are in existence, and are maintained on the same footing as previously.

We think it altogether a matter of doubtful expediency to check promotion, already slow, in the Indian armies, and are inclined to think that if a reduction of the number of officers is absolutely needed, the reduction should commence from the bottom, by appointments being stopped.

We understand that, even in Bengal, there are not sufficient officers for the requirements of the public service, and that almost the only officers without any real employment are some of the old Lieutenant-Colonels of the mutinied regiments. If these latter leave the service, or if any field officers leave the service, and their places are not filled up in full, there will be the same number of Captains and old Subalterns as at present, but with diminished hopes of promotion, consequent upon the reduction in the establishment of field officers.

We do not think this can be expedient; and, as stated in our reply to Question 6, we are not prepared to say that there would be any great advantage in inducing any extraordinary retirements at present.

In section 8 of their Report they state:—

8. In the Indian army there is a Colonel to every regular regiment of Cavalry or Infantry, European or Native, and to every battalion of Artillery or Engineers; and all regimental Colonels receive the allowance which, under the designation of "Colonel's allowance," has been fixed as an equitable commutation for the share of the profits of the clothing off-reckoning fund, which have always been allowed to be their common and peculiar perquisite.

It will be perceived that in the Indian army the number of "Colonels' allowances" is precisely equal to the number of regiments or battalions, and, in proportion to the strength of the army, measured by the number of its regular regiments. We are of opinion that this principle cannot properly be departed from, either immediately or prospectively. If in the process of passing from a war to a peace establishment, any regiments are reduced absolutely, and the strength of the army reduced to a corresponding extent, then the number of Colonels must necessarily be reduced also, and the number of allowances at the same time. But if the measure in operation be not the reduction of the strength of the army, but simply the conversion of regular into irregular regiments, for the purpose of effecting a new organization, while the number of men maintained is the same, or nearly the same as before, we are of opinion that under such circumstances it would be scarcely fair to diminish the number of "Colonels' allowances."

We do not think it necessary to enter into the question how far the expectations of officers to succeed in due course to the "Colonels' allowances" may be regarded as included among the rights and advantages secured to them by the Parliamentary guarantee. But, as a matter merely of policy or expediency, we would observe that the regimental colonelcy, with its corresponding allowance, is the prize to which the officers of the local army have been accustomed from their first entrance into the service to look forward, as the termination of their active career. And it is almost needless to add that any measure which retards the flow of promotion, and postpones the prospect of succession to the highest paid rank of the service, must inflict a very heavy disappointment and carry with

t the sense of serious injury, if not of positive wrong, in the minds of all the officers of the Indian army.

9. We recommend that the whole of the Artillery of the three Presidencies should form, henceforth, a part of the Royal Regiment of Artillery, without prejudice in any way to the present system of rise of any of the officers.

Thus there would be a full complement of officers of every grade at all times kept up; the promotion of every officer now in the Artillery would remain altogether unimpeded and uninjured, while the process of amalgamation would be steadily progressing.

The Indian Artillery have no Generals regimentally. The highest regimental rank is that of Colonel, and the succession to the ranks of Major-General, Lieutenant-General and General, is on one list for every Colonel of the whole Indian army. To make a fixed establishment of Generals for the Indian Artillery would greatly upset the system of promotion that has hitherto prevailed, and would undoubtedly cause much supercession of the other branches in the grades where hitherto it was impossible for them to be superseded, save in such a case as that of Sir Archdale Wilson, who was made a Major-General for distinguished service.

As long, therefore, as a separate establishment of Generals is maintained for officers now in the Indian army, it seems requisite that the promotion to general officer of those now in the Indian Artillery should go on as at present.

Hereafter, when the Indian Artillery officers are absorbed, or nearly so, or if the General Officers of the Royal and Indian armies are placed on one list, a fresh arrangement must be made for the General Officers of the Artillery.

In other respects, doubtless, it is expected by the Indian Artillery officers that they should have the same proportions of the different grades as in the Royal Artillery. This seems desirable, though it is not absolutely necessary to carrying out amalgamation in the manner here proposed. But it would be inconvenient to have one portion of the same regiment rising by a different scale of promotion from the other, and we therefore recommend assimilation.

One disadvantage would accrue to the Indian Artillery (and it is believed only one) from the assimilation of establishments; that is, that there would be prospectively fewer Colonels with "Colonel's allowances;" in fact, if the establishment of seven brigades was adopted for Bengal, there would be five officers now receiving "Colonel's allowances" in excess of the number of brigades.

To declare that the five juniors were in receipt of these allowances as supernumeraries, would be a great blow to the Lieutenant-Colonels now looking forward to receiving them as the reward of more than 40 years' Indian service; and, knowing the desire that exists to deal liberally in the amalgamation, we strongly recommend that they may be retained until the Indian officers are all absorbed, up to the rank of regimental Colonel, when the increase of Colonels Commandant to the Royal Artillery might commence on the Royal Artillery scale.

There would thus seem to be some slight stoppage of promotion for the Second Captains and subalterns; but in reality this would not be so, if a Staff corps is established. There are not many Artillery officers on Staff employ; but still sufficient would probably at once go to the Staff corps to cause the absorption of the 12 supernumerary Captains and Second Captains; and every officer in the Artillery, by the alteration of the establishment, would actually be nearer his lieutenant-colonelcy than at present.

Considering the liberal scale of field officers, and that extra Second Captains are provided to meet the demand for officers as Adjutants of brigades, it seems that the appointments of Assistant-Adjutant-General of Artillery in Bengal and Madras, and of Brigade-Major of Artillery in Bombay, should not involve transfer to the Staff corps, but we are of opinion that officers in the Ordnance Commissariat Department should be seconded, as Royal Artillery officers are when holding similar appointments.

We consider it very desirable that the amalgamation should be applied equally to all branches; and we think that the principle on which we have proposed to unite the Indian Artillery with the Royal will be found to be equally applicable to the Indian and Royal Engineers.

The Committee, whilst being of opinion that the Staff corps proposed might be of advantage to the service, appear to have felt it necessary to point out that, as its organization would inevitably clash with officers' privileges, and the guarantee given by 21 & 22 Vict., it was advisable to conciliate the officers by liberal concessions.

The formation of a Staff corps had long been a desideratum of the Indian Government, but it had ever been found impossible to carry out any scheme which would not interfere with the rights and privileges of the Indian army. The difficulties in the way of the formation of a Staff corps were, as has already been stated, most clearly pointed out before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1832. These difficulties still existed in 1860.

No. 6.

APP. B.

From COLONEL JAMESON,
COLONEL BALFOUR, C.B. } Military Finance Commissioners.

To the Secretary to the Government of India,
Military Department, Calcutta,

[The Italics are not in the original.]

SIR,

I We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of letter, No. 54, of the 4th July last, from Major-General Birch, C.B., Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Department, requesting us to turn our attention to the practicability, or otherwise, of establishing a Staff corps, or unattached body of officers, to meet the requirements of the service in civil and military employ, such as is now assigned to officers of regiments, selected for the purpose; and at the same time to keep up the entire efficiency of regiments in their complement of officers.

2 We were further furnished with General Birch's letter, No. 585, of the 12th August 1859, enclosing printed copies of Reports sent to the Government of India, on the subject of the formation of a Staff corps; as also in respect to providing officers for Staff employ, without a separate Staff corps.

3. We have given our most serious attention to this subject, avowedly one of the first importance, and, as is sufficiently evident from the varying opinions given by experienced officers, beset with many difficulties, arising from the numerous considerations and conditions involved therein. Judging from the question being now referred to us, none of the plans yet devised appear to have afforded a satisfactory solution of these difficulties, and we cannot, therefore, flatter ourselves that the scheme we now venture to submit will be found entirely suitable, or devoid of all objections, but, in freely expressing our views, we may at least hope that they may, in connexion with other plans already submitted, assist the Government of India in coming to a decision, and enable them, without affecting the efficiency of regiments, to make available the services of a sufficient number of qualified officers, for the many varied and constantly increasing duties, not of a strictly military nature, which, in the progressive state of India, call for the employment of military officers.

4. In order, however, to arrive at definite conclusions, we have found it necessary to take into consideration several points, which, though not directly referred to us, we hold to be intimately connected with the questions to which we are instructed to turn our attention; also assuming certain data, drawn from instructions issued by the Court of Directors at various periods, on which to base our calculations for a future establishment of officers, adapted to meet all the required conditions, and entering into various explanatory details, illustrating the bearing of the system hitherto obtaining in the Indian service, on the arrangements we now propose. And in so doing, we may at first be considered as overstepping our proper functions, but the question of the establishment of officers to be provided for regimental duty being inseparable from that of Staff employ, and it will be seen, by the various plans already brought forward, that all who have written on analogous subjects have been obliged more or less to touch on points similar to those we have discussed, we trust that the Government of India will acquit us of presumption, in endeavouring to show the most economical application of an establishment of officers (whether small or large), by means of an improved organization.

5. The particular point on which our views may appear open to objection, in this respect, is, in having assumed for the strength and composition of the whole army a high scale of strength for the different branches based on the establishment of the Native Infantry, as existing in 1856; but we adopted this scale in the absence of other data on which to form the scheme of an establishment, and also because the Court of Directors in that year laid down a new scale of officers, for regimental and Staff duty, involving an increase to the establishment, and whilst showing that the establishment of officers as existing even at the present date, namely, 5,968, was considerably below the numbers for the strength of the army, if calculated on the scale laid down by the Court, viz., 7,192 officers; we at the same time endeavour to show that, under an improved organization, this number of officers is capable of being applied for the discipline of a larger body of men than existed in that year, and whilst maintaining regimental efficiency of this increased force, we also fully provide for absentees on Staff and in Europe. We, however, consider it quite feasible for Government, consistently with efficiency, to adopt a lower scale of army strength, also by diminishing the number of officers laid down by the Court in 1856 as necessary to be present for regimental duty; we think it would be found that a smaller establishment of officers, than at present fixed, viz., 5,968, would suffice to maintain regimental efficiency, and meet all requirements for Staff, if the army were organized into large regiments, whether comprising portions of all arms, or all the several branches being kept in separate regiments, both of which modes of organization have their attendant advantages and disadvantages.

6. For more convenient reference, the points we have considered are arranged under the following heads:—

1st. The advisability of introducing into the Indian Army the "Seconding" system obtaining in the Royal Ordnance Service.
2nd. The position in detail of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian Army, at various different periods.

APP. B.

3rd. The system then and previously in force, regarding the withdrawal of officers from regiments for Staff duties, showing the number of absentees from regimental duty at different periods, from all causes (namely, on furlough, sick, and private affairs in Europe, as also on Staff duty, civil and military); and further, the rules laid down by the Home Authorities at different periods, and at the latest date, in respect to the number of officers necessary to be present and available for active duties with corps, in cantonment and in field.

4th. A review of the opinions generally entertained with regard to officers being withdrawn from their Military duties for Staff employ; and our views as to the attendant advantages and disadvantages of that system.

5th. A scheme for an establishment of officers for the whole Army of India, sufficient to supply the number necessary to meet present requirements for absentees on Staff employ and in Europe; whilst at the same time fully maintaining, both for war and peace service, efficient regimental establishments.

7. A course of careful and minute inquiry has led us to the conclusion, that the formation of a separate Staff corps, with lines of promotion distinct from the other branches of the army, and probably entailing special provision for rewards and retiring pensions, would at present involve great difficulties from various causes. Moreover, owing to the non-existence of a separate Staff corps in the Royal service, no rules for guidance could be drawn from thence, neither do the regulations obtaining in regard to the Staff corps of the French service, appears to us capable of adaptation to the Indian army, without considerable changes in its constitution; and therefore, considering the urgency of some arrangements being made for immediately supplying the want of officers now felt, we submit to Government to allow the question of a separate corps of Staff officers to remain in abeyance, until further light has been thrown on the best course to be pursued: adopting meanwhile measures, which whilst providing a remedy for existing evils, would, far from preventing the subsequent introduction of a Staff corps, facilitate, and pave the way for it.

9. Foremost among the measures we now venture to suggest, we place the introduction into the Indian service, of a system that has for five-and-twenty years past obtained in the Royal Ordnance corps, (which like all branches of Her Majesty's Indian army are organized on the principle of advancement by seniority and without purchase), namely, of "seconding" officers of those branches withdrawn from regimental duty, a practice originally confined to absentees on civil employ alone, but since successfully applied and extended to detached employ of any nature, and therefore especially well adapted for application to the whole military and civil Staff of India, under such rules for the periodical vacation of detached employ, as may be found expedient.

9. We have brought forward the "seconding" system thus prevailing in the Royal Ordnance branches, in preference to the Unattached List, peculiar to the other arms of the Royal service; because the former was introduced solely with a view to supply in regiments the place of officers withdrawn for Staff employ, and besides, owing partly no doubt to similarity of organization in the seniority corps of the two services, might at once be applied to all branches of the Indian service, without entailing on the Government of India the necessity of issuing complicated orders, or in any way making organic changes in the present system of the Indian army; whereas the Unattached List,

to which regimental officers of the other branches of the Royal army are generally transferred when withdrawn for Staff, is inseparably connected with purchase. It was originated by the Home Government, with a view to remedy the stagnation of promotion prevailing about thirty-five years since, in the Royal Ordnance and Marine corps; and officers of long service and high rank, belonging to those two corps, were induced to retire from the army, thus giving regimental promotion, by receiving permission to sell their commissions to officers of the Line and Cavalry, who found it to their advantage to purchase in this way, because they thus obtained a step by rank, and leaving their own regiment, became "Unattached" in the higher rank, and were then available for exchanging into regiments of Infantry or Cavalry under the conditions peculiar to those branches of the Royal service.

10. The Unattached List of the Royal service, comprises a large body of officers in the higher grades of Captains and field officers, some of whom supplement the establishment of regimental officers by filling various appointments on the Staff, but by far the larger number being unemployed, remain on half-pay; and as that system not only does not obtain in the Indian service, but further, as its introduction should be carefully guarded against, since it was stated by his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge (in his evidence before the Commission on Army purchase) to be "extremely objectionable," the conditions of the Unattached List are therefore in our opinion wholly unsuited to the Indian army, on its present constitution as a seniority service. And we recommend the introduction of the "seconding system," as a more suitable measure, which we now proceed to sketch.

We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

G. I. JAMESON, Colonel, } Military Finance
G. BALFOUR, Colonel, } Commissioners.

What was difficult in 1832, was still more so after the passing of the Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, without the willing concurrence of the officers of the Indian army. This willing concurrence is what was recommended to be obtained by the Committee of 1860, in their various recommendations already quoted. But what were the practical results to the Indian army of the G. G. O. (No. 332 of 1861)? The number of Colonels' allowances was reduced; officers appointed to the Staff corps were retained in the cadre of their regiment, not to assist in their own promotion, but to stop that of those below them, and in contravention of the regulations of 1796, and of Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, it was actually exemplified how an officer appointed to the Staff corps would supersede his regimental senior (No. 332 of 1861, par. 60).

But the following tables, selected at hazard, will better illustrate the working of the new system; and it will be observed that in some instances juniors have superseded their seniors by obtaining superior rank, as in cases marked *, and in other instances by alterations in dates of their commissions without gaining any accession of rank, as in cases marked †.

CADRE OF CAPTAINS of late 5th MADRAS LIGHT CAVALRY.

Dates of Commissions previous to the Amalgamation.	Order of Seniority in old Cadre.	Names.	Order of present Seniority.	Date of New Commissions.	Remarks.
8th May 1849 -	1	L. Barrow -	1	18th February 1861 -	Major in Staff corps.
8th December 1852 -	2	E. Forbes -	4	Same as before -	Still a Captain.
23rd November 1856 -	3	G. R. Phillips* -	2	18th February 1861 -	Major in Staff corps.
3rd June 1857 -	4	C. H. Abdy -	5	Same as before -	Still a Captain.
30th May 1859 -	5	F. L. Magniac* -	3	17th May 1862 -	Major in Staff corps.
27th March 1861 -	6	G. S. Simpson -	7	Same as before -	Still a Captain.
1st January 1862 -	7	H. M. Elliott † -	6	18th February 1861 -	{ Captain in Staff corps, but with Captain's commission antedated.

LIST OF CAPTAINS and LIEUTENANTS in 11th REGIMENT BOMBAY N.I.

Dates of Commissions previous to the Amalgamation.	Order of Seniority in old Cadre.	Names.	Order of present Seniority.	Date of New Commissions.	Remarks.
19th August 1847 -	1	D. Boyd -	2	21st February 1861 -	Major in Line.
1st November 1852 -	2	W. F. Anderson -	5	Same as before -	Still a Captain.
4th August 1853 -	3	W. I. Calusac -	6	Do. -	Do.
12th December 1855 -	4	W. S. Hewett* -	1	18th February 1861 -	Major in Staff corps.
27th June 1857 -	5	H. R. Hathway* -	4	13th November 1862 -	Do.
4th September 1857 -	6	G. Davison* -	3	1st " " -	Do.
10th June 1858 -	7	T. Thatcher -	7	Same -	{ Has joined Staff corps, and will be a Major on 10th August 1863.

Dates of Commissions previous to the Amalgamation.	Order of Seniority in old Cadre.	Name.	Order of present Seniority.	Date of New Commissions.	Remarks.
Lieutenants.					
4th August 1853 -	1	M. Boyd -	1	21st February 1861 -	{ Promoted to Captain, <i>vice</i> Boyd. Promoted to Brevet Captain. Captain in 106th Foot. Has joined Staff Corps. Still a Lieutenant. Do. Do. Captain 109th Foot. Still a Lieutenant. Captain 106th Foot. Still a Lieutenant.
16th December 1854 -	2	E. A. Green -	2	11th June 1862 -	
23rd November 1856 -	3	G. Maunsell * -	3	30th July 1862 -	
" " " -	4	J. Bolton -	6	Same -	
27th June 1857 -	5	J. Newton -	7	Do. -	
16th September 1857 -	6	A. Phelps -	8	Do. -	
22nd January 1858 -	7	F. Bowker * -	4	30th July 1862 -	
28th " " -	8	H. Cathcart -	9	Same -	
10th May 1859 -	9	G. Wilmot * -	5	30th July 1862 -	
18th July 1859 -	10	H. Gibson -	10	Same -	

CAPTAINS IN 13th REGIMENT MADRAS N. I.

Dates of Commissions previous to the Amalgamation.	Order of Seniority in old Cadre.	Names.	Order of present Seniority.	Date of New Commissions.	Remarks.
1st February 1853 -	1	F. A. Brooking -	3	Same -	Still a Captain.
5th June 1854 -	2	C. W. Taylor -	4	Do. -	Do.
14th February -	3	H. T. Campbell * -	1	15th December 1861 -	Major in Staff corps.
2nd October 1855 -	4	H. R. Morgan * -	2	15th February 1862 -	Do
23rd November 1856 -	5	R. O. Carey -	5	Same -	Still a Captain.
12th January 1860 -	6	W. Boardman -	6	Do. -	Do.
24th February 1861 -	7	J. H. Wardon † -	7	18th February 1861 -	Joined Staff corps.

A reference to the Army Lists will prove that similar instances of supersession occur in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 27th, 28th, 30th, 31st, 33rd, 36th, 37th, 38th, 44th, 46th, 48th, 52nd regiments, N. I., and 5th Light Cavalry of Madras army; in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 22nd, 24th regiments N. I. Bombay army; while the number of regiments similarly affected in the Bengal army is obviously considerable; moreover, in addition to this regimental supersession, the number of old officers in the service who have been superseded in the army by their juniors is enormous.

The officers of the Indian army do not, of course, venture to offer any suggestion; but submit that they are entitled, in accordance with the rights and privileges guaranteed to them, to be placed in their proper posi-

tion as regards rank, pay, and allowances, with those by whom they have been superseded.

They submit that the pension rules have been departed from in the new regulations, by depriving certain officers of the Staff corps who have actually completed 22 years service in India of the privilege of retiring on the pension of their rank; for, though permitted to reconsider their respective cases, they had originally joined on the distinct understanding that their pensions were to be regulated by the rules then in force.

In the Indian army, previous to the year 1857, there was the following number of regiments, for each of which there was a Colonel in the receipt of "Colonels' allowances," with the addition that in each Presidency the 1st European regiment had two Colonels with those allowances; so that there were 223 of these emoluments for 220 regiments.

Corps.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.	Remarks.
Engineers -	5	3	3	11	—
Artillery -	12	7	5	24	—
Cavalry -	10	8	3	21	—
European Infantry -	3	3	3	9	{ With 12 Colonels in receipt of "Colonels' allowances."
Native Infantry -	74	52	29	155	
Total number of regiments -	104	73	43	220	With 223 Colonels' allowances.

The succession to these emoluments was distinct in each branch of the service; the officers in the Ordnance corps obtaining them by regimental rotation, the Cavalry by a general line of field officers for that branch, as previously explained in regard of promotion, and the European and Native Infantry by one combined line for that branch of the service. By Despatch No. 320, dated 10th April 1861, a certain number of these allowances was ordered to be reduced "in a given ratio to the number of officers appointed to the Staff corps," and "in consequence of the reduction of the number of regiments." This reduction was ordered to be carried out at the rate of one in every four casualties; and these reductions were stated to be necessary by considerations both of a financial and of a political character. Granting the above, it is nevertheless submitted that the advantages as to succession to "Colonels' allowances," although guaranteed to the Indian army, have been materially altered in the following instances:—1st. By the reduction of the number in the Ordnance corps from 35 to 21, without a corresponding reduction in the effective strength of those branches of the service. 2dly. By

the retention on the list of Lieutenant-Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry of the names of field officers who have retired from the service, and their consequent nominal, though not actual, promotion to vacancies in the substantive rank of Colonel; whereby, for each such promotion, there is a reduction of a "Colonel's allowance" for the effective officers who remain, and who would otherwise have succeeded thereto. 3dly. By the substitution of "length of service" for the old system of "seniority on the roster," as the rule under which officers shall hereafter succeed to these emoluments; whilst the mode in which this length of service shall operate has been itself thus subdivided by Despatch No. 270, dated 31st July 1862.

* * * * * Her Majesty's Government have determined that all regimental Lieutenant-Colonels remaining on the general list of the local armies in the three Presidencies, whose commissions as such date prior to January 1, 1862, shall be considered entitled to promotion to the rank and allowances of Colonel when they shall have been 12 years in the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel; provided, however, that no promotion under this rule shall take place until those not in any way affected by the

APP. B.

retention of the names of the retired officers on the list shall have received the step in ordinary course (*vide note* *)

All officers who may have held the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on the 1st of January 1862, will also be entitled to promotion to the superior grade of Colonel with Colonels' allowances if the step come to them in ordinary course before the completion of twelve years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel; but when these Lieutenant-Colonels have been removed from the list, the promotion of those whose commissions bear date on the 1st of January 1862, or subsequently, will only be made, as in the Staff corps, after twelve years' service in that grade. *

The names of the officers of the Staff corps, and those of the new line regiments, will be treated in a similar manner with those of the effective officers on the list, with the exception that, in the case of the two former, their names upon coming into the position of Colonel with Colonels' allowances under the operation of the above rule, will be removed altogether from the general regimental list of the Indian army and promotion made in their places.

The principle upon which the succession to Colonels' allowances of officers of the Indian army who have not joined the Staff corps or the new Line regiments is hereafter to be regulated, is to be considered as determined by this arrangement.

In paragraph 46 of G. G. O., No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, it is stated, "the general gradation list of general and other officers of the armies of the three Presidencies, and their promotion therein, will remain exactly as at present."

In the Indian army this promotion has hitherto gone in one long list, for all branches of the service throughout the three Presidencies; the senior Colonel becoming a Major-General in succession to a vacancy in that grade, without reference to the branch of the service, or Presidency, to which he belonged.

By Royal Warrant,† dated 1st January 1862, new rules have been promulgated, with a view to fuse into one list the general officers of the Royal and Indian armies, and these new rules have very considerably altered those under which promotion to the rank of general officer had hitherto been made in the Indian army. The Warrant provides that the old arrangement shall only hold good for all Colonels of both armies who held that rank before the 17th February 1861, that is, before the amalgamation; but that all promoted after that date shall be formed into three separate lists—one for the Artillery, one for the Engineers, and one for the Cavalry and Infantry; from which lists respectively promotions to Generals shall be made, so soon as the Colonels senior to them shall have been promoted. The Warrant further provides, as regards each branch; that, "if all the Colonels on the separate list of one army shall have become Major-Generals, while some of the Colonels on the other separate list are still unpromoted, those Colonels shall have the benefit of vacancies occurring in the list of Generals of either army;" so that they may all be promoted before any of the Colonels who rank from and after the 17th February 1861. The Warrant further provides, that as soon as all the Colonels on the old system shall have been promoted, a fixed number of general officers shall be established for each of the branches of the Indian army; and that this number shall be added to the number hitherto allowed for the Royal army.

The results of the above measures may be thus illustrated:—

The establishments of general officers for the Indian Ordnance corps have been fixed at 26 for the Artillery and 12 for the Engineers, which, added to the number heretofore authorized by the Royal Ordnance corps, *viz.*, 32 for the Artillery and 16 for the Engineers, make 58 general officers for the amalgamated Artillery and 28 for the Engineers. On the 3rd of November 1854, when the establishments of general officers were fixed for the Royal Artillery and Engineers, those regiments consisted, respectively, of 676 and 347 officers of all grades; whilst, at the date fixed for the amalgamation of the lists, the Indian Artillery and Engineers consisted of 670 and 336 officers respectively; so that the proportion now allowed for the Indian Ordnance corps is much below that granted to the corresponding branches of the old Royal service; thus—

R.A.	R.A.	I.A.	I.A.
676 officers;	32 generals;	670 officers;	31 generals;

whereas, as previously shown, only 26 have been granted.

* Lieut.-Colonel Browne stands at present fifth on the list of regimental Lieut.-Colonels of the Madras Infantry. Two of those above him are effective officers, and two are borne on the list *in stabs*. When the Lieut.-Colonel second on the list, *viz.*, Lieut.-Colonel Fitzgerald, succeeds to the Colonel's allowance, Lieut.-Colonel Browne will become entitled to benefit by the rule as to succession to the allowance after 12 years, but not before.

† Circular, No. 735.

The grade of regimental Colonel has been long established in the Royal Ordnance corps, but was only created in the Indian service on the 18th February 1861; consequently, with the exception of a few officers who hold brevet rank, the whole of the Colonels of the Indian Artillery and Engineers take rank from and after that date; and are therefore all junior to their comrades in the Royal service. Hence, all promotions from the amalgamated list will go almost entirely in the old Royal regiments; the lower grades in them will receive corresponding promotions to fill up the vacancies thus created, and the Indian regiments will receive no benefit whatever. Nor will the inequality of the arrangements stop here; for it necessarily follows that, until the list of Royal Colonels (and the list is a very long one) whose rank dates from or before 17th February 1861, shall have been cleared off, all promotions to the grade of general officer will go in these regiments, and there will be an utter stagnation of the higher grades of the Indian Artillery and Engineers. For instance, by the last official "Army List,"* of the 70 Lieutenant-Colonels in the 16 brigades of Royal Artillery, no less than 37 are Brevet-Colonels; whilst in the 14 brigades of Indian Artillery there are only 4 Brevet-Colonels for the 61 Lieutenant-Colonels of that branch of the service. As on the 17th February 1861, the day before the amalgamation of the armies, there were no Colonels of Indian Artillery and Engineers, it is submitted that if the 19th of that month (or the day after the amalgamation of the armies) had been fixed upon, as the date for the formation of the amalgamated list of Colonels, the fusion might have been effected without any very great inequality.

In Despatch No. 320, dated 10th August 1861, the sum of 93,380*l.* was apportioned to the Indian Cavalry and Infantry, as follows:—

7,070 <i>l.</i> for the Lieutenant-Colonels of Cavalry.
52,760 <i>l.</i> for the Lieutenant-Colonels of Infantry.
33,550 <i>l.</i> for the Majors of these two branches.

These amounts were subdivided into extra annuities, varying from 550*l.* to 125*l.* each; which annuities were given as "pro rata" equivalents to the officers of those branches of the service, for their diminished expectations of succeeding to Colonels' allowances, owing to the prospective reduction in the number of these emoluments, which the Government wished eventually to carry out; and certain promotions in room of those who retired on the above annuities were vouchsafed to the officers remaining in the service. This subject is thus referred to in paragraphs 17 and 20 of the Despatch above quoted:—

Para. 17. Considering the very liberal provisions now offered to the senior officers of the army, and the very great expense that will be entailed upon the Government of India thereby, &c., &c.

Para. 20. By this course you will observe that very great promotion will be at once given to the Captains and junior officers of the army.

Although the term "army" was almost invariably used throughout the several Despatches on this subject, no corresponding outlay has ever been made to the Indian Artillery and Engineers, although 14 out of 35, or two-fifths of their Colonels' allowances were taken away; whilst, on the other hand, they were the only corps in which no reduction in effective strength took place. This exclusion of the Ordnance corps from the above benefits is thus adverted to in paragraph 27 of the Despatch above quoted:—

... in accordance with the proposal of the Amalgamation Commission, I have not contemplated extending the option of retirement, with enhanced pension, to field officers of the Artillery and Engineers.

But the equivalents for this exclusion also proposed by that Commission were not extended to the Ordnance corps, on the grounds stated in the following extract from paragraphs 21 and 25 of the same Despatch:—

Para. 21. the effect of making promotions in place of supernumerary Colonels-Commandant would be to burden the Government with the expense of maintaining a large number of officers in superior and highly-paid grades for whom there is no suitable employment, and to cause a needless amount of supercession in the other branches of the service.

Para. 25. the introduction of the practice of "seconding" in the Indian corps, by causing the promotion of a great number of officers, would give these corps a great advantage over the other arms of the service.

The monthly pay and allowances of an unemployed Colonel of Infantry in India, at the date of the passing of the Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106, were Rs. 1521-10-2. By the following General Order those allowances were only passed for six months from date of promotion to the rank of Colonel; after which time they were to be reduced to Rs. 918-4-2, thus entailing a monthly loss of Rs. 603-6-0 to the officers concerned. It is submitted that this reduction of pay is a departure from the guarantee.

Military Department, Fort William, 1st July 1862.—Under instructions from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for India, it is hereby notified that the grant of Indian allowances of officers who may hereafter attain to the Colonel's allowance, and who may not be required to reside in India by any of the Indian Governments, will be discontinued.

Such officers will receive in addition to that allowance the full rate of regimental pay only as long as they may be unemployed, wherever they may be permitted to reside.

Indian allowances will, however, be passed to such officers for six months from the date of the general order promoting them to

the Colonel's allowance, or for any shorter period during which they may be resident in India

Pay and allowances of a Colonel of Infantry in India unemployed are directed by General Orders of 1st July 1862, under instructions from the Secretary of State for India, to be in future Rs 918-4-2.

As to the Regimental Bonus Funds the Court of Directors sanctioned these funds, and thus created a privilege to the army, which at the period of amalgamation had become a custom. The Court of Directors could not sanction such a privilege, without the concurrence of the Board of Control. The sanction was, therefore the joint act of both authorities, and was promulgated to the Indian army by the Governor-General of India in Council, May 2nd, 1838 (Appendix 5).

That General Order was never rescinded, nor was it ever hinted that it should or would be rescinded. Mr. Melvill, Sir James Outram, Colonel Durand, and Mr. Willoughby, speaking in their high official capacities, distinctly state that these funds were an integral portion of the system of promotion existing in the Indian army. After the passing of Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, this custom was still carried out in its full integrity. Therefore, it is submitted, that the Legislature, when enacting 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, never intended that the officers of the Indian army should thus suffer the great pecuniary loss which has ensued; for to many it has been the loss of the savings of their whole lives, and the only fortune, however humble it might have been, to which their families could look forward.

* G.O.G.G. 23rd June 1838, published the following extract from Military Letter from the Court of Directors, No. 30, dated 14th March 1838.

" Para 34.—We take the opportunity of apprising you that Colonels of regiments, who have succeeded to 'off- reckonings,' may be permitted to reside in India, unemployed, in the same manner and with the same allowances as Major-Generals similarly circumstanced."

APP. B. ABSTRACT, showing :—1. The POSITION of the FIELD OFFICERS and CAPTAINS of the MADRAS ARTILLERY on the Day was carried out ; 3. Their Position as they should have stood on the same Day, had the Corps, as directed in Artillery at the Time it was amalgamated therewith ; 4. The Promotions due to the Regiment, in room of Casualties, Officers as at present gazetted ; and 6. Their Position as it should be under the Royal Artillery Organization.

1.				2.			3.			4.		
Position on the 17th February 1861, being the day preceding the Amalgamation.				Position on 18th February 1861, owing to the Mode in which that Measure was carried on.			Position had the Corps, as ordered, been assimilated with the Royal Artillery.			Promotions due to the Regiment in room of Casualties, showing the Date and Nature of Casualties for which those Promotions are claimed.		
No.	Rank.	Names.	Date of Commission.	No.	Rank.	Date of Commission	No.	Rank.	Date of Commission.	Rank.	Date.	Nature of Casualty.
1	Colonel, with the "Colonel's Allowance."	Showers	2 Jan. 1833	1	Col.-Comt.	2 Jan. 1833	1	Col.-Comt.	2 Jan. 1833	-	-	-
2		Cullen	-	2	"	-	2	"	-	-	-	-
3		Ketchen	-	3	"	-	3	"	-	-	-	-
4		Montgomery	7 Oct. 1849	4	"	7 Oct. 1849	4	"	7 Oct. 1849	-	-	-
5		Conran	15 May 1851	1	Colonel	15 May 1851	Sup	4	15 May 1851	-	-	-
6		Whynates	12 Aug. 1853	2	"	12 Aug. 1853	"	"	12 Aug. 1853	-	-	-
7		Shurreff	-	3	"	-	"	"	-	-	-	-
1	Lieut.-Col.	Croggan	11 Feb. 1855	4	"	18 Feb. 1861	1	Colonel	18 Feb. 1861	*Col.-Comt.	25 Sept. 1861	Vice Shurreff, deceased
2	"	Whistler	4 Nov. 1857	5	"	"	2	"	"	"	9 June 1862	Vice Ketchen, deceased
3	"	Moore	27 Aug. 1858	6	"	"	3	"	"	"	2 Oct. 1862	Vice Cullen, deceased
4	"	Simpson	"	-	"	"	4	"	"	-	-	-
5	"	Briggs	"	7	"	"	4	"	"	-	-	-
6	"	Matland	"	-	"	"	-	"	"	-	-	-
7	"	Balfour	"	8	"	"	7	"	"	-	-	-
8	" A.	Brice	13 Nov. 1858	1	Lieut.-Col.	13 Nov. 1858	5	"	"	*Colonel	18 Feb. 1861	{To complete establishment on the reorganization of the regiment}
9	" A.	Rowlandson	14 Nov. 1858	-	"	14 Nov. 1858	-	"	"	"	"	Vice Simpson, seconded
10	" A.	Orr	24 Feb. 1859	2	"	24 Feb. 1859	6	"	"	"	"	Vice Matland, seconded
11	" A.	Cooke	22 Feb. 1860	3	"	22 Feb. 1860	7	"	"	"	"	Vice Balfour, seconded
12	"	Cotter	-	4	"	-	8	"	"	"	"	Vice Rowlandson, seconded
13	"	Black	31 Dec. 1860	5	"	31 Dec. 1860	-	Lieut.-Col.	31 Dec. 1860	*Colonel	-	-
14	"	Worster	16 Jan. 1861	6	"	16 Jan. 1861	-	"	16 Jan. 1861	"	25 Feb. 1861	Vice Cotter, retired
1	Captain	Gabbett	-	7	"	18 Feb. 1861	1	"	18 Feb. 1861	"	-	-
2	"	Babington	-	8	"	"	2	"	"	"	25 Sept. 1861	Vice Croggan, promoted
3	"	Barrow	5 May 1851	-	"	"	-	"	"	"	-	-
4	"	Eaton	12 April 1852	9	"	"	3	"	"	"	29 Sept. 1861	Vice Gabbett, retired
5	"	Mein	4 June 1852	10	"	"	4	"	"	"	29 Sept. 1861	Vice Babington, retired
6	"	Balmain	6 Jan. 1854	11	"	"	5	"	"	"	9 June 1862	Vice Whistler, promoted
7	"	Selby	14 Mar. 1854	12	"	"	6	"	"	"	29 Aug. 1862	Vice Balmain, seconded
8	"	Macintyre	11 May 1854	13	"	"	7	"	"	"	2 Oct. 1862	Vice Moore, promoted
9	"	Campbell	-	14	"	"	8	"	"	-	-	-
10	"	Scott	-	15	"	"	9	"	"	-	-	-
11	"	Wade	-	16	"	"	10	"	"	-	-	-
12	" A.	Hutchinson	12 Aug. 1854	1	Captain	12 Aug. 1854	11	"	"	*Lt.-Col.	-	-
13	" A.	Nuthall	30 Aug. 1854	2	"	30 Aug. 1854	12	"	"	"	18 Feb. 1861	{To complete establishment on the reorganization of the regiment}
14	" A.	Cadell	28 Nov. 1854	3	"	28 Nov. 1854	13	"	"	"	"	-
15	" A.	Macpherson	31 Dec. 1854	4	"	31 Dec. 1854	-	"	"	"	"	Vice Black, seconded
16	" A.	Baker	11 Feb. 1855	-	"	11 Feb. 1855	14	"	"	"	"	Vice Worster, seconded
17	" A.	Falls	11 April 1855	5	"	11 April 1855	15	"	"	"	"	Vice Barrow, seconded
18	" A.	Bond	1 May 1855	6	"	1 May 1855	16	"	"	"	"	Vice Macpherson, seconded
19	"	Purvis	14 Aug. 1855	7	"	14 Aug. 1855	1	Captain	14 Aug. 1855	"	25 Feb. 1861	Vice Gabbett, promoted
20	"	Molesworth	21 Aug. 1855	8	"	21 Aug. 1855	2	"	21 Aug. 1855	"	15 Sept. 1861	Vice Scott, retired
21	"	Grant	10 April 1856	9	"	10 April 1856	3	"	25 April 1856	"	25 Sept. 1861	Vice Babington, promoted

preceding the Amalgamation ; 2. Their Position on the following Day, owing to the Mode in which that Measure Paragraph 25 of General Order No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, been assimilated to the full Extent with the Royal showing the Nature and Dates of the Casualties for which these Promotions are claimed ; 5. The Position of the

APP. B.

5.			6.			Length of Service. Years	REMARKS.
Position, as at present gazetted.			Position, as it should be under the Royal Artillery Organization.				
No	Rank.	Date of Commission.	No	Rank.	Date of Commission		
1	Col-Comt.	2 Jan. 1863	1	Col-Comt.	2 Jan. 1833	65	<p>Note.—The promotions marked *, although due to the regiment, have been withheld up to this date. Some of the officers marked * have been promoted to the rank claimed for them, but from dates subsequent to those to which they are entitled, as in the cases marked A, which involve in some instances a heavy loss of pay. <i>Vide</i> column 1.</p> <p>Died, 1st October 1862.</p> <p>Died, 8th June 1862.</p> <p>These three officers, being in excess of the new establishment of Colonels-Commandant laid down for the regiment, became supernumerary in that rank, in conformity with the principle laid down in paragraphs 27, 28, 33, 47, and 48 of General Order by the Governor-General of India, No. 332, dated 10th April 1861. They were, at that time, in receipt of "Colonel's allowance," but, contrary to all precedent, they were reckoned as effective officers of the next lower grade, which amounted to a practical disrating, as will be seen by column 2, and the corps lost three steps which were justly its due, under the Government's own orders. <i>Vide</i> columns 2, 3, and 4.</p> <p>Died, 24th September 1861.</p> <p>These three officers are now in receipt of "Colonel's allowance," but are still reckoned as effective Colonels. <i>Vide</i> column 5. They should be (supernumerary) Colonels-Commandant, <i>vide</i> column 6, and the next step should lapse to the Government, it having been laid down in the General Order that supernumeraries were only to be absorbed by every fourth step lapsing to the Government. It is a similar case to the last, and the corps has lost three steps. <i>Vide</i> column 4.</p>
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
2	"	7 Oct. 1849	2	"	7 Oct. 1849	53	<p>Secounded. Inspector-General of Ordnance and Magazines.</p> <p>Secounded. Superintendent of the Gun-Carriage Factory</p> <p>President Military Finance Department of India, should have been secounded, but this has not been done.</p> <p>Secounded. Superintendent of the Gunpowder Factory</p> <p>Retired, 24th February 1861.</p> <p>On the 18th February 1861 this officer was Director of the Artillery Depot of Instruction, Superintendent of the Percussion-cap Factory, and in charge of the Field Train. The General Order directed that officers employed in the manufacturing establishments should be secounded; and in virtue of his second appointment he should therefore have been secounded. The Artillery Depot was abolished on the 1st November 1862, and this officer should therefore be brought on the effective list on the occurrence of the next vacancy. He has never been secounded.</p> <p>Barrack-Master of the Madras Presidency, should have been secounded, but this has not been done.</p> <p>Retired, 28th September 1861.</p> <p>Retired, 28th September 1861.</p> <p>Secounded. Principal Commissary of Ordnance.</p> <p>This officer is Commissioner of a Province. He obtained civil employ on 29th August 1862, and should, therefore, have been secounded from that date. He has never been secounded.</p> <p>Retired, 14th September 1861.</p> <p>Civil employ. Resident Councillor, Singapore; should have been secounded, but this has not been done.</p>
3	"	15 May 1851	3	"	15 May 1851	52	
4	"	12 Aug. 1853	4	"	12 Aug. 1853	50	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
1	Colonel	18 Feb. 1861	Sup	"	25 Sept. 1861	40	
3	"	"	"	"	9 June 1862	39	
3	"	"	"	"	2 Oct. 1862	39	
-	"	"	Colonel	"	18 Feb. 1861	39	
4	"	"	1	"	"	39	
5	"	"	-	"	"	39	
6	"	25 Sept. 1861	2	"	"	37	
7	"	9 June 1862	-	"	"	37	
8	"	2 Oct. 1862	4	"	"	36	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
1	Lieut.-Col.	31 Dec. 1860	-	"	25 Feb. 1861	36	
2	"	16 Jan. 1861	-	"	25 Feb. 1861	36	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
-	"	18 Feb. 1861	-	"	29 Sept. 1861	34	
3	"	"	5	"	29 Sept. 1861	34	
4	"	"	6	"	29 Sept. 1861	34	
5	"	"	-	"	9 June 1862	33	
6	"	"	7	"	29 Aug. 1862	33	
7	"	"	8	"	2 Oct. 1862	32	
8	"	"	1	Lieut.-Col.	18 Feb. 1861	32	
-	"	"	-	"	"	-	
9	"	"	2	"	"	31	
10	"	25 Feb. 1861	3	"	"	29	
11	"	15 Sept. 1861	4	"	"	29	
12	"	25 Sept. 1861	5	"	"	29	
13	"	29 Sept. 1861	-	"	"	27	
14	"	20 Sept. 1861	6	"	"	27	
15	"	9 June 1862	7	"	"	24	
16	"	2 Oct. 1862	8	"	"	24	
1	Captain	14 Aug. 1855	9	"	25 Feb. 1861	24	
2	"	21 Aug. 1855	10	"	15 Sept. 1861	24	
3	"	10 Apr. 1856	11	"	25 Sept. 1861	23	

APP. B.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

FORM OF COVENANT, 1764 to 1770

This Indenture, made the _____ day of _____ in the _____ year of the reign of Our Sovereign Lord _____ by the Grace of God King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and so forth, and in the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and _____ between _____ of the one part, and the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies of the other part Whereas the Court of Directors for the affairs of the said United Company have granted a Commission to the said _____ appointing him Captain of Foot in their military forces in the East Indies. Now this Indenture witnesseth, and the said _____ in compliance with the resolution of a general Court of the said United Company, and for and in consideration of what he is, or shall be, entitled to receive from the said Company, in respect of his said service, or in respect of any other military station or employment, in which the said _____ may hereafter be employed by the said United Company or their Court of Directors, doth hereby, for himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant, promise, and agree to and with the said United Company, that he the said _____ shall not, nor will, at any time or times hereafter, during his being employed in the said Company's service, in any station or capacity whatsoever, either by himself, or by any other person or persons whomsoever in trust for him or for his use, directly or indirectly accept, take, or receive, or agree to accept, take or receive any gift or grant of lands, or rents, or revenues issuing out of lands, or any territorial possession, jurisdiction, dominion, power, or authority whatsoever, from any of the Indian princes, sovereigns, subahs, or nabobs, or any of their ministers, servants, or agents, for any service or services, or upon any account or pretence whatsoever, without the licence or consent of the Court of Directors for the time being of the said United Company, signified under their hands, nor shall or will, at any time or times hereafter, during his being employed in the said United Company's service, in any station or capacity whatsoever, either by himself or any other person or persons whomsoever in trust for him, or for his use, directly or indirectly, accept, take, or receive, or agree to accept, take, or receive any gift, reward, gratuity, allowance, donation, or compensation in money, effects, jewels, or otherwise howsoever, from any of the Indian princes, sovereigns, subahs, or nabobs, or any of their ministers, servants, or agents, exceeding the value of four thousand rupees for any service or services performed, or to be performed by the said _____ in India, or upon any other account or pretence whatsoever, without the like licence or consent of the said Court of Directors of the said United Company, signified as aforesaid, nor any such reward, gratuity, allowance, donation, or compensation, exceeding the value of one thousand rupees, and under the value of four thousand rupees, without the licence or consent of the President and Council for the time being of the Presidency or settlement where the said _____ shall be employed, and that he the said _____ shall and will convey, assign, and make over to the said United Company, for their sole and proper use and benefit, all and every such gifts or grants of lands, or rents, or revenues, issuing out of lands or any such territorial possession, jurisdiction, dominion, power, or authority whatsoever, and also account for and pay to the said United Company, for their sole and proper use and benefit, all and every such gifts, rewards, gratuities, allowances, donations, or compensations whatsoever, which, contrary to the true intent and meaning of these presents, shall come to the hands, possession, or power of the said _____ or any other person or persons in trust for him, or for his use as aforesaid provided always, that nothing herein contained shall hinder or prevent, or be deemed, taken, or construed to hinder or prevent the said _____ from accepting or receiving a share or proportion in respect of his military post or station, of any gift, gratuity, or donation in money, or effects, which any Indian prince, sovereign, subah, or nabob, shall or may, in time of extreme danger, necessity, or emergency, give or bestow on any of the military officers or forces of the said United Company, provided such gift, gratuity, or donation be with the privity and consent of the Governor and Council of the Presidency or settlement where the said _____ shall be employed, and not otherwise, and provided also that the same be not obtained or exacted by compulsion, or by way of bargain or contract, for any service or services performed, or to be performed provided also, that no Governor or President of any of the said United Company's settlements in India shall, by virtue of his commission from the said United Company, be authorized or entitled to accept or receive any part, share, or proportion of any such gift, gratuity, or donation, as is mentioned in the proviso herein-before contained. In witness whereof to one part of this indenture the said A B hath put his hand and seal, and to the other part thereof the said United Company hath caused their common seal to be affixed, the day and year above written.

A. B.

L. S.

Sealed and delivered (being first duly stamped) in the presence of

Memorandum.—Military officers do not give security for the performance of the above covenant.

I acknowledge to have read the within covenant before I executed the same.

Witness A. B.

No 2.

ARTICLE 20 of the INSTRUCTIONS of the East India Company to the Governor General of Bengal, dated 29th March 1774.

If any of the Company's servants, civil or military (except the members of our Board of Trade, whom we do not make liable to your suspension), shall at any time be suspended by you from the execution of his office, or any vacancy shall happen by resignation or death, it is our orders and direction that the person next in rank, office, or rotation, be appointed to supply such vacancy in our civil or military service until our pleasure shall be known. We also further direct that before the removal of any Company's servant from any office, the party be made acquainted in writing with the accusation preferred against him, that he be summoned to make his defence, having a reasonable time allowed him for that purpose, and that you proceed, on all such occasions, with the greatest tenderness and circumspection, and we further direct that all such charges made before you against any of our servants in your department, all proceedings thereon be regularly entered upon your consultations, and with them transmitted to us.


No 3

FORM OF COVENANT, from 1770 to 1796

This indenture, made the _____ day of _____ in the _____ year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord George the Third, by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and so forth, and in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and _____, between A B of London, Esquire, of the one part, and the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies of the other part Whereas the Court of Directors for the affairs of the said United Company have granted a commission to the said A B, appointing him Captain of Foot in their military forces in the East Indies. Now this indenture witnesseth, and the said A B, in compliance with a resolution of a General Court of the said United Company, and in consideration of what he is or shall be entitled to receive from the said Company in respect of his said service, or in respect of any other military station or employment, or which the said A B may hereafter be employed by the said United Company or their Court of Directors, doth hereby for himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant, promise, and agree to and with the said United Company, that he, the said A B, shall not, nor will at any time or times hereafter, during his being employed in the said Company's service, in any station or capacity whatsoever, either by himself or by any other person or persons whomsoever, in trust for him or for his use, directly or indirectly accept, take, or receive, or agree to accept, take, or receive any gift or grant of lands, or rents for revenues, issuing out of lands, or any territorial possession, jurisdiction, dominion, power, or authority whatsoever from any of the Indian princes, sovereigns, subahs, or nabobs, or any of their ministers, servants, or agents, for any service or services, or upon any account or pretence whatsoever, without the licence or consent of the Court of Directors for the time being of the said United Company, signified under their hands, nor shall or will at any time or times thereafter, during his being employed in the said United Company's service, in any station or capacity whatsoever, either by himself or any other person or persons whomsoever, in trust for him or for his use, directly or indirectly, accept, take, or receive, or agree to accept, take, or receive, any gift, reward, gratuity, allowance, donation, or compensation, in money, effects, jewels, or otherwise howsoever, from any of the Indian princes, sovereigns, subahs, or nabobs, or any of their ministers, servants, or agents, exceeding the value of four thousand rupees, for any service or services performed or to be performed by the said A B in India, or upon any other account or pretence whatsoever, without the like licence or consent of the said Court of Directors of the said United Company, signified as aforesaid, nor any such reward, gratuity, allowance, donation, or compensation exceeding the value of one thousand rupees, and under the value of four thousand rupees, without the licence or consent of the President and Council for the time being of the Presidency or settlement where the said A B shall be employed, and that he, the said A B, shall and will convey, assign, and make over to the said United Company, for their sole and proper use and benefit, all and every such gifts, or grants of lands, or rents or revenues, issuing out of lands, or any such territorial possession, jurisdiction, dominion, power, or authority whatsoever, and also account for and pay to the said United Company, for their sole and proper use and benefit, all and every such gifts, rewards, gratuities, allowances, donations, or compensations whatsoever, which, contrary to the true intent and meaning of these presents, shall come to the hands, possession, or power of the said A B, or any other person or persons in trust for him, or for his use as aforesaid: Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall hinder or prevent, the said A B from accepting or receiving a share or proportion in respect of his military post or

station of any gift, gratuity, or donation, in money or effects, which any Indian prince, sovereign, subah, or nabob, shall or may in time of extreme danger, necessity, or emergency, give or bestow on any of the military officers or forces of the said United Company, provided such gift, gratuity, or donation, be with the privity and consent of the Governor and Council of the Presidency or settlement where the said A B shall be employed, and not otherwise, and provided also that the same be not obtained or exacted by compulsion or by way of bargain or contract for any service or services performed, or to be performed: provided also, that no Governor or President of any of the said United Company's settlements in India, shall, by virtue, of his commission from the said United Company, be authorized or entitled to accept or receive any part, share or proportion of any such gift, gratuity, or donation, as is mentioned in the proviso herein-before contained. And this indenture further witnesseth, and the said A B doth hereby covenant, consent, and agree, to and with the said United Company, that in case the said A B shall be dismissed the said United Company's military service by sentence of court-martial, or by a resolution or order of the Company's President and Council of such settlement, where the said A B shall serve or be, or if the said A B shall otherwise legally quit the said Company's military service, that then, and in any or either of the said cases, it shall be lawful to and for the said United Company's said President and Council, at any time after the expiration of six calendar months, next following such dismissal from, or quitting the said Company's military service as aforesaid, to carry and transport the said A B, at the expense of the said Company, to Great Britain, in such ship employed in the said Company's service, as the said President and Council shall for that purpose appoint. And in case the said A B shall neglect, or refuse to repair or go on board such ship as aforesaid by the space of 10 days after notice shall be given him so to do by order of the said President and Council, then and in such case it shall be lawful for the said President and Council, and they are hereby fully authorized and empowered to cause the said A B to be apprehended and detained, and to put him on board such ship as aforesaid, for the purpose of being carried and transported to Great Britain, so nevertheless, that no unnecessary delay be sought, nor any fit occasion or opportunity lost, in so detaining or putting on board the said A B. And further, in case of such apprehending, putting on board, and transporting, the said A B, in manner aforesaid, the said A B doth hereby covenant, promise, and agree to, and with the said United Company, that he, the said A B, his executors or administrators, shall not, nor will commence, sue, or prosecute, the said United Company, or their Court of Directors, or any of their Presidents and Council, commanders, or officers of any such ships, or any other person employed

in any of the matters aforesaid, in, or by any action suit, or other prosecution, civil or criminal, in respect of such apprehending him, the said A B, or of putting him on board, and transporting him, the said A B., to Great Britain, in manner aforesaid. and in case any such action, suit, or prosecution, shall be commenced, sued, or prosecuted, for any of the matters aforesaid, the said A B doth hereby covenant and agree to and with the said Company, that the general issue may be pleaded, and this present indenture, or any other special matter, may be given in evidence, by any of the defendants in any suit, action, or prosecution in bar, discharge and defence thereof, anything in these presents contained to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding. In witness whereof, to one part of this indenture, the said A B, hath put his hand and seal, and to the other part thereof, the said United Company have caused their common seal to be affixed, the day and year above written

A. B. 

Sealed and delivered (being first duly stamped) in the presence of

Memorandum—Military officers do not give security for the performance of the above covenant

I acknowledge to have read the within covenant before I executed the same

Witness A. B.

No. 4.

CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO PROMOTION.

The officers of the Artillery and Engineer corps rise in their respective arms by seniority

In the Cavalry and Infantry they rise by seniority in their respective regiments to the rank of Major. They then take their place in the gradation list of their respective branches, and are promoted by seniority therein to the regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. They continue in these separate regimental gradation lists for succession to regiments, and to the Colonel's allowance

The whole of the Lieutenant-Colonels of Artillery, Engineers, Cavalry, and Infantry, are arranged in one gradation list for promotion to the brevet rank of Colonel and general officer, and promotion to these grades is regulated according to the provisions of the Royal Warrant of October 1854. This brevet rank does not affect their succession to the Colonel's allowance

Subalterns, after fifteen years from the date of their first commissions, are promoted to the rank of Captain by brevet.

CONDITION AS RESPECTS OF REGIMENTAL PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE OFFICERS OF ALL BRANCHES OF THE SERVICE IN INDIA.

TABLE OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ANY MONTH

CORPS AND RANK.	In Garrison or Cantonment, within 200 Miles of direct Distance from the Seat of Government of each Presidency					In the Field, and in Garrison or Cantonment beyond 200 Miles of direct Distance from the Seat of Government of each Presidency				
	Pay and Indian Allowance	Regl House Rent.	Horse Allowance.	Tent	Total	Pay and Indian Allowance	Extra Batta.	Horse Allowance	Tentage	Total
<i>Horse Artillery and Cavalry</i>										
Colonel	RS. A. P. 1,158 7 0	RS. 0	RS. A. P. 120 0 0	RS. 200	RS. A. P. 1,478 7 0	RS. A. P. 1,158 7 0	0 0 0	RS. 120 0 0	RS. 200	RS. A. P. 1,478 7 0
Lieutenant-Colonel	888 10 0	100	120 0 0	150	958 10 0	888 10 0	304 6 0	120 0 0	150	1,167 6 0
Major	461 1 10	80	120 0 0	120	781 1 10	461 1 10	228 4 6	120 0 0	120	929 6 4
Captain or Surgeon, or Veterinary Surgeon, 20 years' service	306 11 4	50	90 0 0	75	521 11 4	306 11 4	91 5 0	90 0 0	75	563 0 4
Lieutenant or Assistant-Surgeon, or Veterinary Surgeon, 10 years' service	194 6 0	30	60 0 0	50	334 6 0	191 6 0	60 14 0	60 0 0	50	380 4 0
Cornet, or Veterinary Surgeon, under 10 years' service	154 15 10	25	60 0 0	50	289 15 10	154 15 10	45 10 6	60 0 0	50	310 10 4
<i>Foot Artillery and Engineers</i>										
Colonel	1,065 5 0	0	30 0 0	200	1,295 5 0	1,065 5 0	0 0 0	30 0 0	200	1,295 5 0
Lieutenant-Colonel	547 14 0	100	30 0 0	150	827 14 0	547 14 0	304 6 0	30 0 0	150	1,032 4 0
Major	410 14 6	80	30 0 0	120	640 14 6	410 14 6	228 4 6	30 0 0	120	789 3 0
Captain, or Surgeon	267 5 0	50	0 0 0	75	392 5 0	267 5 0	91 5 0	0 0 0	75	433 10 0
Lieutenant, or Assistant-Surgeon	154 14 0	0	0 0 0	50	234 14 0	154 14 0	60 14 0	0 0 0	50	265 12 0
Second Lieutenant	117 10 6	25	0 0 0	50	192 10 6	117 10 6	45 10 6	0 0 0	50	213 5 0
<i>European and Native Infantry</i>										
Colonel	1,065 5 0	0	30 0 0	200	1,295 5 0	1,065 5 0	0 0 0	30 0 0	200	1,295 5 0
Lieutenant-Colonel	547 14 0	100	30 0 0	150	827 14 0	547 14 0	304 6 0	30 0 0	150	1,032 4 0
Major	410 14 6	80	30 0 0	120	640 14 6	410 14 6	228 4 6	30 0 0	120	789 3 0
Captain, or Surgeon	249 1 0	50	0 0 0	75	374 1 0	249 1 0	91 5 0	0 0 0	75	415 6 0
Lieutenant, or Assistant-Surgeon	145 12 0	0	0 0 0	50	225 12 0	145 12 0	60 14 0	0 0 0	50	256 10 0
Ensign	107 1 11	25	0 0 0	50	182 1 11	107 1 11	45 10 6	0 0 0	50	202 12 0

East India House, 23d August 1858

FURLOUGH REGULATIONS.

The furlough regulations were revised in 1854, and all officers entering the service since that date come under the operation of the revised rules. The following are the rules:

FURLONGS ON PRIVATE AFFAIRS

Every officer will be allowed a furlough to Europe, or elsewhere beyond sea, for a period of two years at the expiration of ten years' service, and for a second period of two years after twenty years' service in India.

The second furlough of two years will only be granted after ten years' service in India, from the date of the return to duty after

the first furlough of two years. These furloughs are not to be cumulative under any circumstances, but are limited to two years. Officers who have taken leave of absence on sick certificate to Europe, or elsewhere beyond sea, will be ineligible to a furlough on private affairs until they have served six years from their last return to duty. This rule does not apply to short leaves to sea.

All grants of furlough on private affairs are subject to the exigencies of the public service, and to the regulations framed for the preservation of the efficiency of each regiment by limiting the number of absentees.

Officers holding Staff or other detached appointments may be allowed furlough for a period of six months without losing their

APP. B.

appointments; but during that period they will not be entitled to any portion of their Staff salary, which will be drawn in full by the officers officiating for them.

All officers, whether Staff or regimental, while on furlough on private affairs, will be entitled to "furlough pay" only.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE ON SICK CERTIFICATE.

Leave of absence on sick certificate will be granted for a term not exceeding eighteen months, whether it be to any place in Europe, or elsewhere out of India.

Extensions of such leave may be granted, as at present, on production of medical certificates, for further periods not exceeding eighteen months in the whole.

An officer holding a Staff or other detached appointment will be allowed to be absent on sick certificate in England, or elsewhere beyond sea, for a period of fifteen months, without losing his appointment; and, during the first six months only of such absence, he will be entitled to draw half the Staff salary of his appointment, the officer officiating for him drawing the remainder half salary during the first six months, and the whole salary during the remainder of the time.

An officer's claim to half Staff salary for six months, as sanctioned in the preceding rule, will not be affected by his subsequently retiring from the service in Europe, or elsewhere.

No portion of command allowance, Medical Staff salary, or other similar allowance, which under the old rules was inadmissible to officers absent from their corps or stations at the Cape or elsewhere, will be allowed to absent officers under these regulations.

All officers, whether Staff or regimental, while on leave of absence on sick certificate, will be entitled for a period of six months to the same rate of Indian pay and allowances as was allowed under the old regulations to officers proceeding to the Cape on medical certificate, and for the remaining period of their leave they will receive furlough pay only.

If the leave on sick certificate be extended, furlough pay will be continued; but under no circumstances for a longer period than three years altogether, from the commencement of the absence.

STAFF OFFICERS.

The term Staff officer applies to all officers holding Staff or detached appointments, military (general or regimental), political or civil: also to general officers commanding divisions, members of the Medical Board, superintending surgeons, and others who, under the old rules, were entitled to draw half Staff allowance when absent at the Cape.

Staff officers absent on leave beyond the periods stated in Rules 9 and 13 respectively, cannot retain their appointments and allowances except on special grounds, to be sanctioned by the Government of the Presidency. Any such special grant of leave is to be reported at once to the Honourable the Court of Directors, with the reasons for it, and to be subject to their approbation.

The privilege of retaining Staff appointments during leave of absence on sick certificate, or on furlough on private affairs, will not be available a second time, if the fresh leave is on sick certificate, until an officer has been three years, or if on private affairs, until he has been six years in the discharge of the duties of his appointment from the date of last return to it.

This rule, however, does not apply to leaves of absence, whether on sick certificate or on private affairs in India, or for brief periods to Ceylon, the Mauritius, or other places out of India.

Officers commanding troops of Horse Artillery and Light Field Batteries, and officers generally in employment, will be allowed leave out of India under the same rules with respect to allowance and tenure of command or office as regulated the grant of leave to the Cape to such officers under the old regulations, except as to the duration of those advantages, the time for their continuance being subject to the provisions of the new regulations.

DATE OF FURLOUGH AND ADVANCES OF PAY.

The period of furlough on private affairs, or leave of absence on sick certificate, is to be calculated from the date of the departure from India of the ship in which the officer proceeds.

Advances of pay and allowances, Staff and regimental, to officers proceeding on leave of absence on sick certificate, who may be entitled to them, will be made in India for three months from date of embarkation. Payments in continuation will be made in England at the rates of exchange fixed annually for repayment of advances made on account of Her Majesty's Government. Furlough pay will continue to be issued in advance for six months when required by officers obtaining furlough on private affairs.

25. The existing regulations regarding passage money to officers are not affected by these rules.

The certificates issued to officers who are granted furloughs on private affairs, or leave of absence on sick certificate, are to specify the time each officer has been absent on leave within Indian limits, as well as the time of his previous absence in Europe; but will not include the periods allowed for proceeding to the Presidency or port of embarkation, and to enable officers to rejoin their regiments or stations after their return to India, nor the leave of one month's absence in six months as authorized by the regulations. The last pay certificate of all officers proceeding to England on sick certificate is to specify the rate of regimental pay and allowances and Staff salary to which they would have been entitled under the old regulations, if proceeding to sea on medical certificate. This information is necessary, in order that

no difficulty may arise in the Pay Department of the India House in adjusting the several payments which may be done.

OFFICERS OF H.M.'S SERVICE.

Officers of Her Majesty's service in India, whether employed regimentally or in Staff or detached situations, are entitled to the advantages above laid down in respect to allowances and tenure of office when on furlough or leave of absence.

In the case of officers of Her Majesty's service on furlough on sick certificate in England or elsewhere, who may retire or exchange into regiments not on the Indian establishment, the grant to these officers of Indian allowances will cease from the date of their retirement or exchange, if it take place before the expiration of six months from the date of quitting India.

PERIODS OF ABSENCE ALLOWED TO BE COUNTED AS SERVICE FOR RETIRING PENSIONS.

In order that all officers quitting India on furlough or sick certificate may be placed on an exact equality as regards loss of time, the period allowed by regulation for proceeding to the Presidency or to the nearest port of embarkation, as well as the time to enable officers to rejoin their corps or station after their return to India, will be considered as time counting for service for the retiring pension.

No furlough or leave of absence, as announced in General Orders, exceeding two years in twenty years' aggregate service three years in twenty-five years' service, and four years in thirty years' service, shall be allowed to count as service for the retiring pension; and no difference will be made in this respect between leave of absence-taken in Europe or elsewhere, in or out of India, or whether the leave be on sick certificate or on private affairs.

In the term "leave of absence as announced in General Orders" is to be included all leave of absence, except the period allowed in Rule 39, and the ordinary indulgence of one month leave in six months, as authorized by the existing regulations, which are in all cases, whether of regimental or of Staff officers, to be allowed to count as service for the pension. All leave to a greater extent, granted by political and other authorities, which may not hitherto have been published in General Orders, must be so announced hereafter.

Officers to be entitled to retire on the full pay of their regimental rank (under the regulations of 1796) must have served twenty-two years in India, out of which leaves of absence two years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service for the retiring pension.

Officers to be entitled to retire on the full pay of Captains, Majors (under the regulations of 1835-37), must have served twenty and twenty-four years respectively; out of which leaves of absence for two years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service.

Officers to be entitled to retire as Lieutenant-Colonels must have served twenty-eight years, out of which leaves of absence for three years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service.

Officers to be entitled to retire as Colonels must have served thirty-two years; out of which leaves of absence for four years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service.

The scale for medical officers and Veterinary Surgeons privileged furlough and leave of absence, as counting for retiring pensions, will be as follows:—

Year.	Months.	
1	8	in 17 and under 20 years' service.
2	0	in 20 " " 25 "
3	0	in 25 " " 30 "
4	0	in 30 and upwards.

It is to be distinctly understood that, under no circumstances whatever, will an officer be permitted to retire on full pay until he has completed the full time of service above specified, whether he be in England at the close of his service or elsewhere.

The privileged time of absence may, with the permission of the local Government, be taken at any time, subject to these regulations. If, therefore, at the end of twenty years' service, of which eighteen had been passed on actual duty in India, an officer should be on furlough or sick certificate in Europe or elsewhere, he will be entitled to retire on the full pay of a Captain without returning to India, and so in the other terms of service for the higher pensions. In like manner, a medical officer on furlough or sick certificate in Europe, or elsewhere, at the end of seventeen years' service, fifteen years and four months of which have been passed on actual duty in India, will be entitled to retire on the lowest rate pension without returning to India, and so in the other terms of service for the higher pension.

These rules do not in any way affect the existing regulations regarding the grant of leave in India, or for short periods to sea, whether on private affairs or on sick certificate, except as to the periods of such absence being taken into calculation in the time allowed to count as service for retirement on full pay.

Under the Act 33 Geo. III. c. 52, s. 70., an officer who does not rejoin the Presidency to which he belongs within a period of five years from the date of quitting, is no longer in the Company's service.

RETIRING REGULATIONS.

FULL PAY.

All officers after a service in India of 22 years are entitled to retire on the pension of their rank. This rank must be the regi-

mental rank attained in India, or the regimental rank (if on furlough) they may attain within the period of 12 months from the date of arrival in England.

The rates of full pay pension are :—

Colonel	- 25s. a day	- £456 5s. a year.
Lieut.-Colonel	- 20s. "	- 365 "
Major	- 16s. "	- 292 "
Captain	- 10s. 6d. "	- 191 12s. 6d. "
Lieutenant	- 6s. 6d. "	- 118 12s. 6d. "

After certain specified periods of service in India, officers are entitled to retire on the following pensions, whatever may be their rank, viz :—

After 20 years' service, on the pension of Captain,	
" 24 " " " "	Major.
" 28 " " " "	Lieut.-Colonel.
" 32 " " " "	Colonel.

HALF PAY.

Without any fixed period of service being required, regimental Captains, Majors, and Lieut.-Colonels, whose ill state of health renders them unable to continue to serve in India, are allowed to retire on the half pay of their rank. The rates are :—

Captains	- 7s. a day	- £127 15s. a year.
Majors	- 9s. 6d. "	- 173 7s. 6d. "
Lieut.-Colonels	- 11s. "	- 200 15s. "

A Lieutenant after 10 years' service in India, an Ensign after six years' service in India, can retire on the half pay of their rank, if unable to continue to serve in India. The rates are :—

Lieutenant	- 4s. a day	- £73 a year.
Ensign	- 3s. "	- 54 15s. "

A Lieutenant, after six years' service in India, if compelled by health to leave the army, may retire on Ensign's half pay.

Officers compelled to quit the service by "wounds received in action, or by ill health contracted on duty," after three years' service in India, are permitted to retire on the half pay of their rank.

LORD CLIVE'S FUND.

By the rules of Lord Clive's Fund, established before any general retiring regulations were framed, officers incapable of continuing to serve in India are entitled to pensions, as follow, without stipulation as to length of service, viz.,

RETIRING REGULATIONS.

	s. d.	£ s. d.
Colonels	- 12 6 a day	- 228 12 6 a year.
Lieut.-Colonels	- 10 0 "	- 182 10 0 "
Majors	- 7 6 "	- 136 17 6 "
Captains	- 5 0 "	- 91 5 0 "
Lieutenants	- 2 6 "	- 45 12 6 "
Ensigns	- 2 0 "	- 36 10 0 "

The pensions from Lord Clive's Fund being lower than the half-pay rates, the benefits of the fund are now claimed only by officers not entitled to the higher rates.

Officers cannot receive the advantages of both the General Retiring Rules and Lord Clive's Fund.

In all cases of retirement on half pay and Lord Clive's Fund, medical testimony is required of the necessity for the retirement.

CONDITIONS with respect to the FUNDS of the several PRESIDENCIES.

All officers of the East India Company's service are required, as a condition of their appointment, to subscribe to the Military funds of their respective Presidencies. These funds are as follows :—

Bengal	-	- Military Fund.
"	-	- Military Orphan Fund.
Madras	-	- Military Fund.
Bombay	-	- Military Fund.

The benefits derivable from them are twofold, viz. :

Those to the subscribers themselves; those to their widows and children.

The benefits to the Subscribers are :—

Passage Allowance from and back to India, if on furlough on sick certificate, restricted to the grades of Captain and subaltern, when not provided with passages by Government.

An allowance in aid of pay while in Europe on sick certificate, to the widows and families on the decease of the subscribers, pensions as follows :—

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
Widow of a Colonel	- £ 281	- £ 235	- £ 205
" Lieut.-Colonel	- 225	- 208	- 175
" Major	- 168	- 181	- 145
" Captain	- 112	- 136	- 120
" Lieutenant	- 84	- 102	- 102
" Ensign	- 66	- 81	- 81
Children, an annual allowance varying from	- 30 to 45	- 20 to 60	- 22 to 60

In the case of widows this is exclusive of the pensions* to which they are entitled from the East India Company's Military (Lord Clive's) Fund, stated below :—

Widow of a Colonel	-	- £114 a year.
" Lieut.-Colonel	-	- 91 "
" Major	-	- 68 "
" Captain	-	- 45 "
" Lieutenants	-	- 22 "
" Ensign	-	- 18 "

* These are, however, dependent on their husbands' property not exceeding certain stipulated amounts.

The pensions to the widows of officers of Her Majesty's service, and of the East India Company's service, as derived from the Government, are as under :—

APP. B.

	From Her Majesty's Government.	From the East India Company.
Of a Colonel	- £ 90	- £ 114
" Lieut.-Colonel	- 80	- 91
" Major	- 70	- 68
" Captain	- 50	- 45
" Lieutenant	- 40	- 22
" Ensign	- 36	- 18

The pensions of the widows of the officers of the Company's service derived from their own fund and the Company's pension may be stated, taking the Bengal fund as an example, as follows, viz :—

	From the Fund to which the Officers subscribed.	From Clive's Fund.	Total.
Of a Colonel	- £ 281	- £ 114	- £ 395
" Lieut.-Colonel	- 225	- 91	- 316
" Major	- 168	- 68	- 236
" Captain	- 112	- 45	- 157
" Lieutenant	- 84	- 22	- 106
" Ensign	- 66	- 18	- 84

The pensions from the officers' own fund have been gained by subscriptions, of which the following table will furnish an illustration :—

TABLE OF MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTIONS.—BENGAL FUND.

	In India.		In Europe.	
	Married.	Unmarried.	Married.	Unmarried.
Colonels	- Rs 62½	- Rs 28 2	- £ s. d. 3 15 0	- £ s. d. 1 13 9
Lieut.-Colonels	- 45	- 20 4	- 2 10 0	- 1 2 6
Majors	- 35	- 15 12	- 2 0 0	- 0 18 0
Captains	- 20	- 9 0	- 1 6 3	- 0 11 10
Lieutenants	- 12½	- 5 10	- 0 16 2	- 0 7 4
Ensigns	- 10	- 4½ 0	- 0 13 2	- 0 5 11

Bengal Military Orphan Fund.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Colonels	- 2 10 0	Captains - 1 0 0
Lieutenant-Colonels	- 2 0 0	Lieutenants - 0 12 6
Majors	- 1 10 0	Ensigns - 0 1 0

Special pensions are in both services assigned for the widows of officers falling in action. The amounts are the same in both armies, viz. :—

Colonel's widow	- £200 a year	Captain's widow	- £70 a year
Lieut.-Col.'s widow	- 200 "	Lieutenant's widow	- 60 "
Major's widow	- 120 "	Ensign's widow	- 46 "

Indian Army Commission,
August 1858.

GENERAL ORDERS of the RIGHT HONOURABLE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

SIMLA, 2d May 1838.

The Right Honourable the Governor-General of India has much pleasure in publishing to the army the following paragraphs of a letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors in the Military Department to the address of the Governor-General of India in Council, No. 7 of 1837, dated the 29th of November last.

REPLY TO MILITARY LETTER, DATED 14th FEBRUARY 1837 (No. 20).

Submit for Court's favourable consideration five memorials from officers in the Bengal army, praying that for the reasons stated the Court will recall their orders of 6th June 1798, requiring from an officer about to retire on pension, a declaration on oath that he had not received, and would not receive, any pecuniary or other gratification or compensation for so retiring. Government consider that the practice which has for some time obtained, although now for the first time brought to notice, of inducing time-expired officers under the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel to retire from the Service, must conduce to the contentment of the officers and to the efficiency of the army.

Para. 1. The memorials now submitted to us arise out of the memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel Powell of the Bombay Army, the important subject of which we informed the Government of Bombay we would notice in our correspondence with the Government of India.

2d. We now desire that you will cause Lieutenant-Colonel Powell to be informed through the Government of Bombay, in reply to that part of his memorial which indicates a wish for line promotion in certain classes below the rank of Major, that we cannot contemplate the possibility of sanctioning any measure which would infringe upon the integrity of regimental rise; and in reply to the remainder of his memorial, that we see no necessity for interfering with the arrangements which the junior officers of a regiment may make in individual cases for adding to the comforts of a senior officer on his retirement from the service upon the pension to which he may be entitled.

APP. C.

APPENDIX C.

OBSERVATIONS on the "STATEMENT of the LAW, PRACTICE, and CUSTOM upon which the OFFICERS of the late EAST INDIA COMPANY'S MILITARY FORCES found the GRIEVANCES complained of by them in their various MEMORIALS and PETITIONS."

1. The statement laid before the Royal Commission, on the part of the officers of the late Indian army, purporting to contain the grounds on which it is alleged that the recent measures connected with the changes in the Indian army are an infringement of the guarantee contained in certain clauses of the Acts for the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown, and for repealing the power of raising European forces for the Indian army, may, it is presumed, be taken as a full statement of the case of the complainants. In "the memorandum explanatory of the measures adopted "as regards the officers of the Indian armies," and of the reasons for them, which has been already laid before the Commission, explanations are given of the points contained in the "statement," which might be sufficient; but it may be convenient to offer some further observations on them, and to refer, separately and shortly, to the different cases in which it is alleged that the guarantee has been infringed.

2. For convenience of reference, in the ensuing observations, the memorandum of the course taken by the Government will be designated as Paper A., the statement of the officers of the Indian army as Paper B.

3. There are several parts of Paper B., such as opinions on various proposals made at different times, and also the views of different persons as to what might have been done on the present occasion in carrying out the very difficult task of amalgamation, which do not bear directly on the question before the Commission; but the facts as to what has been the practice in former years in respect of regulations affecting the position of Indian officers, and as to what has now been done, are substantially admitted on both sides. It is apprehended that the simple question to be inquired into by the Commission is, not what might have been done, or what would have been the best course, but simply whether the measures which have been adopted in carrying into execution that which had been determined on by Parliament, namely, the amalgamation of the general and Indian armies of the Crown, are, in any respect, an infringement of the Parliamentary guarantee.

4. The words of the guarantee are quoted in Paper A., page 1, and the meaning given to it, and which is in accordance with the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, has been that the officers of the Indian army stood in the same relation to the Crown as that in which they had stood to the East India Company, and that those officers who did not voluntarily adopt other terms of service should not be subjected on the part of the Crown to any change or regulation to which they might not have been subjected on the part of the East India Company.

5. In the regulations which have been adopted, it has been the anxious desire of Her Majesty's Government to act in the same spirit as that in which the East India Company had always acted towards its officers, and to deal with them in the same liberal manner as it might have been expected that the East India Company would have done in similar circumstances.

6. The cases of alleged breach of guarantee may be stated generally as,—

1. The amalgamation of the lists of general officers.
2. The reduction of Colonels' allowances, and the change of system by which, in the Cavalry and Infantry, the advancement to that allowance is made to depend on a certain number of years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel.
3. The filling up of only a portion of the vacancies created by the special scheme of retirement of 1861.
4. The non-removal from the regimental cadres of officers posted to the Staff corps.
5. The supercession of officers remaining in the cadres of Indian regiments by the promotion of officers in the Staff corps.
6. The indirect extinction of the bonuses on retirement.
7. The withdrawal from unemployed Colonels residing in India of the privilege of receiving full Indian allowances.

Page 69,
Pages 67 and
68.

Page 65.

Page 65.

Pages 35 and
60.

Page 70.

8. Cancelling, in 1859, the date of commissions in the Artillery and Engineers given in 1858. Pag
37.

9. Not allowing officers of the Staff corps to enjoy the furlough regulations of 1796. Pag

10. Not giving to officers of Artillery and Engineers annuities similar to those given to officers of Cavalry and Infantry. Pag

7. It is obvious at first sight that the guarantee cannot apply to the last two cases.

8. As regards No. 9, it is only necessary to say that all officers going into the Staff corps did so voluntarily, and if any officer had been misled by a misunderstanding of the pension rules to be applicable to officers of the Staff corps, he was allowed the option of withdrawing. No officer who remains, therefore, has any just cause of complaint.

* "9. It is certain, however, that, in consequence of the reductions which have been and will be effected in the number of native regiments in the armies of the three Presidencies, there will be a considerable number of officers in the ranks of Lieutenant-Colonel and Major, beyond those for whom suitable employment can now be found in regimental commands, and in the higher positions of the army Staff, and that this is especially the case in the Bengal Presidency, where the old native army was almost entirely broken up by the mutiny, and the new levies raised to take the place of the regular native regiments were organized, and are now commanded by younger men.

"10. Under the changes which have thus taken place, a considerable proportion of the field officers of the native armies are deprived of the advantage which they enjoyed under the old system, of continuing to serve in India in command of regiments until entitled to Colonels' allowances; and I concur in the opinion expressed by your Government, and by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that it would be just and expedient to facilitate the retirement of such officers by the offer of any terms which would not entail an undue financial loss on the State."

9. As regards No. 10, the grant of such annuities was a gratuitous boon on the part of the Government; no person had a claim to them. There were reasons for giving them in the Cavalry and Infantry (as stated in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Despatch to India of August 10th 1861, quoted in the margin*), which did not apply to the Artillery and Engineers.

10. In regard to No. 7, it is only necessary to refer to the observations on it at page 13 of Paper A. The position of the officers in question is that of unemployed officers, whose

services are not required in India. They are eligible for divisional commands; but, while unemployed, there is no sufficient reason why they should receive a higher rate of allowances in India than in England.

11. In regard to No. 8 (which was not noticed in Paper A., as no complaints on this score had been received), it is to be observed that, on the arrival of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers in India in 1858, the officers of the Indian corps, in consequence of their different organization, were placed at great disadvantage in comparison with the officers of the Royal corps; and, in order to obviate this, the changes in the organization of the Indian corps, enumerated at page 2 of Paper A., were made, greatly to their advantage.

12. The orders issued by the Court of Directors in 1858 gave back rank. The Indian Government represented that, in consequence of this back rank, great confusion was introduced in the corps, causing inconvenient and anomalous supercession in them. By an order of the Secretary of State in Council of April 14th 1859, this mistake was corrected, and the date of the new commissions was altered to the day when the order was issued, that is, August 27th, 1858, without back rank. It certainly never occurred to Lord Stanley, or to any member of his Council, most of whom had been members of the Court of Directors when the original order was issued, that the correction of such an order was a breach of the guarantee. Indeed, such a case seemed to be provided for by clause 59 of the Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106.

13. Of the remaining six cases, Nos. 2 and 3 are consequences of the reduction which has been made in the armies of India, Nos. 1, 4, and 5 of altered regulations in the service; and No. 6 is an indirect effect of both of the above changes.

14. It cannot be questioned that it was the duty of the Government under the Crown, as it would have been that of the East India Company, had its existence been continued, to have reduced the native army. The reduction actually made was very large. The native

Artillery was abolished, and the whole native army was reduced nearly one half. The number of regiments, regular and irregular, was reduced by upwards of 90.

15. It was only reasonable that, under such circumstances, some reduction should take place in the expense of the establishment of officers. As stated in Paper A., page 10, no large reduction had ever been made in the Indian army. There was no precedent to refer to, except in the British army. In circumstances somewhat similar, but not so strong, when, at the peace of 1815, a large reduction took place, the officers of the regiments and battalions which were reduced were at once placed on the half-pay of their respective ranks.

16. In the reduction of the Indian army, every officer receives the full pay of his rank, and that of any rank which he may attain in the ordinary course of promotion, that promotion going on in his regiment, or in the cadre of his regiment, as if no change had been made. [See Paper A., page 11.]

17. The only reductions complained of as regards officers are,—

No. 2. Reduction of the number of Colonels' allowances; and No. 3. Filling up only a portion of the vacancies of Lieutenant-Colonels retiring under the special arrangement of 1861.

18. The number of Colonels' allowances in the Artillery and Engineers is reduced. This step is necessary in order to assimilate their organization to that of the Royal corps, from which, assimilation they have, in other respects, so greatly benefited. It is to be made very gradually, three vacancies being filled up out of four; and, with a view to meet the case of some of the senior officers whose prospects might be affected, a limited number of special annuities of 200*l.*, as mentioned in Paper A., page 3, has been offered to the Colonels of those corps, in consideration of the retardation in their advancement to the Colonel's allowance anticipated from this reduction.

19. It is to be observed, however, as regards these two corps, that they have benefited largely by recent changes, the increased pay and allowances in the two corps amounting to no less a sum than 130,000*l.* per annum; and the observations in the Despatch, of the Court of Directors, quoted at page 11 of Paper B., seems, with scarcely the alteration of a word, to be strictly applicable to these two corps. The paragraph referred to expresses a hope that the "military servants" of every rank will consider, with candour, the great and important variation which is now made in the "service of our Army in India; and if any one or more individuals should feel that in any respect their own personal situations are not exactly what they might wish, they ought to balance the whole together, and recollect how much, not only each individual in other respects, but the whole service in general, has gained in point of credit and emoluments."

20. In regard to the Colonels' allowances in the Cavalry and Infantry, it is impossible to say whether, by the change which has been made of allowing Lieutenant-Colonels to attain to it after 12 years, the succession of any individual to it will be accelerated or retarded.

21. In Mr. Cabell's memorandum, Paper B., page 23, the average period of service of Lieutenant-Colonels before attaining it is stated at 13 years; but it is certain that, under this rule, all Lieutenant-Colonels must attain to Colonel's allowance after about the average period of service during recent years.

22. In the paragraphs quoted from the report of Lord Hotham's Committee, Paper B., page 62, it is observed that, if regiments are reduced absolutely, and the strength of the army is reduced to a corresponding extent, then the number of Colonels must necessarily be reduced also, and the number of the allowances at the same time.

23. It is quite indisputable that any reduction in the number of Colonels' allowances which may occur under the proposed measures will be very gradual, and fall far short of that which would be due to the reduction which has been made in the Indian army.

24. In order to facilitate a reduction in the number of officers, a large scheme of retirement was adopted; and only a portion of the vacancies of Lieutenant-Colonels consequent upon it were filled up. The reasons for this course were given in Paper A., page 11.

25. In reference to No. 1, or the effect of placing all officers of the British and Indian armies, who attain the rank of Colonel on or after the 17th February 1861, on

one list for promotion, it is to be observed that the fusion of the lists of the officers of the different armies, with a view to regulating their army promotion, was an important step towards their amalgamation; and, by fixing a distant date for its coming into operation, it may fairly be expected that by the time the separate lists, containing all Colonels of an earlier date, are exhausted, the position of Colonels of a subsequent date will be such that the effect of the arrangement on the promotion of any individual officer must be uncertain, and is not likely to be material.

26. The position of the Colonels of Artillery and Engineers, who were promoted on the 18th February 1861, may be affected. They were promoted, however, not in the ordinary course, but in order to effect the assimilation of the organization of the Indian corps to that of the Royal corps; and the few who are likely to be so affected have no just ground of complaint that officers in the Royal corps, who are their seniors, will be promoted before them. The observations in paragraphs 18 and 19 are fairly applicable to their case.

27. In regard to No. 4, the non-removal of officers from cadres, the reasons are fully stated in Paper A., grounded on the—

1. Unnecessary additional expense.

2. Unfairness of promotion, if it were given in each cadre, in the room of every officer removed from it to the Staff corps.

28. It is somewhat remarkable that this last objection is stated in Mr. Cabell's memorandum, Paper B., page 19, as decisive against the formation of a Staff corps. The course, however, which has been taken, of leaving the names of the officers who join the Staff corps in the cadres, completely obviates that objection. [See Paper A., page 7.]

29. In regard to No. 5, namely, the supercession of officers remaining in the cadres of Indian regiments, by the promotion of officers in the Staff corps, the reasons for giving that promotion were stated fully in Paper A., pages 7 and 8. It is clear, also, from the statements in Paper B., that such a course was not without precedent in what had been done, on former occasions, by the East India Company. Whilst they maintained, in ordinary circumstances, the system of regimental and general promotion, which is referred to in many places, and specially stated in Appendix 4 of Paper B., page 84, taken from the Report of General Peel's Commission, they always considered themselves at liberty to make, and did actually make from time to time, such alterations in their system as seemed to them most advantageous, without reference to the effect which promotion in one corps might have on the relative position of officers in other corps or branches of the service.

30. It appears from Paper B. that, previous to 1796, officers were engaged simply by contract.

In the first organization, it would appear that officers of all arms rose by general seniority.

In 1796, officers of Artillery were separated, and rose by seniority in that corps.

Officers of native Cavalry were to rise to the rank of Captain in their regiments, and afterwards by general seniority.

Officers of European Infantry to rise by regimental seniority to Lieutenant-Colonel.

Promotion in native Infantry as in European.

1799. Promotion by regimental seniority in Infantry to Major only.

1817. Ditto as to Cavalry.

1824. Promotion of Cavalry officers in Cavalry alone.

31. These instances of change of the system of promotion are all taken from Paper B. Other instances are stated in Paper A., pages 6 and 8; and, in one of those cases, that which occurred on the occasion of the Cabul massacre, page 6, officers from other regiments were introduced, so as to interfere with the ordinary regimental promotion.

32. In the memorandum of Mr. Cabell, quoted at length in Paper B., various proposals for alteration in the mode of promotion are discussed; some are favourably recommended, others discarded, but, throughout the whole long document, there is no indication of a doubt that the East India Company might, if they chose, have made any of the alterations suggested.

33. The effect of the promotions given in the Staff corps, on the positions of the officers left in the cadres is similar in principle to these cases, though more extensive.

APP. C.

34. The reasons for leaving in the cadres the names of the officers who joined the Staff corps, as well as those for the organization of that corps, and for the rules for promotion in it, have been given, as stated above, in Paper A., pages 7 and 8. It was considered desirable for the public service, and also for their own sake, that Indian officers should join the Staff corps. Even, however, if they had not done so, their services would have been available for Staff employment. These measures, therefore, though desirable, were not necessary, and certainly would not have been adopted, if it had not been declared by the law officers that they were not open to any legal objection.

35. The various changes in the position of officers as to promotion and prospects of promotion, or as regards that of other officers, have now been gone through; and it is believed to have been shown that in no respect has the guarantee been infringed.

36. That every officer should be in precisely the same situation as if no change had been made,—that an officer should retain all the advantages which he would have enjoyed if the native army had been kept up to twice its present amount,—that a great reduction should have been effected, and everybody be left in the same position as before,—was simply impracticable; but it is confidently maintained that there never was a reduction and change of system effected with so large and liberal a consideration for the interests of persons to be affected by the change, the immediate increase of pay and pensions being not less than a quarter of a million per annum,—that nothing has been done which the East India Company might not have done as regards those officers who remain in the Indian army,—and that those who have joined either the Line regiments or Staff corps have done so of their own free choice, and can have no reason to complain of the position which they have chosen.

37. It only remains to advert to the effect of these changes on the practice which had prevailed amongst

officers of the Indian armies, of making private arrangements for purchasing the retirement of their seniors.

38. The most important object of this practice, namely, the accelerated promotion, has, of course, been attained by every officer who had contributed towards such purchase; and it must be observed that the retention of all the officers in the cadres of their respective regiments, notwithstanding that, in many instances, the regiments had ceased to exist, secured to all of them the benefit of the standing which their contributions had assisted them to obtain.

39. It is admitted that many officers may not obtain a bonus which they might reasonably have expected. Such an expectation, however, was never considered as within the guarantee.

40. It is indisputable, as indeed appears in Paper B., page 29, that the practice was illegal; and it is certain that, though general of late years, it was not universal in the Indian armies.

41. The statement that it was recognized by the Court of Directors is contrary to the fact. The Despatches quoted in Paper B., page 28, show that they refused to sanction any plan for a retiring fund. Even in suspending the operation of the rule requiring a declaration of an officer's not having received any consideration for retiring, they reserved their right to reimpose it (page 29). They declared the retiring regulations of 1837, given by them, to be a final measure (page 28). In Paper A., page 14, two important Despatches are quoted, which are omitted in Paper B., but which show that they intimated to the Governments of Madras and Bombay their *disapprobation of those Governments having extended any support whatever to the plans for a retiring fund, which might encourage the service to expect the sanction of the Home Government.*

42. The military funds, to which the sanction of Government had been given, have been guaranteed.

T. T. P.

India Office, 30th April 1863.

APP. D.

APPENDIX D.

The members of the Royal Commission desire to call the attention of the memorialists to the following facts, and they will be glad to be informed whether the memorialists admit their accuracy, or have any observations to make upon their bearing on the questions now in discussion:—

1. Previously to 1824 the officers of the two battalions of which every native regiment was then composed, were promoted in one list.

In that year each battalion was made a separate regiment, and promotion went on in each new regiment.

This must probably have occasioned frequent supercession in army rank by the promotion of officers junior to those who were their seniors in the old cadre of the two battalions.

2. Pursuant to a Despatch of the Court of Directors, dated the 3rd December 1828, two Lieutenants and one Cornet or Ensign in every regiment of local Cavalry or Infantry were reduced; and the officers who by this reduction became supernumeraries, continued to serve until they were absorbed. The result was a delay in the promotion of the Ensigns and Cornets.

3. On occasion of the Cabul massacre in 1842, five regiments (viz., 5th Light Cavalry, 5th, 27th, 37th, and 54th Native Infantry) lost a great number of their officers. Some of the vacancies were filled up by a transfer of officers from other regiments.

4. In 1858 the East India Company abolished the ranks of Major and 2nd Lieutenant in their Artillery and Engineers, and introduced the rank of 2nd Captain. Majors being all made Lieutenant-Colonels, and senior Lieutenants being made Captains, all 2nd Lieutenants becoming Lieutenants.

The result of this was to give great advantages to the Artillery and Engineer officers over those of other branches of the service, especially to Majors, and to cause a great supercession of rank by the officers of the Artillery and Engineers over those of the Cavalry and Infantry.

5. In the Bombay Fusiliers, in which there were 40 officers, all except one Captain and two Lieutenants have joined either the new Line regiments or the Staff corps.

6. In the 6th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry the senior officer, who has joined the new Staff corps, is the junior Captain but one. In the 7th Regiment the Major, all the Captains, and the three senior Lieutenants have joined it.

7. Under the Company a subaltern for service in the field was often noted for promotion to brevet rank as Major on his becoming Captain.

On becoming the junior Captain of his regiment he would thus receive the brevet rank of Major, and so, on general service, would take command over all the other Captains of his regiment.

8. The result of the mutiny has been, that out of 74 regular native regiments in Bengal, 62 have wholly disappeared, and by far the greater number of the officers are without regiments. The total reduction in the native armies of the three Presidencies since the mutiny, has been from about 265,000 to about 135,000 men.

9. Before the transfer of the Government to the Crown the average time in which a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Madras army attained to Colonel's allowances was about 12 years; in Bengal and Bombay it was rather less.

10. On the reduction of the British Army consequent on the peace of 1815, the officers of the reduced regiments were at once placed on half-pay.

The members of the Commission collect that the memorialists consider the assurances contained in the Act to have been violated in cases which may be ranged under the following heads:—

1. The amalgamation of the lists of general officers.
2. The reduction of Colonels' allowances, and the change of system whereby in the Cavalry and Infantry the *advancement to Colonels' allowances is made to depend on 12 years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel.*

3. The filling up of only a portion of the vacancies created by the special scheme of retirement of 1861.
4. The non-removal from the regimental cadres of officers posted to the Staff corps and the new Line regiments.
5. The supercession of officers remaining in Indian regiments by the promotion of officers in the Staff corps.
6. The indirect extinction of the regimental bounties on retirement.
7. The withdrawal from unemployed Colonels residing in India of the privilege of receiving full Indian allowances.

8. Cancelling in 1859 the dates of the commissions in the Artillery and Engineers given in 1858.

APP. D.

The members of the Commission would be glad to know whether there is any other class of cases in which the memorialists consider that the Act has been violated.

And they will be glad, if the officers deem it advisable, to receive information on these points by a statement in addition to their statement now before the Commission.

J. MILTON, Secretary.

8th June 1863.

APPENDIX E.

APP. E.

SIR,
I HAVE the honour to transmit the replies called for in your letter of the 8th ultimo.
John Milton, Esq.,
Secretary to Royal Commission.

13, King Street, St. James',
2d July 1863.

I have, &c.
CHAS. FRED. NORTH,
Lieut.-Col. R.E.

OBSERVATIONS by the COMMITTEE acting on behalf of MEMORIALISTS of the INDIAN ARMY, on certain "FACTS" and "CASES" transmitted by the Royal Commissioners.

"The Members of the Royal Commission desire to call the attention of the Memorialists to the following facts; and they will be glad to be informed whether the Memorialists admit their accuracy, or have any observations to make upon their bearing on the questions now in discussion."

Facts.

1. "Previously to 1824, the officers of the two battalions of which every native regiment was then composed, were promoted in one list
"In that year, each battalion was made a separate regiment.

"This must probably have occasioned frequent supercession in army rank, by the promotion of officers junior to those who were their seniors in the old cadre of the two battalions."

2. "Pursuant to a Despatch of the Court of Directors, dated 3rd December 1823, two Lieutenants and one Cornet or Ensign in every regiment of local Cavalry or Infantry were reduced; and the officers who, by this reduction, became supernumeraries, continued to serve until they were absorbed.
"The result was a delay in the promotion of the Ensigns and Cornets."

3. "On occasion of the Cabul massacre, in 1842, five regiments, (viz., 5th Light Cavalry, 5th, 27th, 37th, and 54th Regiments of N. I.) lost a great number of their officers: some of the vacancies were filled up by a transfer of officers from other regiments."

Replies.

1. The system adopted for carrying out the reorganization in 1824 is fully explained in pages 12 and 15 of the Memorialists' "Statement":—"the result is particularly alluded to in paragraphs 31 and 93. Whether a regiment be composed of one or two battalions, the officers of different regiments must take their chance of regimental promotions, according to their individual good or ill luck.

In the case under reference, although battalions were made into two separate regiments, still the organization of each new regiment was precisely similar; and therefore the chances of regimental advancement for the whole body of officers remained just as before; although individual promotions, as a matter of course, necessarily varied.

The present amalgamation scheme bears no analogy to this.

2. With reference to this case, delay in promotion to the rank of Lieutenant did occur, until the supernumeraries were absorbed.

But the following statement of Mr. Cabell will show that the result was a permanent acceleration of promotion:—

"96. Since the orders of the 25th November 1823, a further improvement has been effected in the promotion of the service, in regard to future appointments, by a reduction to the extent of two Lieutenants and one Ensign, Cornet, or 2nd Lieutenant per regiment, ordered by the Court on the 3rd December, 1823. The result, according to the calculation below, may be expected to accomplish an acceleration in the rise to each rank, from that of Captain upwards, to the extent of about two years."

There is, however, a later and more pertinent case of reduction than that cited by the Royal Commissioners; and one wherein the Court of Directors established quite an opposite principle, which they continued to act upon until the conclusion of their tenure of the Government of India.

In the year 1829, the local European Infantry force, which since the year 1824 had consisted of six battalions, each having one Colonel on its establishment, was reformed into three regiments, by uniting two battalions into one regiment. On that occasion, the establishment fixed for each new regiment included only one Colonel; but the Court of Directors, instead of ordering that the three Colonels who thus became supernumeraries should be absorbed by casualties (as in the case of the Lieutenants reduced in 1823), directed that they should be borne on the general lists as "unattached;" and they continued to be so borne up to the termination of the Company's rule, notwithstanding that between the years 1829 and 1857, six European and four Native Infantry Regiments, each having a Colonel on its establishment, were added to the Indian Army.

3. This was an extraordinary and exceptional case, even for warfare; in which, had ordinary rule and custom been followed, troops and companies would have been commanded by young lads, incompetent by reason of their inexperience. A reference to the following lists will however show, that even in this difficulty every care was taken, not only to avoid undue supercession, but also to remedy, as far as the opportunity offered, those inequalities of rank caused by slower promotion in some regiments, as compared with that in others.

APP. E.

Facts.

Replies.

5TH BENGAL LIGHT CAVALRY.

1842.	1843.
Col. J. Kennedy.	Col. J. Kennedy.
*Lieut.-Col. R. E. Chambers.	*Lieut.-Col. W. Burlton.
Major Wm. Alexander.	Major Wm. Alexander.
<i>Captains.</i>	<i>Captains.</i>
*Ed. M. Blair.	C. E. T. Oldfield.
C. E. T. Oldfield.	A. Wheatley.
A. Wheatley.	O. M. Gascoyne.
*J. Ross.	J. D. Macnaghten.
*P. Hamilton.	A. Hall.
<i>Lieutenants.</i>	<i>Lieutenants.</i>
C. M. Gascoyne.	T. L. Harrington.
J. D. Macnaghten.	E. W. C. Plowden.
A. Hall.	B. Christie.
T. L. Harrington.	A. Wrench.
*H. Y. Bazett.	J. S. G. Eyley.
E. W. C. Plowden.	H. Lindsey.
R. Christie.	S. F. Macmullen.
A. Wrench.	C. G. Becher.
<i>Cornets.</i>	<i>Cornets.</i>
F. E. Vibart.	F. E. Vibart.
H. J. Stannus.	H. J. Stannus.

* Chambers, Blair, Ross, Hamilton, and Bazett were killed at Cabul. Chambers's vacancy was filled up according to Regulation, by the promotion of the senior regimental Major of Cavalry. The death vacancies among the Captains were filled by the promotion of the next senior Lieutenants in the Regiment. Lieutenants Ryley, Lindsey, Macmullen, and Becher were brought in from other Regiments in consequence of the shortness of service of Cornets Vibart and Stannus, the army rank of Vibart being 4th Sept. 1840, and that of Cornet Becher, who was brought in as a Lieutenant the 28th March 1839.

5TH BENGAL NATIVE INFANTRY.

1842.	1843.
Col. Alex. Duncan.	Col. Alex. Duncan.
Lieut.-Col. Ross.	Lieut.-Col. R. Burney.
*Major S. Swayne.	Major J. Jervis.
<i>Captains.</i>	<i>Captains.</i>
J. Jervis.	B. Bygrave.
B. Bygrave.	W. C. Birch.
*C. W. Haig.	J. C. Salkeld.
W. C. Birch.	R. Dowson.
*R. M. Miles.	Lord H. Gordon.
<i>Lieutenants.</i>	<i>Lieutenants.</i>
J. C. Salkeld.	J. Fulton.
*F. W. Burkinyoung.	J. Graham.
*A. F. C. Deas.	W. Kennedy.
*W. H. Tombs.	F. Maitland.
R. Dowson.	T. Brodie.
*C. B. Horsburgh.	E. L. Garstin.
*R. H. Alexander.	M. J. Slater.
*F. H. Warren.	C. C. Crigan.
*A. D. Potengar.	A. B. Fenwick.
	R. C. Stevenson.
<i>Ensigns.</i>	<i>Ensigns.</i>
E. S. Garstin.	J. H. Firth.
M. J. Slater.	H. C. Johnstone.
C. C. Crigan.	W. McNeile.

* Swayne, Haig, Miles, Burkinyoung, Deas, Tombs, Horsburgh, Alexander, Warren, and Potengar were killed at Cabul. Captain Jervis was promoted to Major according to Regulations. Lieutenants Salkeld and Dowson were promoted, *vice* Jervis and Haig; and Lord H. Gordon, a Brevet-Captain of the 10th March 1835, was, in the absence of any Lieutenant, brought in from the 2nd European Regiment, and promoted to Captain. Had *Ensign* Garstin been promoted to this vacancy, he would have avoided the rank of Lieutenant altogether, and thereby superseded every Lieutenant in the Indian Army. Lieutenants Fulton, Graham, Kennedy, Maitland, and Brodie were brought up from other Regiments, the junior, Brodie, being a *Lieutenant* in the 2nd European Regiment, of the 8th October 1839.

27TH BENGAL NATIVE INFANTRY.

1842.	1843.
Col. C. W. Hamilton.	Col. C. W. Hamilton.
*Lieut.-Col. T. Palmer.	Lieut.-Col. A. Carnegy.
Major E. Sutherland.	Major E. Sutherland.
<i>Captains.</i>	<i>Captains.</i>
W. Grant.	A. Watt.
A. Watt.	L. Gibson.
L. Gibson.	T. Plumbe.
T. Plumbe.	J. Alston.
J. Alston.	J. Poett.

* Palmer was killed at Guznee. Lieut.-Col. Carnegy was brought in according to Regulation. Grant died, and the promotion went in the Regiment.

Facts.

Replies.

APP. E.

27TH BENGAL NATIVE INFANTRY—continued.

<i>Lieutenants.</i>		<i>Lieutenants.</i>	
J. Poett.		B. Simpson.	
B. Simpson.		W. Barnes.	
W. Barnes.		C. Scott.	
*D. Lumsden.		C. Harris.	
C. Scott.		C. Sneyd.	
C. Harris.		H. Williams.	
C. Sneyd.		J. Nicholson.	
H. Williams.		G. Gowan.	
J. Nicholson.		W. Forbes.	
T. Davis.			
<i>Ensigns.</i>		<i>Ensigns.</i>	
G. Gowan.		T. W. Seager.	
W. Forbes.		L. Newhouse.	
		H. Dorin.	

* Lumsden was killed at Guznee.

37TH BENGAL NATIVE INFANTRY.

1842.		1843.	
Colonel C. Fagan.		Colonel C. Fagan.	
Lieut.-Col. J. Home.		Lieut.-Col. J. Home.	
Major C. Griffith.		Major C. Griffith.	
<i>Captains.</i>		<i>Captains.</i>	
J. Barstow.		J. Barstow.	
W. Prole.		W. Prole.	
A. Spottiswoode.		A. Spottiswoode.	
*J. Rind.		E. Lyons.	
E. Lyons.		J. Curtis.	
<i>Lieutenants.</i>		<i>Lieutenants.</i>	
J. Curtis.		W. Mayne.	
*O. Carlyon.		V. Lamb.	
†W. Steer.		A. Dewar.	
*F. Huntrey.		J. Bontein.	
†E. Vanrenen.		J. Barrett.	
W. Mayne.		G. Robertson.	
†J. St. George.		B. Parrot.	
*T. Gordon.		H. Macmullen.	
		J. Tytler.	
		J. Peel.	
<i>Ensigns.</i>		<i>Ensigns.</i>	
G. Robertson.		E. Scott.	
B. Parrot.		J. Batten.	
H. Macmullen.		G. Beadwell.	
J. Tytler.			
J. Peel.			

* Rind, Carlyon, Huntrey, and Gordon were killed at Cabul.

† Steer, Vanrenen, and St. George died.

Curtis was promoted to Captain, *vice* Rind.

Lamb, Dewar, Bontein, and Barrett, Brevet-Captains, were all brought in, Barrett being an Ensign of the 80th September 1821, while the senior Ensign, Robertson, was an Ensign of the 11th June 1840.

All the Ensigns were, notwithstanding these transfers, promoted to Lieutenants.

54TH BENGAL NATIVE INFANTRY.

1842.		1843.	
Colonel R. Pitman.		Colonel R. Pitman.	
Lieut.-Col. C. Wilkinson.		Lieut.-Col. C. Wilkinson.	
*Major A. Anstruther.		Major H. Osborn.	
<i>Captains.</i>		<i>Captains.</i>	
H. Osborn.		W. Beatson.	
*A. Corri.		H. Boscawen.	
W. Beatson.		H. Vetch.	
†R. Burnett.		F. Paterson.	
H. Boscawen.		H. Melville.	
<i>Lieutenants.</i>		<i>Lieutenants.</i>	
H. Vetch.		P. Hay.	
†D. Shaw.		J. De Fountain.	
*J. Kirly.		M. Blake.	
*N. Palmer.		B. Mathieson.	
*W. Morrieson.		J. Sibley.	
†H. Weaver.		C. Halhed.	
F. Paterson.		J. Carter.	
H. Melville.		J. Haughton.	
*T. Pottinger.		J. Clarke.	
*G. Cuninghame.		C. Russell.	
<i>Ensigns.</i>		<i>Ensigns.</i>	
†A. Rose.		W. Darell.	
J. Sibley.		D. Shand.	
C. Halhed.			

* Anstruther, Corri, Kirly, Palmer, Morrieson, Pottinger, and Cuninghame were killed at Cabul.

† R. Burnett, Shaw, Weaver, and Rose died.

Osborn was promoted to Major, *vice* Anstruther.

Vetch, Paterson, and Melville were promoted to Captains.

Hay and De Fountain were introduced, being Brevet-Captains, the former of 26th March 1835, the latter of 30th January 1839. Blake and Mathieson were also brought in, being old Lieutenants; and then the Ensigns were promoted to Lieutenants.

APP. E.

Facts.

4. "In 1858 the East India Company abolished the ranks of Major and 2nd Lieutenant in the Artillery and Engineers, and introduced the rank of 2nd Captain, Majors being all made Lieutenant-Colonels, several senior Lieutenants being made Captains, all 2nd Lieutenants becoming Lieutenants."

"The result of this was to give great advantages to the Artillery and Engineer officers over those of other branches of the service, especially to Majors; and to cause a great supercession of rank by the officers of the Artillery and Engineers over those of the Cavalry and Infantry."

Replies.

4. The peculiar duties of the Ordnance corps have always necessitated a peculiar organization, which has been at one time in favour of, and at another against, these corps; but in every case of reorganization, care has invariably been taken to equalize the results as far as possible.

For instance, in 1807 a revised establishment of field officers for the Artillery was given, with the advantage of rank and pay retrospectively for three years and four months.—(Letter from the Court of Directors to the Governor-General of India, dated 21st May 1806; and published at Calcutta, in General Orders, dated 2d January 1807.)

Similarly, in 1810, the establishment of the corps of Engineers was revised, and back rank and pay granted for four years and ten months.—(Letter from Court to Governor-General, dated 25th April 1810; and published at Calcutta in General Orders, dated 6th November 1810.)

But on 24th January 1845, an increase of one Captain was granted to each Regiment of Native Infantry in the three Presidencies; and in 1846, two Captains were added to each Regiment of European Infantry, with back rank and pay in this latter case, for one year and ten months.—(Letter from the Court of Directors to the Governor-General, No. 21, dated 22nd September 1846; published at Calcutta in General Orders, dated 17th November 1846.)

Again, on 23d November 1856, one Captain and one Lieutenant were added to each regiment of native Cavalry and native Infantry; and two Captains and two Lieutenants to each European Infantry regiment, in the three Presidencies.

Extra Captains and Lieutenants were subsequently granted to the Engineers and Artillery, but at various periods and without retrospective effect, either in regard of rank or pay.

For instance, the Madras Artillery only received in May 1854, an increase similar to that granted to the Infantry on 24th January 1845, and on 27th April 1858, one similar to that granted to the other branches in 1856; whereby the officers of Artillery were required to submit, in the one instance for 9½ years, and in the other for 1½ years, to be superseded by officers of Cavalry and Infantry. It will be thus seen that many of these cases of apparent supercession were, after all, but regaining positions originally possessed by Artillery and Engineer officers.

Moreover, in the Artillery and Engineers the last extra Captain was again reduced on the 27th August 1858, when those corps were partially assimilated to the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers; by which partial assimilation, the chances of succeeding to the grade of field officer were also reduced, inasmuch as by the old organization there were only twenty-three Captains and subalterns to three field officers; whereas, by the new, there were twenty-six of those grades, to the same number of seniors, so that the reorganization was not all gain and no loss.

As regards the "great advantages" stated to have been given to Ordnance officers over those of the other branches of the service, these latter will hereafter enjoy an almost entire monopoly of miscellaneous Staff and civil appointments, owing to the Artillery officers being required for regimental duty, as stated recently in Parliament by Sir C. Wood; and as still further confirmed by the following extracts from Military Letter, No. 248, dated India Office, London, 10th July 1862:—

"6. On the other hand, in the present condition of the Indian army, with the number of unemployed officers attached to the several Staff corps, the necessity of withdrawing officers from the Artillery for miscellaneous Staff employ, and thus incurring the expense of supplying their places temporarily in their regiments, may well be doubted.

"7. I request, therefore, that you will take again into your consideration and report upon the subject of seconding officers of Artillery and Engineers (below the rank of field officers) employed in miscellaneous Staff employ, and that you will, at the same time, consider to what extent the application of the system would become absolutely necessary in the Artillery, by the continuance of so many officers of that branch of the service in departments which might be as well supplied from other services, and to what extent it might be practicable to reduce the number to be seconded, by recalling many of the officers so employed to regimental duty."

The principle that all distinctions between the Artillery and Engineers of the Royal and Indian services ought to be abolished, had been long recognized by the Court of Directors (*vide* their Military Letter, No. 183, dated 8th July 1853); but up to the year 1858, considerations of supercession of the other branches hindered the completion of this long-deferred measure. In that year, however, as the interests of the Artillery and Engineer officers in the Company's service had become seriously prejudiced by their immediate association with the same branches of the Royal service, assimilation thereto could no longer be delayed.

The Despatch from the President of the Board of Control to the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, East India Company (dated India Board, 21st May 1858), gives the grounds on which a thorough assimilation was then deemed necessary; yet up to this time such thorough assimilation has not been carried out, although the officers now belong not merely to the *same branch* of Her Majesty's service, but actually to the *same regiment*; and although it has more than once been authoritatively declared to be the intention of Her Majesty's Government to carry out that assimilation to the full extent (*vide* para. 1, and clause vi. of para 2, of Despatch No. 29, dated 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General; and para. 25 of General Order, No. 332, dated 10th April 1861); in both of which official documents the words used are "assimilation and ultimate consolidation," not partial and ultimate assimilation, as actually carried out.

This principle is also enunciated in para. 4 of letter from the Military Secretary, Horse Guards, dated 14th March 1863, to the Under-Secretary of State, War Office; and the fact of its having been so long withheld,

Facts.

5. "In the Bombay Fusiliers in which there were forty officers, all except one Captain and two Lieutenants joined either the new Line regiments or the Staff corps."

6. "In the 6th Regiment Bombay N.I., the senior officer who has joined the new Staff corps is the junior Captain but one."

"In the 7th Regiment, the Major all the Captains, and the three senior Lieutenants have joined it."

7. "Under the Company, a subaltern, for service in the field, was often noted for promotion to brevet rank as Major, on his becoming Captain."

"On becoming the junior Captain of his Regiment, he would thus receive the brevet rank of Major; and so, on general service, would take command over all the other Captains of his Regiment."

8. "The result of the mutiny has been that out of 74 regular Regiments of Native Infantry in Bengal, 62 have wholly disappeared, and by far the greater number of the officers are without regiments. The total reduction in the native armies of the three Presidencies since the mutiny has been from about 265,000 men to about 135,000 men."

9. "Before the transfer of the Government to the Crown, the average time in which a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Madras Army attained to Colonels' allowances, was about twelve years."

"In Bengal and Bombay it was rather less."

Replies.

and even now only partially acted up to, forms one the principal grievances complained of by the Artillery and Engineer officers.

5. The difficulty has entirely arisen from the system adopted by the Government in carrying out the amalgamation of the Indian army; which system, the Memorialists submit, is a complete departure from the guarantees given to the Indian army, by the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100. It might perhaps be obviated to a very great extent, by removing from the lists of the Indian army all officers who have joined the new Line regiments; and by extending to the remaining local or regimental officers, with retrospective effect from the 18th February 1861, the organization granted on that date to the "Staff corps."

This would at once, and effectually, re-establish in the *Local Indian Army* the seniority system now so much disturbed; it would again place the officers of the local regiments on an equal footing with their former comrades in the local Staff corps;—and the expediency and justice of the arrangement are evident from the fact, that both classes of officers are serving, and can only serve, on Indian ground.

6. This is another difficulty occasioned by the formation of the Staff corps; and the memorialists presume that this and the last statement are brought to their notice, in illustration of the unequal effect that would follow the removal of the Staff corps officers' names from the cadres of their former regiments.

The memorialists submit that this difficulty would also be obviated in the same manner as indicated in their reply to No. 5; or by filling up the vacancies from the seniority or gradation list of the Presidency; by which measure every officer concerned would necessarily receive his full share of promotion and no more, and the seniority system would be thoroughly and impartially recognized; whereas if the promotion were given regimentally, it necessarily could not be so impartial.

Sir John Malcolm and many other distinguished men who made Indian affairs the study of a lifetime, were unanimously of opinion that the formation of a Staff corps could only be carried out on the principle of an augmentation to the army.

Sir John's words are very decided: "These unattached corps would be formed, in the first instance, as an augmentation."—(*Vide* note, page 223, vol. ii., of Sir John Malcolm's "Central India;" and also page 127 of Appendix B. of the Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1832 (vol. v., Military), in which Appendix and Report this question is fully discussed.)

7. Officers have always been held to be fairly entitled, by the rules of the service, to obtain brevet rank for distinguished service in the field; but such is *Army*, and not *Regimental* or substantive rank; it is open to all; and the regimental position of an officer who thus receives brevet promotion, is quite unaffected by such advancement.

The memorialists, however, observe that in the Indian service there were but few instances of subalterns being noted for prospective majorities; and that such brevet rank was invariably obtained only for individual conspicuous gallantry or good service; but in the cases now complained of by Memorialists, substantive promotion has been granted by length of service only, and in many instances over the heads of officers who have actually a greater length of service than those so promoted whilst relative merit has not entered into the question at all.

8. This is true, so far as the Bengal regular regiments of Native Infantry are concerned; but in Madras there remain 44 out of 52 regular regiments of Native Infantry, and in Bombay 26 out of 31; whilst in Bengal, in addition to 32 irregular Cavalry corps, there are still on the establishment—

- 33 irregular regiments, numbered in the Line.
- 4 new Goorkha regiments.
- 4 Shikh "
- 6 Punjab "
- 1 corps of Guides.
- 2 Nagpore regiments.
- 6 Hyderabad Contingent.
- 6 levies of various denominations.

62 Total irregulars.
12 Add regulars.

74 Total regiments of Native Infantry, with officers attached.

In Bombay, in addition to the regular forces, there are three regiments of Silledar Cavalry, six of Irregular Horse, and thirteen of Irregular Infantry.

9. The average time of a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Madras Army attaining to his "Colonels' allowances" might, at the period when the Staff corps was created, have been twelve years. But whether twelve years, or more, or less, each officer had the same chance; inasmuch as each could only enter the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel by rising from the bottom of the list of Majors by regular line gradation, and was therefore quite safe from supercession.

The Staff corps rules, on the contrary, ensure to the Staff corps officers that each shall obtain his majority, lieutenant-colonelcy, and colonelcy, within certain fixed periods; thereby entirely disturbing the system of rise by Line gradation only, heretofore in force, and guaranteed by Act of Parliament; which system is still further disturbed by there being, in the "Staff corps," no definite proportion of field officers to other grades, as obtains in the rest of the service.

APP. E.

APP. E.

Facts.

10. "On the reduction of the British army, consequent on the peace of 1815, the officers of the reduced regiments were at once placed on half-pay."

Replies.

10. There is no analogy between this question and any custom or practice of the Indian Army. The English army depends on an annual vote of Parliament. Its increase or decrease depends on the sum voted, and officers as well as men may be discharged at a moment's notice. The liberality of Parliament sanctions that, after a certain number of years, which has varied from time to time officers may retire on a certain amount of pension, termed "Half Pay."

But "Half Pay" could not be and never was recognized by the East India Company, except as a *boon* granted to officers obliged to leave their service on medical certificate, before having served the fixed period for pension. The East India Company could not dispense with the service of an officer able to serve them. He had, on his part, to fulfil certain duties, and the Company had, on their part, to employ him until he had served a certain fixed period, which enabled him to retire on a certain fixed pension.

"The Members of the Royal Commission collect that the Memorialists consider the assurances contained in the Act to have been violated in cases which may be ranged under the following Heads."

Cases.

1. "The amalgamation of the lists of general officers."

2. "The reduction of Colonels' allowances, and the change of system whereby, in the Cavalry and Infantry, the advancement to Colonels' allowances is made to depend on 12 years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel."

3. "The filling up of only a portion of the vacancies created by the special scheme of retirement of 1861."

4. "The non-removal from the regimental cadres, of officers posted to the Staff corps and the new Line regiments."

Observations.

1. This point is remarked upon at page 69 of Memorialists' "Statement," and may be thus summarized:

Since the passing of Acts 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100. certain rules and changes have been made, by which the mode of succession to the rank of general officer, although secured by those Acts to all officers then in the service, has become materially altered.

It is therefore submitted, that the Regulations on this subject, promulgated on the 1st January 1862, are an infringement of the above Acts of Parliament.

2. This point is entered into at pages 67, 68, of memorialists' "Statement."

The memorialists cannot understand on what calculations one annuity of 200*l.* per brigade, or battalion, granted only to a limited number of Colonels in the Ordnance corps will, (as stated by Sir Charles Wood, in para. 6 of his letter, dated 3rd March 1863, to the Military Secretary, Horse Guards) "fairly meet the case of these officers; and by still further accelerating the promotion in the corps at large, will remove "all grounds of complaint from the remaining officers;"—when it is a fact, that sums varying from 550*l.* to 125*l.* per annum were offered as annuities, *without exception*, to all officers of Cavalry and Infantry, from the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel to that of Captain with 25 years' service; although the proportion of Colonels' allowances reduced in the Ordnance corps was far greater than in the Line;—as were also their regimental commands and regimental Staff appointments, by the doubling up of their four company battalions into brigades of eight companies each.

Nor can the Memorialists admit the correctness of the statement made in para. 4 of the same Despatch, "that this measure is the *only feature* in the reorganization which was calculated to affect injuriously "the prospects of a certain limited class of officers of long standing and high rank;" inasmuch as every officer in the Ordnance corps is equally affected by this measure, although to some that effect is remote, whilst to others it is immediate; and every officer is injuriously affected by the Indian Ordnance corps not being, up to this date, thoroughly assimilated to the Royal corps, of which they are now a component part.

As regards the change of system for succession to Colonels' allowances in the Cavalry and Infantry, the memorialists observe, that by the rules obtaining in the Indian army, previous to the passing of Acts 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100., when an officer had once attained to the rank of Major, he succeeded by regular Line gradation to his lieutenant-colonelcy, and to the enjoyment of Colonel's allowances, without the possibility of being superseded.

By the changes introduced since the passing of those Acts, each "Staff corps" officer, on completing the required periods of service, rises from the rank of Major to that of Lieutenant-Colonel, and thence to the enjoyment of Colonels' allowances, irrespective of any gradation list; and the local field officers are thereby liable to supersessions, which could not have taken place under the rules existing anterior to and guaranteed by the Acts.

It is therefore submitted, that the new rules have caused an injury to local field officers; and that they do not now retain "the same advantages as regards promotion, allowances, and otherwise," which were guaranteed to them by the Acts specified.

3. It is submitted, that in this case, the steps taken by Government are entirely without precedent.

The rules hitherto governing promotions in succession to retirements in the Indian service are most clear: and, after the passing of Acts 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100., could not be departed from, without an infringement of those Acts.

4. After a most careful examination of the orders and regulations in force, previous to the amalgamation of the two armies, Memorialists are quite unable to discover a single precedent for depriving the officers concerned, of their just right of succession to the benefits derivable from these vacancies.

On the contrary, on all previous occasions of new regiments being added to the Indian army, promotions have been invariably given, in room of *all officers* transferred from the old to the new corps.

Cases.

Observations.

APP. E.

Officers have also, in one or two instances, been transferred from the Indian to the British army, and promotions in their room, followed as a matter of course; but in no single instance did a transfer take place, without promotions being given, in succession to the vacancy thus created in the regiment.

Whereas in the case now before the Royal Commission, a number of officers are transferred from their own to another regiment; *vide* Remarks by the Secretary of State for India, on the reply by the Government of India, to Question 54, on para. 93, of the Amalgamation Order: in which remarks it is officially stated, with reference to Staff corps officers, "the Staff corps is their only regiment, and their rank in it, up to that of Lieutenant-Colonel inclusive, is substantive rank."

Yet in violation of all precedent, and although those precedents have been guaranteed by Act of Parliament, the names of the Staff corps officers are still retained in the lists of their former regiments, to which they no longer belong.

As regards this question, the case of the new Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers is even stronger, so to speak, than that of the local service; for by the retention on the lists of the new R. A. and R. E. of the names of officers who have joined the Staff corps, those regiments have been treated as cadres of the local service, although the new R. A. and R. E. are not local corps: whilst the Staff corps officers have been declared (in paragraph 11 of Military Despatch from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General, No. 494, dated 31st December 1861) to "pass into corps, organized for special service in that country" (India).

The retention of the names of these officers in the lists of the R. A. and R. E. is, moreover, in direct contravention of the orders of the Secretary of State himself; for in paragraph 21 of Despatch, No. 27, dated 18th January 1861, it is distinctly directed, that "officers of the British army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belonged."

It is a fact, that the officers of the late Indian Ordnance corps belonged to the British army, from the date of their incorporation with the Royal Ordnance corps; and they are therefore at a loss to understand why the local Staff corps officers remain on their lists; especially as the names of the Cavalry and Infantry officers similarly situated have been, in accordance with the above order, removed from the lists of the new Line regiments, and promotions have been given in their room.

5. "The supercession of officers remaining in Indian regiments, by the promotion of officers in the Staff corps."

5. This is a hardship which most seriously affects the officers concerned.

Previous to 1858, every officer entered the Indian army on the distinct understanding that it was a seniority service; and that substantive promotion up to the rank of field officer, could only be obtained by regular regimental rotation; and after that, by regular line gradation.

It is true that brevet rank was given for conspicuous gallantry, or good service; which rank although not conferring all the benefits enjoyed by substantive rank, did cause *army* supercessions; but it again urged, that this advancement was open to all; whereas, by the operation of the Staff corps rules, local regimental officers, after years of tropical service, find themselves further than before from the prizes of the service.

These prizes include command of a regiment, of a station, of a brigade, and of a division; and Colonels' allowances.

Under the old rules, an officer on whom brevet rank had been conferred, could not supersede his senior, either for the command of a regiment or for Colonels' allowances; he might, it is true, be selected for station, brigade, or divisional command; but such cases were for recognized merit: whereas, by the Staff corps supercessions of local officers, it cannot be said that these latter are in the enjoyment of the like "advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise," as guaranteed to them by the above-quoted Acts.

It is therefore submitted that after those Acts were passed, the future prospects of no single officer could be altered, save under the authority of other and subsequent Acts of Parliament.

The feelings in the service on this and other points submitted for consideration is most marked: complaints have been received by scores, and daily continue to arrive.

6. "The indirect extinction of the regimental bonuses on retirement."

6. On this point the Memorialists venture to request particular attention to, and a careful consideration of the remarks set forth at pages 26 to 31 of their "Statement."

After the system there referred to had been not only recognized, but actually encouraged by their former masters, they submit that, directly or indirectly, to deprive a large body of officers of all return for money laid out, with the legitimate view of eventual benefit, is substantially to deprive them of a portion of the "just expectations" formed by them on entering the Indian service.

The money so invested was, in very many, if not in most instances, borrowed at very high interest; the payment of which obliged the officer and his family to incur great sacrifices; yet after submitting for years to these sacrifices, now, at one fell swoop, the savings of a whole life have been lost; and no compensation whatever granted.

7. "The withdrawal from unemployed Colonels residing in India, of the privilege of receiving full Indian allowances."

7. Previous to the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown, unemployed Colonels were allowed the option of residing in India, with the full Indian pay and allowances of their rank, so long as they remained in that country.

Since the passing of Acts 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100., the above allowances are only passed to those officers for a period of six months: and they thereby incur a loss of income to the extent of about rupees 7240, equivalent to about 724l. per annum.

APP. E.

Cases.

8. "Cancelling in 1859, the date of the commissions in the Artillery and Engineers given in 1858."

Observations.

It is submitted that these officers do not now, as guaranteed to them, enjoy the like "pay and allowances" as heretofore.

8. This point is fully entered into at pages 35 to 37 of the Memorialists' Statement.

"The Members of the Commission would be glad to know whether there is any other class of cases in which the Memorialists consider that the Act has been violated. And they will be glad if the officers deem it advisable, to receive information on these points by a statement in addition to their Statement now before the Commission."

Other Cases.

9. Supernumerary Colonels-Commandant of Artillery and Engineers, contrary to all precedent regarded as regimental Colonels, and even when general officers, not unattached as such; thereby preventing the completion of the established proportion of Colonels, and the consequent promotions of the lower grades.

Further Observations.

9. In paras. 27, 28, and 38, 39 of the General Order by the Governor-General of India, No. 332 of 10th April 1861, which will be found at pages 40 and 41 of the printed Statement, it is directed that the Colonels-Commandant will take that *regimental rank* from the date on which they respectively receive Colonels' allowances. It is also directed that the Colonels-Commandant, who will be *supernumerary*, will continue to receive Colonels' allowances.

It is also directed that the Artillery and Engineer corps of Her Majesty's Indian forces shall be formed into brigades and battalions, each of the following strength:—

Artillery.	Engineers.	
1	1	Colonel-Commandant.
2	2	Colonels.
4	5	Lieutenant-Colonels.
8	8	Captains.
9	8	Second Captains.
24	24	Lieutenants.

Although some of these officers have since been absorbed, a reference to the Army Lists for that period will show, that in the three Presidencies these supernumerary Colonels-Commandant were designated "*Colonels having rank as Colonels-Commandant*," and that where these existed, the established proportion of Colonels, *viz.*, two per brigade or battalion, was not completed, but the supernumerary *Colonels-Commandant* were counted as effective officers of the grade next below that which they actually held, and were thus practically disrated. They should have been gradually absorbed, and the lower grade completed without them. This principle has hitherto been acted on in all similar cases: for example, on the reorganization of the Indian Ordnance corps in 1858, previous to the amalgamation, the First Captains, who were in excess of the established proportion, became supernumeraries, but the established proportion of the next lower grade of Second Captains was completed, and promotions were not made from it until all the supernumerary First Captains had been absorbed. Moreover, many of these supernumerary Colonels-Commandant were Majors-General, and as such, if ranked as "*Colonels*," they ought not to have been on the strength of the regiment at all: so that, whichever way the question is viewed, the corps were fairly entitled to the steps withheld.

10. Depriving officers who have joined the Staff corps of the privileges of the old pension rules offered to all such officers by clause 95, Amalgamation Order.

10. Clause 95 of the Amalgamation Order states that "officers in Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the regulations of the Indian service." In direct opposition, however, to this very clear and distinct clause, officers who joined the Staff corps on this understanding have since been informed that they must either consider themselves as coming under new and much less favourable rules, only then brought into force to regulate their retiring pensions, or leave the Staff corps, although duly qualified to enter them; which latter alternative has been taken in many instances.

11. Additional disadvantages under which officers of the local Cavalry and Infantry are suffering.

11. These officers are not now in the enjoyment of the same "advantages" as heretofore. For instance, many complaints have been received in regard to the mode in which appointments to and exclusions from the new Hussar and Line regiments have been regulated.

Some officers have been excluded therefrom, although at the time of their formation they commanded the very men of whom those corps are now composed, and although they volunteered for "general service" equally with their men. Others have no men to command, but are moved hither and thither to various regiments, as doing-duty officers, to the utter destruction of all *esprit de corps*, whilst, to the detriment of the remainder, officers of the reduced regiments, when posted to do duty as above, are allowed to succeed to regimental commands, Staff appointments, &c. in regiments to which they do not belong, according to the regimental rank held by them in regiments which no longer exist.

12. The military funds of the several Presidencies.

12. As the interests of the officers of the Indian service are very largely bound up in the future of the several military funds, the Memorialists feel it their duty to reserve any expression of opinion on the subject, pending the promulgation, to the service at large, of the intentions of the Government with regard to these institutions. The Memorialists observe, that by statements not long ago furnished to the House of Commons, the balance in favour of the Bombay Military Fund on the 30th April 1859 was about 583,348*l.*, whilst that of the Madras Military Fund, on the 30th April 1858, was about 906,765*l.*, which latter sum had increased, on 30th April 1862, to 1,068,799*l.* sterling.

13. Lord Clive's fund.

13. As it may perhaps be gathered from the published statements by the press, in the case of Sir J. B. Walsh *versus* the Secretary of State for India, that the advantages of this fund shall only be continued to the present recipients thereof, the Memorialists wish it to be distinctly understood that they claim, as one of their guaranteed advantages, the full privileges of this fund for all and every the officers and men in the Indian service at the date of the...

CONCLUSION.

APP. E

The Committee of Officers acting on the part of the Indian Army desire to impress on the Royal Commissioners that the classification of headings under which the complaints of the Memorialists are epitomized does not include all the points on which it is asserted that there have been deviations from the Parliamentary guarantee. There are several individual cases which do not properly belong to any of the foregoing classes. The officers wish it also to be understood that the names of those who have sent in their petitions, memorials, or statements are a very small proportion of those who are sufferers by the amalgamation scheme as carried out. The committee are constantly receiving numerous letters from officers in India, conveying, in a private form, statements, more or less succinct, of their different cases. Many of those in India have not sent in any complaints, from ignorance of the proper form in which they should be drawn up; and others, actuated by the groundless supposition that they would be offending the authorities, and thereby perhaps prejudicing their future prospects, have omitted to bring forward their grievances. Others, again, have trusted that the whole question would be fully represented in all its details by the officers elected in England to act on their behalf.

The committee desire also to impress on the Royal Commissioners the important difference that exists between the positions held by the late East India Company and Her Majesty's Government respectively, as regards the legitimate powers of each to alter the system and regulations established under the authority of the former. The late East India Company were entrusted by Parliament with full power, in concurrence with the Board of Control, to frame and establish such rules regarding the pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise of their officers as they might deem expedient, and also to modify the same from time to time. But Her Majesty's Government, on the contrary, was precluded, by the Act of Parliament transferring to it the future Government of India, from making any alterations in those rules to the prejudice of the officers who were in the East India Company's service at the time of the passing of the Act.

The committee will now, therefore, briefly recapitulate the particular sections of the Act of Parliament which contain the principal guarantees alleged by them to have been departed from in carrying out the amalgamation scheme.

It is expressly enacted by the 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106, section 30, that "All appointments to offices, commands, and employments in India, and all promotions which by law or under any regulations, usage, or custom are now made by any authority in India, shall continue to be made in India by the like authority, and subject to the qualifications, conditions, and restrictions now affecting such appointments respectively."

By the 56th section of the same Act it was enacted as follows: "The Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company shall be deemed to be the Indian Military and Naval Forces of Her Majesty, and shall be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the same territorial limits only, for the same terms only, and be entitled to the like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise as if they had continued in the service of the said Company."

By the 58th section of the same Act it was provided that the transfer of any person holding any office, employment, or commission under the Company, "shall not prejudice any claims to pension, or any claims in the various annuity funds of the several Presidencies in India which he might have had if this Act had not been passed."

By the 57th section of the Act it was provided that it should be lawful for Her Majesty from time to time, by Order in Council, to alter the terms and conditions of service under which persons "hereafter" entering Her Majesty's Indian Forces might be commissioned, &c. &c., but the power was strictly limited to persons entering "HEREAFTER."

By the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, it was enacted that "the advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, AND OTHERWISE secured to the Military

Forces of the East India Company by the Act of the 21st and 22nd years of the Queen, c. 106. sections 35, 56, and 58 respectively, shall be maintained in any plan for the reorganization of the Indian army."

It is urged by the Memorialists that appointments to offices, employments, and commands in India, as well as promotions in Her Majesty's Indian forces there, could only (as regards persons then in the employment of the Company) be made *thereafter* subject to the qualifications, conditions, and restrictions *then* affecting the same respectively; and that any scheme of amalgamation involving a departure from those qualifications, conditions, and restrictions would be contrary to law, and altogether beyond the powers of the Secretary of State for India to carry out without obtaining the sanction of the Legislature.

And, further, as the system of promotion by seniority in the East India Company's service was established by Act of Parliament, and has been uniformly adhered to, it is argued that the establishment of a Staff corps on the principle on which the Staff corps in India has been organized, as well as the forcing a system of retirement by means of annuities granted to one branch of the service and withheld from the other, is a departure from the "qualifications, conditions, and restrictions" under which promotions "in India" have hitherto been made, and consequently a violation of the Act of Parliament.

And, further, in a similar way it is a violation of the provisions of section 56 of 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. to reduce the number of commands bringing with them off-reckonings or "Colonels' allowances;" to retain officers nominally on the strength of the army with a view to impeding promotion, who have really retired from it under the extra annuities, or in any other way to limit or abridge (as far as persons in the service at the time of the passing of the Act are concerned) the pay, allowances, and advantages as regards promotion or otherwise at that time existing in the Company's army.

And, further, as regards the system of regimental bonuses to officers on retirement, though they do not come within the provisions of the 58th section of the Act relating to annuity funds, yet they do come by implication within the scope of the "advantages" guaranteed by section 56, and appear to be a fair subject for compensation by Government.

Lastly, the question of the non-extension in full to the officers of the late Indian Artillery and Engineers of the advantages enjoyed by those branches of the Royal service at the date of the amalgamation, although perhaps it may be deemed not to come strictly under the term "breach of the Parliamentary guarantee," appears to the Memorialists to be so intimately connected and mixed up therewith, that they are at a loss to understand how the claims of those officers can be fairly investigated without such question being fully entered into.

The necessity of this is still further apparent from the fact that the officers of the Ordnance corps were debarred from many of the advantages held out to the Line on the very plea that the assimilation of the Ordnance branch of the Indian service to the same branch in the Royal service would give them advantages equivalent to those then and still withheld.

The Memorialists therefore trust that this portion of the grievances complained of by the Indian service may be brought to the notice of Government by the Royal Commissioners, in such manner as to ensure the required redress.

The Memorialists feel that they cannot better conclude their case than by soliciting the attention of the Royal Commissioners to the following extract from the opinion of Sir John Malcolm.

"The rise of European officers in the native army of India must continue to be by seniority, but every measure consistent with their interests, and with those of the public, should be taken to accelerate the attainment of rank and command for those who have gained experience in this branch of the service. The frequent stagnations of promotion which have occurred have been hitherto relieved by expedients that gave an impulse for the moment, but were followed by a reaction that often left men in a worse situation than they were before. We must not judge of the effects of such stagnation of promotion in the local army in India by what we observe

APP. E.

from the same cause in England; there is hardly any analogy. The power of exchanging into other corps, of purchasing and selling their commissions, that of living with their relations and friends, the connexions they form, and the different walks of life open to men in their native country, place them in a situation totally different from those who are in a manner banished to a foreign land, where they may be almost considered aliens from all family ties and connexions, with their prospects limited to their profession, to which they are in fact bound, from the day they enter it, as the only means they have of subsistence. The officers of His Majesty's service, if disappointed or discontented, have generally the means of escape; and if, in effecting that, their condition becomes worse, their complaints are not heard; they produce no effect on others; young and more sanguine candidates fill the niche they occupied; nor does the State suffer by the change, for the constitution of the army to which they belong requires, in its inferior officers, no qualifications that may not be easily acquired. But how different is the situation of those who enter the Company's service! Their youth must be devoted to the attainment of acquirements, without which they are unfit even for the subaltern duties of a native corps; they have no escape from their lot in life; discontent and disappointment in it not only corrode

their own minds, but spread a baneful influence over the minds of others; their place, after they are in any degree advanced, cannot be easily supplied, for certain qualifications, which time and study alone can give, are requisite to those who succeed them. All these circumstances (and many more might be adduced) show that the question of the improvement of the Indian army should be considered on its own grounds, and not with the reference, which is too often made, to the comparative condition and pretensions of an army from which its constitution is altogether different."

"The sale of commissions and exchanges between the English and local branches of the army employed in India, under regulations which guarded the efficiency of the local branch, would be most beneficial, both from introducing good and effective officers, and accelerating promotion in the local army; but there is no measure so requisite for the latter as the formation of a Staff corps, which would furnish the means of supplying vacancies in regiments occasioned by the removal of their officers to other duties."

Sir John had elsewhere stated that such Staff corps would of course be formed, on the principle of an augmentation to the army.—(Vide Reply at page 10, to "Fact" No. 6.)

APP. F.

APPENDIX F.

SUPPLEMENTARY MEMORANDUM submitted for the CONSIDERATION of the ROYAL COMMISSION, by the COMMITTEE acting on the MEMORIALISTS' behalf.

One of the most manifest injuries the amalgamation has inflicted upon the officers of the local army is the destruction to all prospect of their ever succeeding to the "off-reckoning" allowances, to which they formerly looked as the crowning reward of their career. The statement of the case is somewhat troublesome, but we think we shall be able to make it clear. For the sake of perspicuity, we shall confine our attention to the case of the Bombay army, and to the Infantry branch of it. Before the amalgamation scheme was carried there were 33 officers in the receipt of what were called "off-reckonings." This was the established strength of the list of Colonels. As in the Royal army, the object of a general officer's ambition is to obtain the emoluments which belong to "the colonelcy of a regiment;" so in the old local army, the great desire was to live long enough to obtain the "off-reckonings," towards which the field officer progressed by a system of rigid seniority. The moment an officer attained the rank of Major in his regiment, he became enrolled in the general list of field officers, and his succession to the "off-reckonings" depended simply upon his living long enough to obtain them in his regular turn. Now the strength of the field officers' list prior to the amalgamation was as follows:—33 Colonels, in receipt of "off-reckonings," 36 Lieutenant-Colonels, 35 Majors. The junior Major had thus to rise 71 steps before he could obtain the "off-reckonings." The number of Colonels being 33, and all of them advanced in life, it was found that the casualties among them gave two steps a year, upon the average, to the men below them. The rank of Major (which entitled a man to a place in the list of the field officers) was usually attained in about 28 years from date of entering the service, and in about 14 years more, or in his 42nd year of service, the officer found himself, through the promotion, death, or voluntary retirement of those above him, in the long looked-for receipt of the "off-reckonings." The goal was now won, and there was nothing more to look forward to. Now the amalgamation scheme has destroyed all hope of succeeding to these "off-reckonings," in the following way.—In the first place, the strength of the establishment in the receipt of them has been cut down from 33 Colonels to 31, by declaring two of them absorbed (in a way we shall presently see), and by the transfer of Major-General Hale, Major-General Wyllie, and Sir David Capon, to general service. The names of these three officers appear now in the list of Colonels *in italics*, as under:—

COLONELS.

Gilbert, William	-	-	3rd N. I.
Frederick, Edward, C.B.	-	-	10th N. I.
Lodwick, Peter	-	-	16th N. I.
Farquharson, Francis	-	-	9th N. I.
James, Charles Butler	-	-	4th N. I.

COLONELS—continued.

Capon, Sir David, K.C.B.	-	-	106th Foot.
Robertson, W. Donald	-	-	Cadre 29th N. I.
Soppitt, Matthew	-	-	26th N. I.
Moore, George	-	-	8th N. I.
Wilson, George James	-	-	Cadre 31st N. I.
Farrell, Francis Turnley	-	-	28th N. I.
Cavaye, William	-	-	6th N. I.
Forbes, David	-	-	Cad. 3rd Eur. Rt.
Cricklow, Henry	-	-	2nd N. I.
Hancock, Henry	-	-	19th N. I.
Smee, Walter Nugent T.	-	-	11th N. I.
Parr, Thomas Chase	-	-	Cadre 2nd E.L.I.
Macan, Henry, C.B.	-	-	17th N. I.
Wyllie, William, C.B.	-	-	109th Foot.
Browne, Walter J., C.B.	-	-	14th N. I.
Scott, James	-	-	5th N. I.
Morris, J. E. Gordon	-	-	15th N. I.
Hale, Joseph	-	-	103rd Foot.
Down, James Sommers	-	-	1st N. I.
Shortt, John Macourtie	-	-	13th N. I.
St. John, Robert	-	-	7th N. I.
Macan, George	-	-	25th N. I.
Jameson, George Inglis	-	-	Cadre 30th N. I.
Lyons, Humphry	-	-	18th N. I.
Bayly, Richard Albert	-	-	22nd N. I.
Stuart, Sir C. Shepherd, K.C.B.	-	-	20th N. I.

Upon the death of the three *italicized* officers (Hale, Wyllie, and Capon), the establishment will sink from its present strength of 31 to 28 names; no promotions being allowed in their room. But this is by no means the end of the absorbing process. This list of 31 Colonels is followed by the Lieutenant-Colonels, the first 36 of whom stand in the last Army List, as follows:—

LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.

James, Haughton	-	-	February 17, 1852.
Lang, William	-	-	June 25, 1852.
Melville, Sir Peter Melville, K.C.B.	-	-	(Retired)
Outram, Sir James, Bart., K.S.I., G.C.B. (Civil), K.C.B., K.C.D.	-	-	June 22, 1853.
Jacob, George Le Grand, C.B. (Retired)	-	-	November 15, 1853.
Shepherd, Alfred, C.B. (Retired)	-	-	April 18, 1854.
MacDougall, Neill Patrick (Retired)	-	-	May 1, 1855.
Honner, Robert William, C.B.	-	-	September 15, 1855.
Swanson, John (Retired)	-	-	October 1, 1855.
Scobie, Donald Mackay (Retired)	-	-	October 10, 1856.
Heath, John Coussmaker	-	-	May 25, 1857.
Keily, John Richard (Retired)	-	-	July 5, 1857.
Shortrede, Robert (Retired)	-	-	October 12, 1857.
Stewart, John Drummin	-	-	March 24, 1858.

LIEUTENANT-COLONELS—continued.

Skinner, Phillip Kearney M. (Staff corps)	-	April 25, 1858.
Hobson, John	-	May 18, 1858.
Pope, George, C.B. (Retired)	-	May 20, 1858.
Green, Edward, C.B. (Staff corps)	-	July 13, 1858.
Liddell, John, C.B.	-	July 20, 1858.
Grimes, George Robert	-	November 10, 1858.
Birdwood, Christopher	-	December 2, 1858.
Holmes, John, C.B. (Retired)	-	May 2, 1859.
Munro, Charles George Graham (Retired)	-	September 21, 1859.
Hogg, Charles Robert (Retired)	-	November 3, 1859.
Travers, Robert	-	November 29, 1859.
Guerin, Edmund Arthur (Retired)	-	June 2, 1860.
Lye, William Henry Cobb (Retired)	-	July 1, 1860.
Stockley, George Cator (Retired)	-	September 29, 1860.
Manson, Alexander Robert	-	October 7, 1860.
Andrews, Edwin (Retired)	-	January 2, 1861.
Lynch, Edward Patrick, K.L.S.	-	February 21, 1861.
Honner, Augustus Cotgrave (Retired)	-	April 21, 1861.
Arrow, William George (Retired)	-	July 4, 1861.
Baynes, Edward (Retired)	-	September 2, 1861.
Whitlock, Charles Robert (Retired)	-	September 17, 1861.
Christie, Thomas Tolfrey	-	September 17, 1861.

It will be observed that 20 of these officers have retired from the army altogether, and that two more have joined the Staff corps. The retirements having been brought about by the bonus scheme, it was contended that they ought not to give promotion to the officers below them. The statement is an absurdity. It is intended to use these italicized names as the occasion of absorbing an off-reckoning as each one comes up for promotion. The effect of this will be, that by the time it comes to Lieutenant-Colonel Christie's turn to get his "off-reckonings," the whole strength of the Colonels' list will have been reduced to eight officers, instead of 33 as before the amalgamation. The number has already dwindled from 33 to 28 by the italicising of Hale, Wylie, and Capon, and the absorption of Lieutenant-Colonels LeMessurier and Davidson, on the death of the late Generals Barr and Brooks. And the list is

to dwindle down further from 33 to eight; a very bright look-out, truly, for all field officers below Lieutenant-Colonel Christie, and for their successors.

Three years ago every field officer in the Army had a certain prospect of two steps a year towards his "off-reckonings," by casualties amongst the 33 Colonels. Now the number of Colonels is to be reduced to eight, when instead of two steps a year the whole list may reckon, perhaps, on a step once in every two or three years. In plain English, all prospect of officers ever obtaining the "off-reckonings" has been taken from the local army by the change. But it is worth looking a little further still, that we may note the effect of the scheme upon the whole local force. A little inquiry will show, that if 12 of the present Colonels were to die to-morrow, instead of giving a step in rank to 60 Officers and promotion to 300, as such casualties would have done under the former rules, they could not possibly now give a step in rank to more than nine Officers, or promotion to more than 60. The death of 12 Colonels to-morrow would simply place Lieutenant-Colonels James, Lang, Honner, and Heatn in the receipt of their "off-reckonings," while the other eight vacancies would be used to absorb the italicised names of Melvill, Jacob, Shephard, MacDougall, Swanson, Scobie, Keily, and Shortrede. The strength of the Colonels' establishment would thus fall from 28 to 20.

A vacancy in the Colonels' list was of old filled up by the senior Lieutenant-Colonel of the Army, whose promotion made a Lieutenant-Colonel of the senior Major. The elevation of the senior Major, in its turn, gave a step to every man in the Regiment to which he belonged, and promoted the senior Ensign, Lieutenant, and Captain of the Regiment to a lieutenantancy, company, and majority respectively. Thus every casualty in the Colonels' list gave a step in rank to five officers, and a regimental step to about 20. And as there were upon the average two casualties a year, 10 officers gained a higher rank, and 40 officers a regimental step, thereby annually. Under the absorption process that is now introduced, the death of a dozen Colonels to-morrow would barely give the same promotion as two casualties formerly. And this will remain the case until the process of absorption has reduced the Colonels' list down to eight officers.

11th July 1863.

APP. F.

APPENDIX G

APP. G.

LIST of MEMORIALS forwarded to the COMMISSIONERS by HER MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA.

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.	No.	Rank and Name	Regiment.
1	Lieut.-Col. H. Yule	Bengal Engineers.	31	Brevet-Col. P. K. M. Skinner	Bombay Staff Corps
2	Capt. A. H. Hope	3d Madras Cavalry.	32	Brevet-Capt. G. L. Fraser	23d Bengal N. I.
3	W. R. Cunningham	5th Bengal Europ. Inf.	33	Capt. W. Fullerton	Bengal Staff Corps.
4	H. D. Innes	47th Madras N. I.	34	Brevet Col. J. D. Macpherson	10th Bengal N. I.
5	Benj. Hodson	7th "	35	Capt. Horace Durrant	5th Bengal Europ. Cav.
6	Lieut. Rowland Farrer	21st "	36	Brevet-Major John Hood	12th Punjab Infantry.
7	Brevet-Col. S. A. Abbott	Staff Corps.	37	Lieut.-Col. G. S. Cotter	Madras Artillery.
8	Major T. F. Hobday	72d Bengal N. I.	38	J. H. Smyth	Bengal Artillery.
9	F. F. Warden	2d Madras Europ. Inf.	39	Major S. Richards	Bengal Staff Corps.
10	Capt. T. Drever	2d "	40	Lieut.-Col. C. F. North	Bombay Engineers.
11	W. F. Anderson	11th Bombay, N. I.	41	T. Brougham	Bengal Artillery.
12	Brevet-Major D. Boyd	11th "	42	G. Rowlandson	Madras Artillery.
13	Brevet-Col. H. Marshall	18th Madras N. I.	43	Colonel G. W. Y. Simpson	"
14	Lieut.-Col. T. McGoun	20th "	44	Capt. C. E. Taylor	Madras Staff Corps.
15	B. W. Black	Madras Artillery.	45	Col. J. Fordyce	Bengal Artillery.
16	Capt. G. A. Fulton	105th Foot.	46	Major-Gen. J. Hobson	Bombay Army.
17	Major R. Woolley	Madras Staff Corps, late 28th Madras N. I.	47	Capt. H. E. T. Williams	108th Foot.
18	Lieut. W. M. Williams	13th "	48	Major George Baldock	Madras Staff Corps
19	Capt. F. E. Francis	14th Bombay N. I.	49	Lieut.-Col. John Stewart	Retired List, Madras Army.
20	Lieut. A. J. Vibart	14th "	50	Major A. Tod	Madras Staff Corps.
21	Brevet Lieut.-Col. G. S. Montgomery	14th "	51	C. C. McCallum	"
22	Capt. W. L. Cahussac	11th "	52	J. E. Mayne	"
23	J. T. Hill	14th "	53	Lieut. J. G. Lindsay	Madras Engineers.
24	C. W. Wahab	14th "	54	Major-Gen. S. Bullock	Retired List, Madras Army.
25	Major A. K. C. Kennedy	Madras Staff Corps.	55	J. Swanson	Late of the Bombay Staff Corps.
26	Capt. C. F. Grant	3d Bombay N. I.	56	Capt. A. Y. Sinclair	26th Bombay N. I.
27	Lieut.-Col. J. G. Balmain	Madras Artillery.	57	Alfred Becher	8th "
28	J. D. Stewart	25th Bengal N. I.	58	George L. Thomson	26th "
29	Lieut. James Clements	Bombay Staff Corps.	59	H. H. James	10th "
30	Major-Gen. Ed. Green	"	60	W. Walker	1st "

APP. G.

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.	No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.
61	Brevet-Major A. E. Loch	1st Bombay Lt. Cav.	102	Capt. A. E. Bowen	19th Madras N. I.
62	" A. B. Little	25th Bombay N. I.	103	" M. C. Spottiswoode	24th "
63	Col. W. H. C. Lye	Retired List, Bombay Army.	104	" C. J. Bradley	24th "
64	Brevet Capt. C. Armstrong	Late of the 10th Bengal N. I.	105	" A. J. Shuldham	26th "
65	Major H. E. Walpole	16th Madras N. I.	106	Major G. T. Haly	41st "
66	Lieut.-Col. W. Dickinson	Bombay Engineers.	107	Capt. W. R. Broome	49th "
67	Major W. W. Anderson	1st Bombay Lt. Cav.	108	" F. Pictet	49th "
68	Capt. John Bates	8th Bombay N. I.	109	" A. D. McDougall	3d "
69	" J. T. Hill	14th "	110	" C. F. Gilbertson	3d "
70	Lieut.-Col. H. B. Lumsden, C.B.	Staff Corps.	111	" R. S. Burge	3d "
71	Lieut.-Col. A. Wilde, C.B.	4th Punjab Infantry.	112	Lieut. C. J. T. Whitlock	3d "
72	Major O. E. Rothney	Late of the 45th Beng. N. I.	113	Capt. E. H. Blomfield	7th "
73	" Geo. R. Cookson	Bengal Staff Corps, late of 4th Bengal N. I.	114	" Wm. Blount	7th "
74	Capt. F. G. Hodgson	Madras Staff Corps.	115	Lieut.-Col. B. R. Powell	26th Bombay N. I.
75	Lieut. E. Cave	7th Madras N. I.	116	" J. M. Taylor	2d " Light Cav.
76	" W. W. Mercer	7th "	117	Capt. C. Thompson	2d " Europ. Reg.
77	Capt. T. C. Ansley	9th "	118	" H. E. Jacob	18th " N. I.
78	" A. F. Williams	9th "	119	" J. C. Farquharson	2d " Light Cav.
79	Lieut. J. B. Taylor	9th "	120	Lieut. C. A. Moore	2d " "
80	Brev.-Capt. E. Dunbar	12th "	121	" G. F. Hogg	Bombay Staff Corps.
81	Lieut. Wm. M. Parratt	12th "	122	Lieut.-Col. Gaitskell	Bengal Retired List.
82	" W. A. Cheke	13th "	123	" J. MacGrigor	15th Bombay N. I.
83	" F. T. Miller	16th "	124	Capt. G. L. Thomson	26th "
84	" J. C. Hay	16th "	125	" Ewen Grant	3d "
85	" L. Owen	16th "	126	" C. D. Grant	11th Madras N. I.
86	Brev. Capt. Wm. Hornidge	24th "	127	Capt. and Brevet-Major E. L. Grant.	1st Madras Fusiliers.
87	Lieut. Q. S. A. Jamieson	22d "	128	Capt. E. Thompson	8th Bombay N. I.
88	" N. Alexander	22d "	129	" W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
89	Brev.-Capt. V. J. Shortland	24th "	130	Major G. Beale	22d Bombay N. I.
90	Lieut. E. G. Ingram	24th "	131	Capt. St. J. O'Neil Muter	2d "
91	" Tudor Lavie	24th "	132	Capt. G. E. Herne	103d Regiment of Foot.
92	Ensign C. J. Rose	24th "	133	Major C. T. Trower	103d "
93	Capt. B. Revell	31st "	134	Capt. E. M. Lawford	4th Madras Light Cav.
94	Lieut. A. Mears	36th "	135	" H. H. Lyster, V. C.	72d Bengal N. I.
95	Capt. J. R. Fulton	46th "	136	" Wm. Ashbourne	3d Bombay Light Cav.
96	Lieut. R. B. Cummins	46th "	137	Lieut. and Brevet-Capt. E. A. Green.	11th " N. I.
97	Capt. J. W. Rutherford	47th "	138	Capt. Jenkin Jones	Bombay Engineers.
98	Lieut. S. F. M. Grant	47th "	139	" C. B. Basden	61st Bengal N. I.
99	" J. B. Leggett	47th "	140	Lieut. F. J. Wise	26th Bombay N. I.
100	" Lieut. R. Stewart	49th "	141	Capt. W. Montriou	24th "
101	Capt. A. N. H. Lynch	19th "	142	Lieut. G. S. Hawthorn	24th "

SCHEDULE OF THE MEMORIALS, ACCORDING TO THEIR SEVERAL SUBJECTS.

(a.)

RETENTION OF NAMES OF OFFICERS—JOINING THE
STAFF CORPS—ON THE CADRES OF THE REGIMENTS
TO WHICH THEY BELONGED.

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.
5	Capt. B. Hodson	7th Madras N. I.
6	Lieut. R. Farrer	21st "
19	Capt. F. Francis	14th Bombay N. I.
20	Lieut. A. J. Vibart	" "
(d) 24	Capt. C. W. Wahab	" "
(e) 56	" A. Y. Sinclair	26th "
(e) 57	" A. Becher	8th "
59	" H. H. James	10th "
(b) 60	" W. Walker	1st "
(b) 61	Major F. Loch	1st Bombay Lt. Cav.
(b) 62	" A. B. Little	25th Bombay N. I.
75	Lieut. E. Cave	7th Madras N. I.
66	Lieut.-Col. Dickinson	Bombay Engineers.
76	Lieut. W. W. Mercer	7th Madras N. I.
77	Capt. T. C. Ansley	9th "
78	" A. F. Williams	" "
79	Lieut. Taylor	" "
(b) 80	Brevet-Capt. E. Dunbar	12th "
(b) 81	Lieut. W. M. Parratt	" "
82	" W. A. Cheke	13th "
83	" F. T. Miller	16th "
84	" J. C. Hay	" "
85	" L. Owen	" "
86	Brevet-Capt. W. Hornidge	24th "
87	Lieut. Q. S. A. Jamieson	22d "
88	" N. Alexander	" "
89	{ Brevet-Capt. V. J. Shortland }	24th "
90	Lieut. E. G. Ingram	" "
91	" T. Lavie	" "

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.
92	Ensign C. J. Rose	24th Madras N. I.
93	Capt. B. Revell	31st "
94	Lieut. A. Mears	36th "
95	Capt. J. Fulton	46th "
96	Lieut. R. B. Cummins	" "
97	Capt. J. W. Rutherford	47th "
98	Lieut. S. F. Grant	" "
99	" Leggett	" "
(b) 100	" R. Stewart	49th "
(b) 101	Capt. A. Lynch	19th "
(b) 102	" A. Bowen	" "
(b) 103	" M. C. Spottiswoode	24th "
(b) 104	" C. J. Bradley	" "
(b) 105	" A. J. Shuldham	26th "
(b) 106	Major G. T. Haly	41st "
(b) 107	Capt. W. R. Broome	49th "
(b) 108	" F. Pictet	" "
(b)(c)(e) 119	" J. C. Farquharson	2d Bombay Lt. Cav.
(c)(d)(e) 117	" C. Thompson	2d Bombay Europeans.
(c)(e) 120	Lieut. C. A. Moore	2d Bombay Lt. Cav.
(b)(e) 124	Capt. G. L. Thomson	26th Bombay N. I.
(b)(e) 126	" C. D. Grant	11th Madras N. I.
(b)(c)(d) 128	" E. Thompson	8th Bombay N. I.
(b)(e) 129	" W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
(c)(d)(e) 135	" H. H. Lyster, V. C.	72d Bengal N. I.
138	" Jenkins Jones	Bombay Engineers.
(b)(e) 139	" C. B. Basden	61st Bengal N. I.
(e) 140	Lieut. F. J. Wise	26th Bombay N. I.
(b)(c) 141	Capt. W. Montriou	24th "
(d)(e) 142	Lieut. G. S. Hawthorn	" "

NOTE.—The letters quoted in the margin denote that the Memorialist has brought forward other subjects of complaint in his Memorial.

(b.)

SUPERCESSION IN ARMY RANK BY REGIMENTAL JUNIORS PROMOTED IN THE STAFF CORPS.

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.
3	Capt. W. R. Cunningham	5th Bengal Europeans.
4	" H. D. Innes	47th Madras N. I.
22	" W. L. Cahusac	11th Bombay N. I.
(f) 23, 69	" J. T. Hill	14th "
9	Major F. F. Warden	2d Madras Europeans.
10	Capt. T. Drever	"
11	" W. F. Anderson	11th Bombay N. I.
12	Brevet-Major D. Boyd	"
26	Capt. C. F. Grant	3d "
113	" E. H. Bloomfield	7th Madras N. I.
114	" W. Blount	"
(a) 60	" W. Walker	1st Bombay N. I.
(a) 61	Major F. A. E. Loch	1st " L. C.
(a) 62	" A. B. Little	25th " N. I.
(a) 80	Brevet-Capt. E. Dunbar	12th Madras N. I.
(a) 81	Lieut. W. M. Parratt	"
(a) 101	Capt. A. Lynch	19th "
(a) 102	" A. E. Bowen	"
(a) 103	" M. C. Spottiswoode	24th "
(a) 104	" J. J. Bradly	"
(a) 105	" A. J. Shuldham	26th "
(a) 106	Major G. T. Haly	41st "
(a) 107	Capt. W. R. Broome	49th "
(a) 108	" F. Pictet	"
36	Brevet-Major J. Hood	12th Punjab Infantry.
64	Capt. C. Armstrong	10th Bengal N. I.
65	Major H. E. Walpole	16th Madras N. I.
(c) (d) 67	Major W. W. Anderson	1st Bombay Lt. Cav.
(a) (c) } 119	Capt. J. C. Farquharson	2d " N. I.
(f) 121	Lieut. G. F. Hogg	Bombay Staff Corps.
(e) 118	Capt. H. E. Jacob	18th Bombay N. I.
(d) 115	Lieut.-Col. B. R. Powell	26th "
(a) (e) 124	Capt. G. L. Thompson	26th Bombay N. I.
125	" Ewen Grant	3d "
(a) (e) 126	" C. D. Grant	11th Madras N. I.
(c) (e) 127	{ " and Brevet-Major E. L. Grant	1st " Fusiliers.
(a) (c) (d) 128	" E. Thompson	8th Bombay N. I.
(a) (c) } 129	" W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
(d) (e) } 130	Major Beale	22d Bombay N. I.
(e) 131	Capt. St. J. O'N. Muter	2d "
132	" G. E. Herne	103d Reg. of Foot.
133	Major C. F. Trower	"
(f) 136	Capt. W. Ashbourne	3d Bombay L. C.
(a) (e) 139	" C. B. Basden	61st Bengal N. I.
(a) (c) } 141	" W. Montriou	24th Bombay N. I.
(d) (e) } 142	Lieut. G. S. Hawthorn	"

NOTE—The letters quoted in the margin denote that the Memorialist has brought forward other subjects of complaint in his Memorial.

(c)

RETENTION OF THE NAMES OF OFFICERS—JOINING THE NEW REGIMENTS OF THE LINE—ON THE CADRES OF THEIR FORMER REGIMENTS.

No.	Rank and Name	Regiment.
109	Capt. A. D. McDougall	3d Madras Europeans.
110	" C. F. Gilbertson	"
111	" R. S. Burge	"
112	Lieut. C. J. T. Whitlock	"
(b) (d) 67	Major W. W. Anderson	1st Bombay Lt. Cav.
(a) (b) } 119	Capt. C. J. Farquharson	2d "
(e) } 117	" C. Thompson	2d Bombay Europeans.
(a) (d) } 120	Lieut. C. A. Moore	2d Bombay Lt. Cav.
(a) (c) } 116	Lieut. J. N. Taylor	"

APP. G

No.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.
(b) (e) 127	{ Capt. and Brevet-Maj. E. L. Grant	1st Madras Fusiliers.
(a) (b) (d) 128	" E. Thompson	8th Bombay N. I.
(a) (b) } 129	" W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
(d) (e) } 135	" H. H. Lyster, V. C.	72d Bengal N. I.
(a) (b) } 141	" W. Montriou	24th Bombay N. I.
(d) (e) }		

NOTE—The letters quoted in the margin denote that the Memorialist has brought forward other subjects of complaint in his Memorial.

(d.)

NON PROMOTION TO THE FULL EXTENT OF RETIREMENTS.

No.	Rank and Name	Regiment.
(a) 21	Lt.-Col. G. S. Montgomery	14th Bombay N. I.
(e) 24	Capt. C. W. Wahab	"
(e) 63	Col. W. H. C. Lye	Bombay Retired List
(a) (c) 117	" C. Thompson	2d Bombay Europeans
(b) 115	Lieut.-Col. B. R. Powell	26th Bombay N. I.
(a) (b) } 128	Capt. E. Thompson	8th "
(e) }		
(a) (b) } 129	" W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
(c) (e) }		
(a) (c) } 135	" H. H. Lyster, V. C.	72d Bengal N. I.
(e) }		
(a) (b) } 141	" W. Montriou	24th Bombay N. I.
(c) (e) }		

NOTE—The letters quoted in the margin denote that the Memorialist has brought forward other subjects of complaint in his Memorial.

(e)

ABOLITION OF THE PURCHASE SYSTEM IN THE ARMY BY BONUSES TO SENIOR OFFICERS.

No.	Rank and Name	Regiment.
(f) 50	Major A. Tod	Madras Staff Corps.
(a) 56	Capt. A. Y. Sinclair	26th Bombay N. I.
(a) 57	" A. Becher	8th "
(f) 41	Lieut.-Col. T. Brougham	Bengal Artillery
(d) 63	Colonel W. H. C. Lye	Bombay Retired List.
(f) 112	Lieut.-Col. J. G. Gaitskell	Bengal "
(a) (b) } 119	Capt. J. C. Farquharson	2d Bombay Lt. Cav.
(c) }		
(a) (c) } 117	" C. Thompson	2d " Europeans.
(d) }		
(b) 118	" H. E. Jacob	18th " N. I.
(a) (c) 120	Lieut. C. A. Moore	2d " Lt. Cav.
(a) (b) 124	Capt. G. L. Thomson	26th " N. I.
(a) (b) 126	" C. D. Grant	11th Madras N. I.
(b) (c) 127	Capt. and Brg.-Maj. E. L. Grant	1st Madras Fusiliers
(a) (b) } 129	Capt. W. A. Deey	41st Madras N. I.
(c) (d) }		
(b) 131	" S. J. O'N. Muter	2d Bombay N. I.
(a) (c) } 134	" H. H. Lyster, V. C.	72d Bengal N. I.
(d) }		
(a) (b) 139	" C. B. Basden	61st Bengal N. I.
(a) 140	Lieut. F. J. Wise	26th Bombay N. I.
(a) (b) } 141	Capt. W. Montriou	24th "
(c) (d) }		
(a) (b) 142	Lieut. G. S. Hawthorn	" "

NOTE—The letters quoted in the margin denote that the Memorialist has brought forward other subjects of complaint in his Memorial.

APP. G.

MISCELLANEOUS; HAVING REFERENCE (IN SOME INSTANCES) TO SUBJECTS NOT DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH THE AMALGAMATION OF THE ARMIES.

Number.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.	Subject.
1	Lieut.-Colonel H. Yule	Bengal Engineers	Complaining that a more unfavourable scale has been used in assimilating the Bengal Corps of Engineers to the Royal Engineers than that taken for the Madras and Bombay corps.
2	Captain A. H. Hope	3d Madras Cavalry	Complaining of having to enter the staff corps as lieutenant, although he became captain 24 days afterwards, and has served 20 years.
7	Bt.-Colonel S. A. Abbott	Staff Corps	Complaining of disadvantageous effect on their prospects if they join the staff corps.
8	Major T. F. Hobday	72d Bengal N.I.	
13	Bt.-Colonel H. Marshall	18th Madras N.I.	Requesting to be permitted to postpone their decision, in regard to the staff corps, until the receipt of information as to the terms on which colonel's allowances are to be allotted to that corps.
14	Lieut.-Colonel T. M'Goun	20th Madras N.I.	
15	Lieut.-Colonel B. W. Black	Madras Artillery	
16	Captain G. A. Fulton	105th Regiment, late 2d Madras European.	Appealing against decision of Government that his appointment was not to be considered a staff appointment qualifying for the staff corps.
17	Major R. Woolley	Madras Staff Corps	Praying that his appointment to the staff corps may be cancelled, he having misunderstood the rule by which staff service was to be reckoned.
18	Lieutenant W. M. Williams	13th Madras N.I.	Praying for admission to the staff corps, not having passed in Hindustani.
25	Major A. K. C. Kennedy	Madras Staff Corps	Requesting to be allowed to count the period passed by him as quartermaster and interpreter of regiments other than his own, as staff service for promotion.
27	Lieut.-Col. J. G. Balmain	Madras Artillery	Requesting that the retiring scheme offering additional annuities to the pension of officers of cavalry and infantry may be extended to the artillery.
28	Lieut.-Col. J. D. Stewart	25th Bengal N I	Complaining of reduction in the number of colonel's allowances, and delay in obtaining promotion to position of regimental colonel.
29	Lieutenant J. Clements	Bombay Staff Corps	Praying that he may not be deprived of the rank of captain in the staff corps to which he had been promoted.
30	Major-Gen E. Green	Bombay Staff Corps	Praying for colonel's allowances at the expiration of 10 years from date of promotion to regimental lieutenant-colonel.
31	Colonel P. K. Skinner	Bombay Staff Corps	
32	Captain G. L. Fraser	23rd Bombay N.I.	Praying that the period during which he officiated as interpreter and quartermaster may reckon as service for promotion.
33	Captain W. Fullerton	Bengal Staff Corps	Praying that the period during which he officiated in charge of the Sudder Bazaar, may reckon as staff service.
34	Bt. Col. J. D. Macpherson, C.B.	10th Bengal N. I.	Complaining of delay in obtaining promotion to position of regimental colonel and colonel's allowances.
70	Lieut.-Col. H. B. Lumsden	Corps of Guides	Praying that, as staff corps officers are not allowed to retire under Regulations of 1796, he may revert to his former position.
71	Lieut.-Col. A. Wilde, C.B.	4th Punjaub Infantry	Praying that staff corps officers may be allowed to retire under the Regulations of 1796.
72	Major O. E. Rothney	45th Bengal N. I.	
73	Major G. R. Cookson	Bengal Staff Corps	
42	Lieut.-Col. G. Rowlandson	Madras Artillery	Complaining of loss in consequence of amalgamation of Indian and Royal Artillery.
43	Colonel G. Simpson	Madras Artillery	
44	Captain C. E. Taylor	Madras Staff Corps	Complaining that, by the operation of staff corps rules, he is precluded from counting the whole of his staff service for promotion.
45	Major-Gen. J. Fordyce	Bengal Artillery	Complaining of reduction in the number of colonel's allowances.
46	Major-Gen. J. Hobson	Bombay Army	
47	Captain H. E. T. Williams	108th Regiment	Complaining of supercession by Captain Shuldham.
48	Major G. Baldock	Madras Staff Corps	Praying to be placed on a more equal footing with other officers in the staff corps, and be permitted to count service for retirement, according to the old rules, up to the 27th November 1855.
74	Captain F. G. Hodgson	Madras Staff Corps	Complaining that he is not allowed the benefit of the retiring regulations of 1796.
49	Lieut.-Colonel J. Stewart	Madras Retired	Complaining that he has been deprived, on retirement, of the substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and that his position, as a subscriber to Military Fund, has been injuriously affected.
35	Captain H. Durrant	5th Bengal Cavalry	Appealing against the selection of the 1st, 2d, and 3d Bengal European Cavalry regiments, to form the basis of the new Dragoon regiments.

Number.	Rank and Name.	Regiment.	Subject.
37	Lieut.-Col. G. S. Cotter, C B.	Madras Artillery	Complaining of the mode in which the promotions have been made in the Madras Artillery, by which he has been superseded by his juniors in the service in Bengal and Bombay.
(e) 50	Major A. Tod - -	Madras Staff Corps -	Complaining of loss of rank and position, as regards retirement, by entering the staff corps.
51	Major C. C. McCallum -	Madras Staff Corps -	} Praying that staff corps officers may be allowed to retire under Regulations of 1796.
52	Major J. E. Mayne -	Madras Staff Corps -	
38	Lieut. Col. J. H. Smyth -	Bengal Artillery -	Complaining of the arrangements for the reorganization of the Indian regiments of Artillery.
39	Major S. Richards - -	Bengal Staff Corps -	Appealing against the working of the staff corps rules in his case, and requesting that his appointment to staff corps may be cancelled.
40	Lieut.-Col. C. F. North -	Bombay Engineers -	Requesting that the assimilation of the Indian with the Royal Engineers may be made more complete.
(e) 41	Lieut.-Col. T. Brougham -	Bengal Artillery -	Praying that all distinctions between the Royal and Indian regiments of Artillery may be abolished as regards promotion.
53	Lieut. J. G. Lindsay -	Madras Engineers -	Complaining that the system of "seconding" has not been carried out in the Indian corps of Engineers.
(e) 122	Lieut.-Col. J. G. Gaitskell -	Bengal retired -	Complaining of loss of annuity allowed to officers on retirement
54	Major-Gen. S ^o Bullock -	Madras retired -	Complaining of injury to Madras cavalry officers by their exclusion from the newly-formed regiments of Hussars.
55	Major-Gen. J. Swanson -	Bombay Establishment	Complaining of measures adopted for regulating succession to colonel's allowances.
68	Capt. John Bates - -	8th Bombay N I. -	Complaining of not having been permitted to enter the staff corps.
(b) 121	Lieut. J. F. Hogg - -	Bombay Staff Corps-	Complaining of having had his promotion to be Captain in the staff corps cancelled.
(b) 23, 69	Capt. J. T. Hill - - -	14th Bombay N.I. -	Praying to be promoted to the rank of Brevet-Major.
123	Lieut.-Col. James McGrigor	15th Bombay N.I. -	Complaining of the early date given to the Artillery on the amalgamation
134	Capt. E. M. Lawford -	4th Madras Lt. Cav. -	Complaining of supercession by officers of the disbanded Cavalry Regiments.
(b) 136	Capt. W. Ashbourne - -	3rd Bombay Lt. Cav.	Complaining of not having been permitted sufficient time to qualify for the staff corps in Hindustan.
137	Lieut. and Brev.-Capt. E. A. Green.	11th Bombay N. I. -	Complaining of not being allowed to enter the staff corps.

COPIES of all MEMORIALS addressed either to the COMMANDERS-IN-CHIEF or to the GOVERNMENTS of BENGAL, MADRAS, and BOMBAY, which have been transmitted to the INDIA OFFICE, or addressed direct to the SECRETARY OF STATE for INDIA, by OFFICERS of the INDIAN ARMY, complaining of the mode in which the AMALGAMATION has been carried out.

(1.)

Public Works Department, Fort William,
29th July 1861.

The undersigned having brought the following facts to the notice of his Excellency the Governor-General in Council, has been directed to communicate them to Major-General Sir R. Birch, K.C.B., for consideration in the Military Department:—

2. In the process of amalgamation as applied to the three Indian corps of Engineers, a different scale has been used in the assimilation of the Bengal corps to the Royal Engineers from that used in reference to the Madras and Bombay corps, the former being very unfavourable in comparison with the latter.

3. The Bengal corps consisted of five Indian battalions; the Madras and Bombay corps each of three; the organic strength of each battalion being as stated in the margin, and the total strength of each corps as follows:—

Bengal	-	-	-	135
Madras	-	-	-	81
Bombay	-	-	-	81

4. In the assimilation the five Bengal battalions have been converted into three Royal battalions, whilst the three Madras and three Bombay battalions have been converted each into two Royal battalions; the strength

of these being as in the margin, and the resulting nominal strength of each corps as follows:—

Bengal	-	-	-	144
Madras	-	-	-	96
Bombay	-	-	-	96

5. The result of this is obviously unfavourable to the Bengal Engineers, both in relative number of promotions and in nominal strength, in the ratio of $\frac{2}{3}$ ths to $\frac{1}{3}$ rd, or of 6:5.

6. The effect is as follows:—

First, as regards promotions. If the assimilation in Bengal had taken place on the nearest practicable scale to that adopted for the other Presidencies, the Bengal corps would have had one Colonel Commandant, one Colonel, two Lieutenant-Colonels, and four Captains more than have been allowed. The "grievance" is a very practical one, because the officers of the Madras and Bombay corps have thus surpassed in promotion those who had a parallel position in the Bengal corps, not from the ordinary chances, or from the exigencies of service, but simply from an authoritative act of Her Majesty's Government. Not from the exigencies of service, because it is notorious that the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, especially the latter, are relatively much better supplied with Engineer officers than this Presidency, as a comparison of the public works lists will show. The paucity of Engineer officers for the numerous fields of duty under the Government of India

5 Lieutenant Colonels
8 Captains
8 2nd Captains
24 Lieutenants.
48 Officers per Battalion.

APP. G.

has been repeatedly of late years urged by the Governor-General in Council in addressing the Home Government.

7. It may be added, in illustration of the action of the scale of assimilation adopted in Bengal, and in Bengal only, that an officer of the corps would had been actually promoted to Second Captain in the ordinary course of things on the 13th March 1861 (Lieutenant Aeneas Perkins), was reduced again to the rank of Lieutenant, when the orders for assimilation were published with retrospective effect from the 18th February. It is to be observed also that the promotion of subalterns has been stagnated by the partial assimilation of 1858, which made five Captains supernumerary, and that the result of the present assimilation produces a new stagnation. Yet it is the Bengal corps, that one of the three which bore the brunt of the mutinies, and lost 16 of its officers by wounds and exposure during 1857 and 1858, which is thus placed in a position so inferior to that of the other two Indian corps of Engineers.

8. As regards nominal strength, had the same scale been applied here as in the other Presidencies, the corps of Bengal Engineers would have obtained an additional nominal strength of 25 officers instead of nine only. The effect of this is practical also, because the ranks of the corps are to be completed with young officers of the Royal Engineers, and so many more officers would have been available, where they are so much to be desired. As regards the requirements of the service, four battalions would not have been by any means too large an organization for the corps among all the provinces of the Bengal Presidency. But something like equity would have been attained had the Bengal corps been organized as 3½ Royal battalions. This is quite according to practice, as the Royal Engineers have been, (probably more than once) augmented by a half battalion at a time, and at this moment consist of 7½ battalions.

9. A retrospect of the history of the corps makes the case yet more unequal. In 1854 the Bengal corps consisted of four battalions on the then Indian scale, the Madras and Bombay corps of two each. One battalion was added to each corps, so that whilst the Bengal augmentation was only one-fourth, the augmentation of the others was one-half. The Bengal augmentation barely absorbed the supernumeraries. Hence, starting from 1854, the four Bengal battalions eventuate in the three Royal battalions, the two Madras and Bombay battalions in two Royal battalions. Absolute equality, therefore, would not be given by anything short of one whole Royal battalion additional. And if it be asked to what extent the increased corps of Bombay and Madras have been drawn upon for aid in the provinces added to the British dominion shortly previous to and since 1854,* the reply is, that Bombay furnishes one Executive Engineer and one Assistant Engineer, Madras one Executive Engineer and three assistants.

(Signed) H. YULE,
Lieutenant-Colonel, Bengal Engineers.

(2.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Archibald Hugh Hope, Captain in the Third Light Cavalry on the Madras Establishment, and Superintendent and Agent of Army Clothing.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT he would beg respectfully to solicit the favour of your attention to a few remarks he has to make in reference to the Calcutta General Order, dated 10th April 1861, relative to the amalgamation of the Royal and Indian armies, in so far as it affects his individual case, and should they meet your favourable consideration, prays that the small boon sought for may be granted.

The date of his first commission is 2d January 1841, and he was promoted to the regimental rank of Captain on the 14th March 1861, after a service of 20 years, 2 months, and 14 days; on the 10th April, or 26 days subsequent to his promotion, the Calcutta General Order above quoted is published, and, unfortunately, the date on which officers are to enter the Staff, on the rank they then hold regimentally, is fixed retrospectively to the 18th February 1861, or 24 days before he was promoted to the rank of regimental Captain; and it thus fortuitously happens that though on the 18th February 1861 he had served 20 years, 1 month, and 18 days, he must enter the Staff corps as a Captain, whilst others of exactly his service, but who were more lucky in regimental

promotion, are promoted to the rank of Major, which rank, under the rules, he cannot be promoted to under two years, or until 18th February 1863. He observes, however, that several officers who on the 18th February 1861 were regimental Captains, but who had not on that date completed the 20 years entitling them to promotion to Majors, have on a subsequent date, viz., the 30th March, on which they then completed their period of 20 years' service, been then promoted to the rank of Majors; as, therefore, it is evident they, equally with himself, were ineligible to promotion to the rank of Major on the 18th February, inasmuch as they had not fulfilled all the terms required by the General Order, and that as they were on the 30th March 1861 promoted to the rank of Major on a date subsequent to that, 14th March 1861, on which he had in like manner completed the terms required for like promotion, he begs most respectfully to request that he may be promoted to the rank of Major from the 15th March 1861, the day subsequent to that on which he completed all the required terms.

He asks this boon as a solitary and special case, as he has actually only lost the promotion of right by the fortuitous circumstance of the General Order of Government being given retrospective effect to a date 24 days before he completed the terms in full.

And your Petitioner will ever pray.

Madras, (Signed) A. H. HOPE,
23d August 1861. Captain 3d Madras Cavalry,
and Superintendent and Agent
of Army Clothing.

(3.)

The Memorial of Captain W. R. Cunningham, late 5th Regiment, Bengal European Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Calcutta, 1st October 1861.

Showeth,

THAT your Memorialist entered the service of the late Honourable East India Company on the 31st January 1837.

2. That, in the month of June 1857, your memorialist was second in command of the 12th Irregular Cavalry, and was detached to the Oude frontier with a party from that regiment.

3. That your memorialist's health, after 22 years' continued service in India, being unable to stand the exposure in the field at that trying season of the year, broke down; and your memorialist was sent to England by a board of medical officers.

4. That your memorialist, in the month of July 1857, proceeded to Europe on sick leave for 15 months, under the new furlough rules, retaining his appointment.

5. That after your memorialist's departure from the country, the 12th Irregular Cavalry, to which he belonged, mutinied.

6. That it has now been ruled by the Government of India, that your memorialist shall be considered as having lost his appointment from the date of such mutiny, which being beyond the limit of three years allowed, your memorialist is thereby precluded from joining the new Staff corps, and counting his former staff service of upwards of 13 years.

7. That your memorialist has been already superseded by many officers junior to him, who, from having joined the Staff corps, are now Majors.

8. That one Captain below your memorialist in the cadre of his own regiment, has been promoted to a majority on the Staff; and that others of the junior Captains are likely to be similarly advanced, so that your memorialist will always be liable to be commanded by men much his juniors in the service.

9. That your memorialist feels it particularly grievous that, under the operation of Government General Order No. 332, of 10th April 1861, he should be thus superseded by so many of his juniors, from no fault of his own, although the rights, privileges, and promotion of the officers of the late Indian army were previously guaranteed to them by Act of Parliament.

10. Trusting that your memorialist's case may be taken into favourable consideration, and that he may be allowed to join the new Staff corps with advantage of his previous staff service, and taking rank from the 18th February 1861, your memorialist will ever pray.

(4.)

The respectful Memorial of Captain H. D. Innes, 47th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry, to the Honourable Sir C. Wood, G.C.B., Secretary of State for India, dated Ootacamund, 14 September 1861.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist has served for the period of upwards of 26 years, and that by recent orders published in the Fort St. George "Gazette," he finds himself superseded by the promotion of a junior officer of his own regiment, viz., Captain Pollard, who has joined the Staff corps, which compels your memorialist to submit this respectful remonstrance, and to beg that his commission as a Major may be antedated to that of his junior officer in the Staff corps by virtue of the Parliamentary pledge, that all our existing rights and privileges should be respected and guaranteed in the amalgamation; this service having hitherto been a seniority service.

2. Officers having been permitted to make known their grievances singly, your memorialist ventures most respectfully to submit the above for your favourable consideration, through the authorities at this Presidency, and regular channel for transmission to the Home Government.

(5.)

The Memorial of Captain Benjamin Hodson, 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council, dated Camptee, 1st October 1861.

1. Your memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration the following representation.

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety, by his very respectful but earnest representation of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him by the retention of the name of Major McCallum in the list of captains of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, after his appointment to, and promotion in the Staff corps.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto to allow every promotion of officers which might occur in regiments up to the rank of Major (inclusive) to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has, moreover, been ruled, that in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India, who shall join the Indian Staff corps, those officers are to be seconded, and their steps are to go in their respective regiments; and the irregularity of operation in the two services in the instance he describes makes an invidious distinction.

5. Your memorialist cannot but remember, had Major McCallum been promoted and removed into any other new corps before the Amalgamation Act, his position would at this moment have been that of the senior Captain of his regiment; but according to the new rules by which Major McCallum is retained on the roll of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, not with any view of his ever returning to the corps as heretofore, whenever the regiment may be employed on active service; not in order that his subscriptions to the regimental funds may still be claimed; not as in any way belonging to the regiment, but solely to regulate, as the General Order terms it, the promotion of the juniors, your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely, leaving a feeling of bitter disappointment as the result.

6. Further, your memorialist would notice that, under the operation of the same order, while debarred from advancement in succession to his senior, he has been subjected to permanent supercession by the promotion of a junior, Captain Saunders, of his own regiment, who, though more than six years junior to your memorialist in the rank of Captain, has now been promoted to Major, and as such may very possibly be placed at some future time in command over your memorialist.

7. Your memorialist submits that it cannot be justly urged that the formation of the Indian Staff corps involves a new arrangement, from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefits contingent thereon; nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed, with its subordinate

arrangements. It has been the well understood rule in the service, and hitherto faithfully observed, that every removal or promotion of a regimental officer under the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel should give a step to the juniors of his rank. Captain, now Major McCallum, has been promoted, and promoted moreover into a new corps, and your memorialist thinks and feels that in refusing to him the step in the regiment which Major McCallum's removal to another corps makes, the conditions of his service are not observed by the Government under which he serves.

8. It is because your memorialist began his career in the Indian army, believing that however slow might be the process of advancement in the service to him as regimental officer, the time would eventually come, if his life was spared, when the long struggle through the junior ranks would receive its late reward, that your memorialist feels the disappointment of seeing his senior promoted without benefit to him, and his junior promoted over his head. This falls with peculiar severity now that that career has extended to over three and twenty years.

9. It is because your memorialist's brother soldiers of the regimental branches of the British Army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system, that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

10. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of Amalgamation has been purposely so constituted, as to retain for him all the privileges and rights which he acquired as an officer of the Indian Army when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

11. Your memorialist, therefore, upon the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation, that Major McCallum and Major Saunders may be struck off the returns of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, from the date of their appointments to their new corps, that your memorialist may thereby at least obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled, if he cannot also be relieved from the supercession to which he has been subjected.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) B. Hodson, Captain.

(6.)

The Memorial of Lieutenant Rowland Farrer, of the 21st Regiment Madras Native Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India, dated Vellore, 28th September 1861.

1. Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialise you, regarding what he conceives to be grievances, in having been superseded by junior officers in his regiment.

2. By General Order by the Commander-in-Chief, Fort St. George, dated 23d August 1861, Lieutenant G. C. Blomfield was appointed to the Madras Staff corps, and to be a Captain from 18th February 1861, subject to Her Majesty's approval; and by G.O.G.C., Fort St. George, dated 3d September 1861, Lieutenant B. H. W. Magrath was similarly appointed and promoted.

3. Lieutenants Magrath and Blomfield are your memorialist's regimental juniors, and as such your memorialist respectfully submits, cannot supersede him either in accordance with the rules and custom that prevailed in the late Honourable East India Company's Service, or in conformity with para. 23 of G. O. G. C., dated Fort William, 10th April 1861; such supercession appears to your memorialist to invalidate part of the Parliamentary guarantee of 1858 itself (confirmed in 1860).

4. But Lieutenants Magrath and Blomfield, your memorialist's juniors, by being appointed to the Staff corps, have each obtained the substantive rank and title of Captain, whilst your memorialist, their regimental senior, still remains a Lieutenant.

5. And your memorialist begs further to state, that although these two officers, your petitioner's regimental juniors, have been advanced to substantive rank above him, yet he has derived no advantage nor advancement; on the other hand again, from officers of regimental seniors, having been transferred from his regiment, for it has been ordered that the names of officers removed to the Staff corps shall remain in the Army List in their previous respective regiments.

APP. G.

italics—thus presenting a grievous barrier to promotion both present and prospective. Your memorialist (who is of fourteen years' service and the third Lieutenant in his regiment) respectfully submits this to be a great grievance, and not in accordance with precedent and the so-called "vested rights" of the service positively guaranteed by Act of Parliament in 1858 and 1860, and totally opposed to para. 23 of G. O. G. G. C. of 10th April 1861.

6. Your memorialist, in bringing these grievances of supercession and non-promotion to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration and adjustment of the same, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, for ever pray.

(7.)

From Brevet Colonel S. A. Abbott, Commissioner and Superintendent, Lucknow Division, to Colonel H. W. Norman, C.B., Officiating Adjutant-General of the Army, Calcutta (No. 547, dated Lucknow, the 26th August 1861).

I HAVE to acknowledge and thank you for your letter, No. 3514, dated 14th instant, regarding the rank I should obtain were I to elect for the Staff corps

2. Perhaps you would do me the favour to lay before his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, the following representation, and solicit him, should he concur in my views, to lay them before the Government of India.

3. I am now senior Captain of my regiment (the late 51st), after a service of 33 years in the Army (appointment dates 12th June 1828). I have been 25 years in continuous Staff or Civil employ, and I am a full Colonel in the army.

4. It appears, that if I join the Staff corps I shall do so as a Major, after two years be promoted to a Lieutenant-Colonel, and my eventual position with respect to Colonel's allowance would be determined by the date of that event, and clause 84 of the Warrant records, that I shall become a Brevet Colonel (a rank I at present hold) five years after I shall have attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

5. I would most respectfully submit to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that the rule regarding rank on entering the Staff corps operates with great inequality, and places old-officers-of-long service in the Civil Department at comparative disadvantage; for instance, a junior Captain of 20 years' service, and six of Staff employ, enters on the same position as those who have served upwards of 30 years in the service, and 25 on Staff employ.

6. I cannot but believe his Excellency will be struck with the inequality in position held out by the Amalgamation Rules, as affecting old Officers like myself, who have served the Government faithfully and well for so many years, both in civil and military employ.

7. The boon I would solicit for myself, and all old officers similarly situated, is, that the rank on entering the Staff corps be calculated by the service laid down in clause 84, without the interval between grades, prescribed in clause 85 of the General Order by the Governor-General, No. 332, of 10th April. My argument, I know, can readily be met by the reply given to the labourers in Scripture. No one can doubt the power of Her most Gracious Majesty to apply the same rule in disposing of the labours of Her servants, or the duty of the servants to submit to Her will, but still there is inherent in human nature, and particularly in that of the soldier, a laudable love of distinction and acknowledgment of services performed, which no one better than Her most Gracious Majesty knows how to acknowledge, so that I feel confident it merely requires to be brought to notice to be rectified.

(8.)

From Major T. F. Hobday, late 72d Regiment Native Infantry, Deputy Commissary-General, Lower Circle, Officiating Examiner of Commissariat Accounts, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. Mayhew, Adjutant-General of the Army (No. 170, dated Calcutta, 10th August 1861).

WITH reference to General Order No. 332, dated the 10th April last, containing rules for the amalgamation of the armies, I have the honour, with much deference, to solicit the favour of my case, as explained below, being submitted for the favourable notice and orders of authority.

2. My commission, as Ensign, is dated the 17th December 1836; consequently, on the 18th February 1861, I had been 24 years, 2 months, and 3 days in the service, including about 17½ years on the Staff; having attained the rank of Major of the Line, in the Infantry, on the 28th August 1857.

3. Para. 84 of the Order, above cited, provides that Officers holding the substantive rank of Major, who may choose the Staff corps, "after twenty-six years' service, of which eight must have been in the Staff corps, will become Lieutenant-Colonels."

4. On the 18th February last, when the Staff corps was formed, I had served only 24 years, 2 months, and 3 days, as explained, therefore, all Majors, juniors to me in the Line, but who had completed the qualifying period of service on that date, and who have already done so, or will hereafter enter the Staff corps, prior to the 21st October next, supersede me by obtaining the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, retrospectively from the 18th February.

5. In the Indian army promotion has always been given by seniority. Even when an increase to the force was ordered from time to time, officers, who had been unfortunate in promotion, were drafted from the old, and obtained steps to fill the several ranks in the new regiments; but (to the best of my belief) no supercession of any one officer was allowed in carrying out this measure.

6. More recently, or since the order for the amalgamation of the Armies was published, considerable promotion has been given in the Corps of Engineers and Artillery, owing to an increase to the number of officers in the higher grades. But no one has been passed over; every step has been accorded by rotation to the senior officers, in their respective grades.

7. It is only in the Infantry and Cavalry that supercession will occur, in the manner herein described.

8. Her Majesty's and the Indian Governments have been pleased to notify that it is their anxious desire not to infringe existing rights more than can possibly be avoided. I am aware that, bringing into operation so important and comprehensive a scheme as that of the amalgamation of the armies, the privileges of some individuals must be interfered with for the general good. Yet my own case seems to be a peculiarly hard one.

9. I have paid very large sums of money to secure rapid advancement since I entered the service. I now stand twelfth on the list of Majors of the Line; and, in all probability, shall be promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in three or four months. It is naturally my desire to join the Staff corps—being a Staff Officer—yet under existing circumstances, the drawbacks to this course are so great as to amount almost to an absolute prohibition. I could only enter as Major, and should have to serve about sixteen months from the date of this letter to complete the qualifying period (26 years) for the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and to secure the pension of the same; whereas, by electing to retain my present appointment, without joining the Staff corps, under the operation of para. 72 of the Amalgamation Order, I should attain both that rank and become entitled to the pension thereof in about four months.

10. Agreeably with present orders, officers must notify their wish to join the Staff corps, or continue in the local service, by the 21st October next, or a month or so only before I shall obtain the substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. I therefore very respectfully but earnestly solicit that I may be spared supercession in the way elucidated (several Majors, my juniors on the list, having already been advanced to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff corps, from the 18th February last), and I trust his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief may not consider me unworthy the indulgence of his recommendation and support, in forwarding this my prayer to Government, and if necessary, to the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to be allowed to join the Staff corps as Lieutenant-Colonel, on my being promoted to that rank in the Line, my commission being then antedated to the 18th February 1861, to prevent supercession, and give me my proper standing in the Staff corps, and further, that I may not be compelled to send in my application for local or Staff corps service until I am favoured with a reply to this petition.

11. Acting on the spirit of Sir Hugh Rose's General Order, dated 26th July 1860, I take the liberty of enclosing copies of testimonials of services granted to me at different times, for his Excellency's perusal.

(a.)

Lieutenant Hobday, of the 72d Regiment Bengal Native Infantry, having requested to be supplied with a testimonial of the manner in which he has performed his duties during the period he has been attached to the 21st Fusiliers; it gives me great pleasure to comply with his wish, and to express my complete satisfaction at the manner in which he has conducted the duties of the Department entrusted to his charge, and to offer him my best thanks for the zealous assistance he has given me during the period he has acted as interpreter to the 21st Fusiliers.

(Signed) GEO. DEARE, Lieut.-Colonel
Dinapore, 16th March 1842. Commanding.

(b.)

Camp, Delhi, 8th February 1843.

MY DEAR HOBDAY,

ON the breaking up of the Detachment under my command, of which you were Detachment Staff, I have to offer my best thanks for the correct manner in which you invariably conducted the duties of your office; and from my observation of your zeal and intelligence, I feel confident that you would do justice to any Staff situation to which you may hereafter be appointed. You have my best wishes.

(Signed) L. BRUCE, Major,
Late Comdg. Detcht. 1st and 2d Lt. Bn.
Lieutenant Hobday, Intr. and Qr. Mr.,
2d Lt. Bn.

(c.)

Extract from Regimental Orders issued by Major Smith, late Commanding 2d Light Infantry Battalion, on its being broken up.

"To Lieutenant Hobday, Acting Interpreter and Quartermaster, Major Smith offers his sincere thanks for the very satisfactory manner in which he has conducted the duties of his office, and which is so praiseworthy in so young an Officer, and more particularly on entering an appointment under so many disadvantages as he did, when joining the battalion."

(d.)

Extract of Letter, dated 26th November 1844, from Major Somerset, Military Secretary to the Governor-General.

"I am glad you are pleased at being appointed permanently to the Commissariat. You owe your appointment entirely to the character you have made for yourself during the short period you have had the Abkaree at Agra."

(e.)

I HAVE much satisfaction in certifying that Lieutenant T. F. Hobday, of the 72d Regiment Native Infantry, served in the Commissariat Department at Agra, under my command, as superintendent of the Abkaree cantonment police and of the Sudder Bazaar, from May until December 1843, during which period he conducted himself in every respect much to my satisfaction. He appears to be a zealous, energetic officer, conversant in the language of the country, and possesses great command of temper with the natives.

(Signed) J. H. LITTLE, Major-General,
Comdg. Rajpootanah Field Force.
Nussecrabad, 31st August 1844.

(f.)

CERTIFIED that Lieutenant Thomas F. Hobday, 72d Regiment Native Infantry, had charge of the Abkaree department at Agra; was also superintendent of cantonment police and Sudder Bazaar during the period that I commanded the Agra district, viz., from December 1843 to the month of June 1844, and that he discharged his various duties in a most satisfactory manner.

I also bear testimony to Lieutenant Hobday having, in addition to his ordinary duties, performed those of the Station Commissariat, when the troops were employed at Gwalior, a period which involved great

responsibility; and the assiduous manner in which this duty was performed by Lieutenant Hobday was most praiseworthy.

(Signed) GEO. MOORE, Colonel,
Late Brigadier, Comdg. at Agra.
Simla, 3d September 1844.

(g.)

Lieut. Hobday, Sub-Assistant Commissary-General.
SIR,

THE operations of the army of the Sutlej being now brought to a close, I cannot allow the opportunity to pass of expressing the high sense I entertain of your unwearied assiduity and exertions in the performance of the very arduous duty entrusted to you in the charge of the field godown of the army, and of the success which has attended all your arrangements; and it will at all times afford me great pleasure to bear testimony to the zealous, prompt, and efficient manner in which the duties intrusted to you were performed, and which I have not failed already to bring to the notice of the highest authorities.

(Signed) JAS. PARSONS,
Deputy Commissary-General.
Deputy Commissary-General's Office,
Head Quarters, Camp, Bank of the River Sutlej,
26th March 1846.

(h.)

CERTIFIED that Lieutenant Hobday, S. A. C. General, was with me at Ferozeshuhur on the evening of the 22d December 1845, having brought a most important convoy of supplies from Moodkee for the troops encamped within Sikh entrenchments.

(Signed) A. BECHER, Captain,
Asst. Qr. Master-General,
Governor-General's Camp, 19th March 1846.

(i.)

Extract of Letter from Colonel A. Becher, now Quartermaster-General of the Army, dated 19th March 1846.

"The medal, when given, will be but a poor reward for your important services to the Army at a time when it was more seriously threatened by want than by Sikhs; and I shall be truly glad to hear of your getting some more substantial reward, as I know those who have the power, as well as the wish, are disposed to bring your share of the arduous duties of the Commissariat to notice."

(j.)

Extract of Letter from Colonel now Major-General Hawkins, late Commissary-General, dated 15th March 1848.

"Occasionally, smart intelligent officers must pay, in one sense, a penalty for being so. Davidson being obliged to leave Allahabad upon medical certificate, I know of no officer in the Department more fit to relieve him than yourself, and for the conduct of the duties thereat, and to keep in order the many bad and troublesome characters at the place, a firm hand and head, well acquainted with departmental affairs, is essentially necessary."

(k.)

Extract of Letter from Colonel now Major-General Hawkins, late Commissary-General, dated 2d Oct. 1848.

"So valuable an officer as yourself could not be spared from the field at this juncture; you have consequently been placed at the Joint Deputy Commissary-General's disposal, and ordered to proceed without delay to the frontier."

(l.)

To Captain Hobday, Sub-Assistant Commissary-General,
Camp.

WITH reference to your letter by Mr. [Name], dated 10th ult., reporting the successful result of your expedition from Ramnuggur to [Name] [Name] the honours to annex copy of Adjutant-General's letter, No. 1250, dated 3d inst., conveying the [Name] of the Com-
mander-in-Chief [Name] [Name] [Name].

App. G.

I take this opportunity of tendering to you my own especial thanks for the prompt, zealous, and efficient manner in which you discharged the important and very difficult duty assigned to you. By your exertions a large quantity of grain has been rescued from falling into the hands of the enemy, and the value of which has been saved to Government.

(Signed) J. RAMSAY,
Joint Deputy Commissary-General.
Deputy Commissary-General's Office,
Head Quarters, Camp,
4th March 1849.

(m.)

From the Adjutant-General of the Army to the Joint Deputy Commissary-General, dated Head Quarters, Camp, 3d March 1849.

WITH advertence to your letter No. 3924, of the 12th ultimo, and its annexment No. 401, of date the 10th idem, from Captain T. F. Hobday, Sub-Assistant Commissary-General, relative to the removal of the commissariat dépôt of grain, which had been stored at Koonjar and Goojerat, for the use of the Army, I am now directed to request you will have the goodness to communicate to Captain Hobday the opinion entertained by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that great credit is due to him for the excellent and successful arrangements made for the safe transport of the supplies adverted to.

(True copy.)
(Signed) J. RAMSAY,
Joint Deputy Commissary-General.

(n)

To the Secretary to the Government of India, in the Military Department.

SIR,
OBSERVING in Government Orders the promotion to Major regimentally of Assistant Commissary-General Captain T. F. Hobday, of the 72d Regiment, N. I., I beg you will do me the favour, with reference to the Staff regulations whereby he would be removed from this Department on such promotion, to submit my respectful report to the Right Honourable the Governor-General in Council, that the services of this Officer cannot possibly be dispensed with; he cannot be relieved "without inconvenience to the public service."

(Signed) T. J. NUTHALL,
Offg. Commissary-General.
Commissary-General's Office, Fort William,
19th December 1857.

(o.)

From the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the Officiating Commissary-General, dated Council Chamber, 2d January 1858.

IN reply to your letter, No. 640, of the 19th ultimo, I am directed to acquaint you that the Right Honourable the Governor-General in Council is pleased, under existing circumstances, to determine that Major Hobday shall continue to perform his present duties.

(p.)

True copy forwarded for the information of the Executive Commissariat Officer, Presidency.

(Signed) T. J. NUTHALL,
Offg. Commissary-General.
Commissary-General's Office, Fort William,
5th January 1858.

(True copy.)
6th January 1858. T. F. HOBDAY,
Assistant Commissary-General.

(q.)

I HAVE known Captain T. Hobday, of the 72d Regiment, N. I., for many years. His services in the Commissariat Department, throughout the Sutlej and Punjab campaigns, were most valuable; and I consider that the admirable way in which the armies in the field were supplied during these extensive operations was in no small degree attributable to the zeal, intelligence, and unceasing exertions of Captain Hobday. I believe that I am correct in saying that he has always been considered one of the most valuable officers in the

Commissariat Department; and I desire to add that I was greatly pleased with the ready alacrity and perfect success with which Captain Hobday conducted the Commissariat arrangements for the several bodies of troops disembarked from the colonies and England, and despatched to the Upper Provinces, both by land and water, during the short period I was in chief command of the Bengal Army.

(Signed) P. GRANT, Lieut.-General,
Commander-in-Chief, Madras.
Madras,
17th September 1857.

(r.)

Military Department, 30th April 1858, No. 237.

From the Secretary to the Government of India, in the Military Department, to the Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, in the Military Department, dated Allahabad, 26th March 1858.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 93, dated the 11th instant, forwarding copies of testimonials granted to Assistant Commissary-General Major Hobday, and to acquaint you, for the information of the Honourable the President in Council, that they have been perused with much satisfaction by the Right Honourable the Governor-General, and will be forwarded for the information of the Honourable the Court of Directors.

(s.)

Copy of the foregoing forwarded for the information of the Commissary-General, with reference to his letter, No. 905, dated 24th February 1858.

By order of the Honourable the President of the Council of India in Council.

(Signed) F. D. ATKINSON, Major.
Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India, in the Mily. Dept.

(t.)

True copy forwarded to the Executive Commissariat Officer, Presidency, with reference to his letter No. 217, dated 23rd February 1858.

(Signed) J. RAMSAY,
Commissary-General.
Commissary-General's Office, Fort William,
10th May 1858.

(u.)

ON the eve of being relieved by Lieutenant-Colonel J. Ramsay, Commissary-General, I feel it a duty, as well as a pleasure, to place on record my opinion of the manner in which the Assistant Commissary-General Major T. F. Hobday has conducted his most onerous and arduous duties during a period of difficulty unprecedented in India, and perhaps in any other country. Indefatigable in their performances, out of as well as office, Major Hobday has succeeded in affording universal satisfaction. His exertions have been crowned with a well-merited and marked success, and fortunate was it for the service at large, and for the Department, that so able and efficient an Officer as Major Hobday held the Presidency executive charge during the late most eventful period.

(Signed) T. J. NUTHALL, Lieut. Col.,
Calcutta, Officiating Commissary-General.
13th February 1858.

(v.)

Extract paras. 1 and 2 of letter No. 1, dated the 14th July 1858, from the Commissary-General, to Major T. F. Hobday, Officiating Deputy Commissary-General, Lower Circle.

WITH reference to General Orders "by the Right Honourable the Governor-General, No. 246, of the 2d July 1858 I have the honour to request you will arrange for entering upon the duties of Deputy Commissary-General of the Lower Circle as soon as possible.

"2. With this object you will make over charge of the Presidency division to Sub-Assistant Commissary-General Lieutenant Lowe, and in so doing I trust you will afford that Officer the benefit of your large experience and of your advice in all matters, so that no public inconvenience may be felt by your withdrawal from the Executive charge, in which you have afforded

such entire satisfaction, not only to your superiors, but to all who have been brought into contact with the Department during a lengthened period of unprecedented public calamity.

(w.)

From the Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, in the Military Department, to the Commissary-General, dated Fort William, 18th October 1858.—Military Department.

With reference to your No. 905, of the 24th February last, I am directed to transmit to you the annexed extract (paras. 6 and 7) of military letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors to the Government of India, No. 207, dated 11th August 1858, sanctioning the continuance of Major Hobday in the office of Assistant Commissary-General, notwithstanding his promotion to the rank of Regimental Major.

(x.)

Extract of a Military Letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors to the Government of India, No. 207, dated 11th August 1858.

"6. We have perused with much satisfaction, these testimonials to the admirable manner in which Major Hobday has discharged his duties in the Commissariat. Letter dated 1st April 1858. Testimonials granted to Assistant Commissary-General, Major Hobday, Executive Commissariat Office, Presidency, showing the high sense entertained of his services in the Commissariat Department—submitted for Court's notice.

"7. We entirely approve of your having allowed this Officer to continue to hold the Office of Assistant Commissary-General, notwithstanding his promotion to the rank of Regimental Major."

(True extract.)

(Signed) H. K. BURNE, Captain.
Offg. Depy. Secy. to the Govt. of India, in the Mily. Dept.

(y.)

True copy forwarded for the information of the Deputy Commissary-General, Lower Circle.

(Signed) JAS. RAMSAY,
Commissary-General.
Commissary-General's Office, Fort William,
22d October 1858.

(z.)

Extract of Letter, No. 177, dated 15th December 1859, from Major-General Birch, C.B., Military Secretary to the Government of India, with the Governor-General, to Major Hobday, Deputy Commissary-General.

As regards your own individual services, I am desired to inform you, that the Governor-General appreciates them highly, and knows with what zeal and assiduity they were performed.

His Excellency has also made this known to the Home Government.

(za.)

Major T. F. Hobday, Deputy Commissary-General, has been officially known to me since his appointment to this Department in 1843. He has been employed under my immediate orders in situations of great difficulty and responsibility, and in which he has always acquitted himself with much credit. Added to superior intelligence and a thorough knowledge of the rules and practice of the Commissariat Department, Major Hobday has, at all times, evinced a remarkable zeal for the public service, which has received the acknowledgments of the Government of India.

I have no hesitation in stating my opinion, that Major Hobday is a most valuable and efficient Commissariat officer.

(Signed) JAS. RAMSAY, Major-Genl., Retired List,
And late Commissary-General Bengal Army.
1, Sussex Square, London,
8th December 1859.

(9.)

The humble Memorial of Major Francis Faithful Warden, of the 2d Madras European Light Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, K.C.B., Secretary of State for India, dated Trinchinopoly, 26th September 1861.

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist was promoted to the rank of Major on the 18th November 1859, having invested a large sum of money to obtain this rank in full and perfect confidence that the rules and conditions of the service would remain intact and inviolate.

That by the conditions of the service, no officer who had not obtained the regimental rank of Major on or before the 17th November 1859, could either by wealth, influence, or even distinguished gallantry in the field, obtain the substantive rank of Lieutenant Colonel prior to your memorialist.

That your memorialist has observed with great alarm that by the Staff Warrant, officers, who are even now holding only the regimental rank of Captain, may by virtue of passed service on the Staff for a certain period be promoted over your memorialist's head to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and further that a Major standing below your memorialist in the Army List has actually been promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel to his supercession.

That these officers being eligible for military command may therefore supersede your memorialist in command in garrison and in the field.

That by the conditions of the service, no officer who had failed to obtain the rank of Regimental Major on the 17th November 1859, could obtain the off-reeckonings or Colonel's allowance prior to your memorialist, whereas by the Staff Warrant they may do so.

That a pledge has been given in the Houses of Parliament, that officers electing to remain in local service under former condition, shall retain all their rights and privileges, &c., whereas your memorialist respectfully submits, that the promotion of his juniors over his head, whereby they are made eligible to Colonel's allowances before him, is in direct violation of this pledge, as well as contrary to the conditions under which your memorialist entered the service, and not only inflicts on him a serious pecuniary injury, but also by implication detracts from his character as an officer.

Under these circumstances your memorialist, deeming a respectful appeal to be perfectly consistent with soldierly obedience, humbly prays that such rank may be granted to him, now and subsequently, as may obviate his present and impending supercession as above set forth.

(10.)

The humble Memorial of Captain T. Drever, Her Majesty's 2d Madras European Light Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, K.C.B., Secretary of State for India, dated Trinchinopoly, 28th September 1861.

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist desires very respectfully to represent that, under the operation of the Staff corps Warrant, he will be superseded in rank by many of his juniors in the service, and even by some of his own regiment, and that two of a lower grade, who simply by reason of their good fortune in holding present Staff employment, are permitted to reckon for promotion certain periods passed in such employ, the effect whereof is, that your memorialist, although of longer service than such officers, by reason of not having the good fortune to hold a Staff appointment, will be compelled, should he obtain admission into the Staff corps, to see, in the course of a very few years, those of lower standing than himself in his old regiment, besides others his juniors in the service, attain their promotion before he himself can.

That should your memorialist remain in his old regiment, his supercession will take place in like manner as set forth. Under the former conditions of his service, supercession by any officer junior to himself in his regiment could not have occurred except by sentence of court-martial.

That, it being ruled that the promotion of officers, who do not join the Staff corps, shall be unaffected by the removal of those who do, in order apparently that the former shall not gain undue advantage in promotion by such removals, neither should they be disadvantaged

APP. G.

by supercession by officers so removed, as will happen in many cases.

That although length of service is laid down as the rule for promotion in the Staff corps, your memorialist would not be admitted on the same footing with others, inasmuch as any one of equal service and rank with him, who happens to be in present Staff employ, would obtain his promotion so many years sooner, in consequence of your memorialist not being able to count any portion of his service as Staff employ.

The assurance given that, in the execution of these measures, due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and that this pledge shall be scrupulously adhered to, encourages your memorialist in the hope that some remedy may be devised, and consideration given in his case.

(11.)

The humble Memorial of Walter Fergus Anderson, a Captain in Her Majesty's 11th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your petitioner entered the military service of the Honourable the East India Company on the 11th day of December 1839, and has therefore now served nearly 22 years in Her Majesty's Indian army. That the said army has always been deemed to be a seniority service, in which no officer was liable to be superseded except by officers who obtained brevet rank for distinguished service in the field. That, by a late Act of Parliament, the army of the East India Company has been transferred to Her most Gracious Majesty; but, by a clause in the said Act (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.) it is ruled "that the Indian military and naval forces of Her Majesty shall be under the same obligations, to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the said territorial limits only, and be entitled to the like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company."

That consequently on the above quoted Act Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India issued orders for the organization of a Staff corps for each of the three Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, for which corps officers of both Her Majesty's British and Indian forces were invited to volunteer. Your petitioner, not being on the Staff at the time, was not invited to join; but, even if he had, he could not have availed himself of it, the supercession would have been so great.

That by paragraphs 101 and 102 in the Regulations for the Staff corps, officers belonging thereto are to take command and precedence in the army according to the rank and dates of their commissions in the said corps, which your petitioner respectfully submits bears exceedingly hard on regimental officers so superseded, who, thus, through no fault of their own, are deprived of the chief "honours," "allowances," "privileges," and "advantages" as regards promotion hitherto accruing from length of service, and which are humanely secured by the clause in the Act above quoted. That your petitioner, having already been superseded by several officers who were, previous to the formation of the Staff corps, junior to him in army rank, whilst amongst other supercessions so caused appears one of an officer who, during his whole period of service, has been junior to your petitioner in the same regiment, and who may hereafter, by paragraphs 61 and 70 of the above quoted orders, be sent to command the regiment in which your petitioner will then be his junior, which, by former regulations, he could never have done, however high he might have risen by brevet rank.

Your petitioner also begs most respectfully to point out, that in the event of any portion of the armies of the three Presidencies being brought together on field service, the supercession above complained of will be far greater in extent, and will consequently have a still more baneful effect on the "privileges" and "advantages" of officers, who, like your petitioner, have been thus superseded.

The consequences of these numerous and constantly increasing instances of supercession are most serious, the injuries in a seniority service of one single case of supercession are incalculable, as any officer so superseded may thereby be deprived of commands, honours, and allowances to an enormous amount.

That the very great grievance above complained of, and

pointed out, may be easily rectified and removed by it being ordered that every officer so superseded shall be provided with a commission of relative rank with that of the officer of the Staff corps who has superseded him. Your petitioner therefore prays, that a Major's commission, dated the 18th February 1861, with its full advantages, may be conferred on him.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) W. F. ANDERSON, Captain,

11th Regiment Bo. N. I.
Camp near Deesa, 15th October 1861.

(12.)

The humble petition of Daniel Boyd, a Captain and Brevet Major in Her Majesty's 11th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your petitioner entered the military service of the East India Company on the 19th day of January 1837, and has therefore now served for nearly 25 years in Her Majesty's Indian army; that the said army has always been a seniority service, in which no officer was liable to be superseded, except by officers who obtained brevet rank for distinguished service in the field; that by a late Act of Parliament the army of the East India Company has been transferred to Her most Gracious Majesty; but by a clause in the said Act (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.) it is ruled, "that the Indian military and naval forces of Her Majesty shall be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the said territorial limits only, and be entitled to the like 'pay,' 'pensions,' 'allowances' and 'privileges,' and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company."

That consequent on the above quoted Act, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India issued orders for the organization of a "Staff corps" for each of the three Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, for which corps officers of both Her Majesty's British and Indian forces were invited to volunteer.

Your petitioner not being on the Staff at the time had not the option of electing for the "Staff corps," nor would such election, if granted, have been beneficial to him, owing to the rules drawn up for the formation of the same, requiring an officer to have served a certain number of years on the Staff before being eligible for promotion.

That by the organization of the said "Staff corps," your petitioner finds himself superseded to a most alarming extent by numerous officers, who were junior to him both in rank and length of service, and in one particular case by an officer whose name stands three below your petitioner's in the same regiment, and who might, by the Staffs corps regulations, paragraphs 61 and 70, join your petitioner's regiment as senior officer, and so command him. Your petitioner would further most respectfully point out the extreme hardship of his case in being superseded by the officers above mentioned, who merely by their good fortune have been able to elect for the "Staff corps," thereby obtaining their promotion from the 18th February last, just three days prior to your petitioner's brevet rank, given for length of service, expressly to prevent such supercessions.

In order that your petitioner's position in the army may be the same as it would have been supposing no "Staff corps," had been organized, he most respectfully begs that a Major's commission bearing the same date as that already given to those officers of the "Staff corps," by whom he has been superseded may be granted to him.

And he will, as in duty bound, every pray.

(Signed) D. BOYD, Bt. Major,

H.M. 11th Regiment, Native Infantry.
Camp, near Deesa, 28th October 1861.

(13.)

From Brevet Colonel H. Marshall, 18th Regiment Native Infantry, and Military Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, 17th October 1861, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Fort St. George.

I HAVE the honour to report that I am desirous of continuing in Staff employment, without joining the Staff corps under the terms of paragraph 72 of the General

Order by the Government of India, No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, retaining my position in the Indian army.

2. I beg, however, very respectfully to remonstrate against being obliged to decide on a matter of such vital importance to my interests, in the absence of all information as to the terms on which "Colonels' allowances" are to be appropriated to the Madras Staff Corps; and as this information can only be afforded by the Government, I trust I may yet be permitted to reconsider my election hereafter, on the requisite information becoming available.

(14.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel T. M'Gour, 20th Regiment Native Infantry, Controller of Military Finance, Fort St. George, 18th October 1861, No. 1097, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Fort St. George.

I HAVE the honour to report, that I am desirous of continuing in Staff employment, without joining the Staff corps, under the terms of paragraph 72 of the General Order of the Government of India, No. 332, of the 10th April 1861; retaining my position in the Indian army.

2. In making this election, I trust I may be permitted to place on record, that I have been constrained to do so, in the absence of information as to the terms on which "Colonels' allowances" are to be appropriated to the Madras Staff corps; this is a matter of vital importance to my interests, as regards the position which I hold in the Line, and its importance will, I trust, be accepted as a sufficient excuse for my venturing to express a hope, that when the information is afforded, I may have the opportunity of re-considering my election.

(15.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel B. W. Black, Artillery, Director Artillery Dep't, 21st October 1861, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Fort St. George.

HAVING been constrained, by want of information regarding the future prospects of Lieutenant-Colonels joining the Staff corps, to continue to serve on the Staff under the provisions of paragraph 72 of the G. O. G., No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, in order to secure myself in my present position, and the requisite information not having, at this the latest date allowed for election, been communicated to the service, I have most respectfully to solicit that the period for decision on points so very materially affecting my future prospects, may be extended until such time as the Government may be in a position to inform Lieutenant-Colonels of the intended arrangements regarding their succession, after joining the Staff corps, to "Colonels' allowances," and, in event of such opportunity for re-consideration being afforded, I request I may be allowed the privilege of availing myself of it.

(16.)

The humble Memorial of Captain G. A. Fulton, Regimental Officer, Instructor in Musketry, Her Majesty's 105th Foot, Madras Light Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., Secretary of State for India, dated Trichinopoly, 2d October 1861.

Most respectfully sheweth,

1. That under paragraph 69 of Order No. 332, of 1861, dated 10th April 1861, by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, your memorialist, as Regimental Instructor in Musketry, applied for admission into the "Staff corps."

2. The supreme Government has ruled that the appointment of Regimental Instructor of Musketry is not to be held a Staff appointment as contemplated in paragraphs 68 and 69 of the above Order, No. 332 of 1861.

3. Your memorialist most respectfully submits that the appointment of Regimental Instructor in Musketry is a Staff appointment on the following grounds:—

Firstly.—That the Royal Warrants, dated 8th April 1856, and 4th February 1857, establish such.

Secondly.—That the appointment of Regimental Instructor in Musketry is authorized by G. O. G. dated Fort Wilham, 3d July 1857.

Thirdly.—That your memorialist was appointed under the just above quoted G. O. G., 3d July 1857.

Fourthly.—That the Book of Musketry Regulations, dated Adjutant-General's Office, Horse Guards, 1st February 1859, paragraph 4, page 8, lays it down that an Officer Instructor is "as one of the "Regimental Staff."

Fifthly.—That Instructors of Musketry are furnished with a special Royal Commission, which shows the value and importance of these appointments.

Sixthly.—A military letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, No. 174, dated 19th May 1859 (published in Madras General Orders of 1860, page 38), on the subject of Staff salary of Regimental Instructors of Musketry, paragraph 27, is as follows:

"In consideration of the importance of this office, and of the severe duties it entails in India, Her Majesty's Government approves of the Staff salary being fixed at (60) sixty rupees a month, "in addition to the horse allowance," and the Government of Madras in G. O. G., 27th January 1860 (published in Madras General Orders, of 1860, page 58), extends the same allowance, using exactly the same terms, to Officer Instructors of Musketry of Her Majesty's Indian forces, showing that then, at least, the appointment was considered a Staff one.

Seventhly.—The appointment of district Inspectors of Musketry on a "Staff" salary of 250 rupees per mensem; also the terms of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India, No. 8A of 1860 (published in Madras General Orders of 1861, page 13) dated Camp Lallunge, the 19th December 1860, viz.:

"The Governor-General is pleased to direct that the "officer employed as Chief Inspector of Musketry, "shall hold the relative position of a Deputy "Adjutant-General or Deputy Quartermaster-General, with the official rank of Major, if "below that rank in the army; and that the "officers employed as district Inspectors of "Musketry shall hold the relative position of "an Assistant Adjutant-General, or Assistant "Quartermaster-General, and shall, if under the "rank of Captain, take rank and precedence as "the junior Captains in the district in which they "are serving." Your memorialist humbly submits that this order, by admitting district Inspectors to be general Staff Officers, furnishes a valid reason for including Regimental Officer Instructors in Musketry in the category of "Regimental Staff."

Eighthly.—That in the Army Lists (British as well as Indian) and Pay Code (both published by authority), the Officer Instructor of Musketry is distinctly entered under the head of "Staff."

4. Your memorialist solicits attention to the fact that he has passed in the Hundoostanee language many years ago the prescribed examination for an interpreter; which signifies the highest test required by General Orders on the subject of officers passing in the language; and although it has never been his good fortune to be appointed permanently to the general Staff, he has repeatedly officiated for various short periods in the situations of military Paymaster of a division, of Deputy Commissary-General, and of Deputy Judge Advocate General of a division, being chosen at the moment of need by superior officers on the spot, who had the best possible means of judging of his efficiency; and lastly, that when a subaltern, he held the acting adjutancy of his corps for some months, and the regimental Staff appointment of Quartermaster and interpreter for upwards of five years, further proof, were it needed, of his qualifications.

5. Your memorialist having, as he humbly conceives, shown by various official documents that his appointment has hitherto been unquestionably considered a Staff one, forming as much an integral part of the constitution of a battalion as those of the Adjutant and Quartermaster, and interpreter, may further be permitted to add, that on the Officer Instructor of Musketry's individual capacity and honest zeal, in imparting instruction, the practical efficiency of the soldier is more vitally dependent than on that of any other officer in the regiment; and what is its extent? That the men of his regiment shall be able in the field efficiently to use the beautiful weapon with which they are armed, failing which, their discipline and courage, however great, as well as the efforts and military knowledge of their officers, will be comparatively useless. Such being the requirements, and, in a military

APP. G. point of view, the almost vital importance of your memorialist's office, he humbly conceives, that he who fills it is, *ipso facto*, when further qualified as a linguist, proved at least as much fitted for Staff employ as any of those nominated in paragraph 69 of the General Order alluded to in your memorialist's first paragraph.

And further, he is convinced, that officers of experience will support him in asserting that, independently of any qualifications as a linguist and an old regimental Staff officer your memorialist may possess, that the efficient performance of his bare duties of Instructor of Musketry would not be below the capacity of a large proportion of the fortunate officers admitted by paragraph 69 of the General Order already alluded to.

6. Your memorialist begs to observe that he has held the appointment of Regimental Instructor in Musketry for upwards of four years, and the whole of that time has been passed in about the two hottest stations in the whole of the East Indies; he has, moreover, never been absent from his duty during that period for a single day or hour, either by leave or by sickness; and now he sees with much pain and concern that the time thus passed is not to be brought under the category of the appointments enumerated in the 69th paragraph of the Governor-General of India in Council's Order, No. 332. Furthermore, your memorialist having served upwards of 21 years, of which, were the appointment of Regimental Instructor in Musketry to be included in paragraph 69, it would reckon upwards of nine years on "Staff employ," and hence entitle him to enter the "Staff corps," as Major, agreeably to paragraph 84 of Governor-General of India in Council's Order, No. 332; therefore your memorialist most respectfully urges that the rule alluded to in paragraph 2 of his memorial mars his prospects of promotion and advancement in the service in a manner which, he conceives, could never have been contemplated.

Your memorialist most humbly requests attention to the fact that any young officer, having passed the prescribed examination in the language, and holding say an interpreter and quartermastership, were it only for 24 hours before the 10th April 1861, can claim (as his right) admittance into the "Staff corps;" and yet an old officer as your memorialist, after so many years' service (all in India) is debarred from entering it.

Your memorialist most painfully feels this blight on his prospects, more especially as he conceives that his case is quite an isolated one.

Others may hold the same appointment and efficiently too, while they are at the same time, from want of lingual attainments, not qualified for other Staff employ; but as your memorialist's own qualifications embrace all the requirements of a Staff officer, *de facto* as well as (until the issue of the excluding order) *de jure*, he humbly submits that his exclusion involves a hardship which could never have been contemplated, when the excluding order was framed, and which, therefore, may fairly be made the subject of respectful, and as he trusts, of successful appeal.

7. Your memorialist therefore prays, that in consideration of the foregoing facts, he may be protected from the operation of the rule quoted in paragraph 2 of this memorial, and admitted to be, what he humbly urges that he is, viz., a Staff officer; and therefore competent to seek admittance to the "Staff corps" on the same terms as other officers now holding other Staff appointments.

(17.)

From Major R. Woolley, 28th Regiment Native Infantry, and Assistant Adjutant-General, Nagpore Force, Kamptee, 1st October 1861, No. 356, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Fort St. George.

I HAVE the honour to request I may be allowed to cancel my election to join the Staff corps, and I do so on the following grounds;—

2. On the 15th July I sent in my application to join the Staff corps, and I included in my Staff service for promotion, the period I had passed at Jaulnah as Cantonment Adjutant and as Acting Assistant Adjutant-General of the Nagpore Force.

3. I was informed by letter from your office, under date the 10th August, that the period of Staff service passed by me in the above appointments, appeared to be inadmissible towards promotion, and requesting to know whether I still wished to be appointed to the Staff corps.

4. I replied at once, that though the Staff service alluded to could not be allowed to count, I was still desirous of being appointed; and I at the same time earnestly solicited that the decision in regard to my service as Cantonment Adjutant, might be re-considered. I have since been informed, that, under the terms of the answer to Question 22 on the Amalgamation Order, this cannot be allowed.

5. I was accordingly appointed to the Staff corps in General Order of the 17th September, No. 317.

6. In the "Calcutta Gazette" of the 14th September, appeared a General Order, offering certain additional pensions to Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors of Infantry, if they retire within a certain date, a measure which it is presumed, will be largely taken advantage of, and which, from my position in the 28th Regiment, will in all probability promote me to a Majority in the cadre of my Regiment on the 1st January 1862.

7. In a subsequent "Calcutta Gazette," the decision of the Secretary of State for India is given on a point which may most materially affect my future promotion in the Staff corps, and which, I apprehend, is quite at variance with the letter and spirit of the replies given to Questions Nos. 41 and 83 on the Amalgamation Order, which have been published in General Orders.

The Secretary of State has ruled, that an officer in the Staff corps, who may obtain leave either on furlough or sick certificate, other than the usual privilege leave of 30 days in the six months, cannot reckon such leave for promotion in the Staff corps.

8. I would respectfully urge how seriously this ruling may work to my disadvantage, should I unfortunately require to take sick leave. I am a Regimental Captain only, close upon 26 years' service; I must now perform upwards of two years of uninterrupted Staff service, ere I can attain the majority; and a further two years of uninterrupted Staff service for the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; in short, four years of continuous service to attain the latter rank.

9. Had I known that so favourable a scheme for the retirement of Field officers was to be introduced, or that the decision of the Calcutta Committee on Questions Nos. 41 and 83 would be overruled by the Secretary of State, I should certainly have preferred continuing in my present position, without joining the Staff corps, and taking advantage of the almost certain promotion in my own regiment.

10. On the grounds, therefore, that subsequently to my election, my prospects as a Regimental officer have been materially improved by the offer of increased pension to Field officers, while by the decision of the Secretary of State overruling the decision of the Government of India on the question of leave of absence, my prospects in the Staff corps have been seriously deteriorated, I would respectfully and earnestly submit my claim to have my appointment to the Staff corps cancelled, unless I may still be allowed the benefit of my former Staff service.

11. I would, at the same time, ask the Commander-in-Chief to take into consideration the fact, that I have, besides the appointments of Cantonment Adjutant at Jaulnah, and Acting Assistant Adjutant-General of the Nagpore Force, formerly acted for some months as Adjutant of my Regiment, and as Quartermaster and interpreter in no less than three, viz., the 26th, 21st, and 5th Regiments, all of which acting regimental Staff service is lost to me under the conditions on which service is reckoned for promotion in the Staff corps.

(18.)

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant W. M. Williams, Adjutant, Her Majesty's 13th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart, G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Trichinopoly, 8th October 1861.

Most respectfully sheweth, that,

1. Agreeably to General Orders by Governor-General of India in Council, No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, paragraph 69, head "Staff corps," your memorialist applied for admission to the "Staff corps."

2. Admission was denied (on the 26th of August 1861) on the grounds that memorialist had not passed the required examination in the Hindoostanee language, having only passed "A" instead of "S."

3. Memorialist most respectfully opines, that by paragraph 69, distinctly saying that "officers holding military appointments * * * of Adjutants of existing local European and native regiments, will be

" held to be now on Staff employ, and will be eligible, " under the conditions hereafter noted, to have their " names placed on the list of the Staff corps," he is entitled to admission to the Staff corps, and nothing is said in the conditions subsequently inserted by which it may be ruled that a higher lingual qualification shall be demanded than the one his appointment required him to possess, before an officer can reap the advantages which the Governor-General's order distinctly says his appointment entitles him to.

4. Your memorialist has been 14½ years in the service, and upwards of seven years the Adjutant of his regiment, and as in paragraph 1, section IV., page 7, of the Standing orders of the army, "head Adjutant," it is stated, "his (the Adjutant's) talents and qualifications " will best be ascertained from the general appearance and efficiency of the corps," memorialist has the honour to submit copies (hereto appended and marked A.) of the reports, &c. on the 13th Regiment, on the several inspections of the corps during the time he has been Adjutant, which will abundantly prove that he cannot be deemed wanting either in "lingual " qualification," "professional capacity," or "official " zeal."

5. Your memorialist most respectfully represents that his exclusion from the Staff corps has debarred him, not only from the promotion which the Governor-General's Order, No. 332, and Royal Warrant distinctly entitle him to, but has further caused him to be superseded by his two immediate juniors in the regiment, Lieutenants Macquoid and Heytham, who in joining the Staff corps have become Captains, and may exercise command over him, in contravention of the pledge given in paragraphs 23 and 62 of the Governor-General's Order, No. 332, above referred to, "that the rights and " claim of officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces shall " be scrupulously adhered to."

6. Again, paragraph 19, Military Despatch No. 27, dated India Office, London, 18th January 1861, states, " the option of joining the Staff corps referred to in " foregoing paragraphs will be open to those officers " only who have fulfilled the conditions prescribed for " original appointments," and your memorialist most respectfully states that he has already fulfilled all and every condition prescribed by the Government for his appointment as Adjutant; and that he is only denied admission into the Staff corps on account of his not having passed "S.," but the examination your memorialist has passed is the same as an interpreter's, as far as the colloquial, urzee or letter, and court-martial are concerned, and the duties of an Adjutant of a native corps are such, that unless he is well acquainted with the language he cannot carry out his work either satisfactorily to the Government, his immediate commanding officers, or himself, and your memorialist has always borne a good name for efficiency and zeal in every way and at all times.

7. Your memorialist would most respectfully state, that in applying for permission to be allowed to join the Staff corps he does not do so for the purpose of getting an appointment on the General Staff of the army, as he is desirous of remaining with his regiment in military employ, but he does it merely to obtain rank and prevent supercession.

8. In conclusion, your memorialist begs to state, that by being denied admission into the Staff corps he is, after nearly 15 years' service, out of which the last 7½ years have been passed on Regimental Staff, superseded by two officers, his immediate juniors in his regiment, and by numbers of officers in the army, which he feels to be a most serious and grievous blow to his future prospects and advantages; and he now most respectfully but earnestly prays that his claim may be taken into consideration, and that he may be allowed to join the Staff corps, with his more fortunate brother officers, on the terms specified in the Governor-General's Order, dated 10th April 1861, No. 332.

This memorial is clear and distinct, and does not call for any remark from me. I can only testify to the superior zeal and ability of the memorialist, not only in regard to his acquirement in the Hindoostanee language, but in every other pertaining to his office.

(Signed) J. W. G. KENNY, Lieutenant Col.
Comdg. H.M.'s 13th Reg. M.N.I.
Trichinopoly, 9th October 1861.

(a.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. G. Woods, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Officer Commanding Southern Division, No. 953, dated Fort St. George, 28th February 1856.

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 31, dated 18th instant, forwarding your inspection report on the 13th Regiment Native Infantry for 1855, I have the honour, by order, to request you will be so good as to intimate to Lieutenant-Colonel Hughes, and through him to all ranks, the Provincial Commander-in-Chief's approbation on the very satisfactory state of the regiment.

(b.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. G. Woods, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Officer Commanding Pegu Division (No. 536, dated Head Quarters, Ootacmund, 12th April 1858).

I HAVE the honour, by order of the Commander-in-Chief, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th ultimo, No. 69, forwarding your inspection report on the 13th Regiment Native Infantry, together with the ordered returns.

Lieutenant-General Sir P. Grant has instructed me to express his satisfaction at the favourable state in which the regiment is maintained.

(c.)

From Captain E. Travers, Assistant Adjutant-General, Pegu Division, to the Officer Commanding 13th Regiment Native Infantry, (No. 212, dated Rangoon, the 25th June 1859).

UNDER instructions from Army Head Quarters, and by order of the officer commanding the division, I have the honour to forward you a copy of the remarks by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief on the recent inspection report of the regiment under your command.

" From the report under observation it appears that " the general state of the 13th regiment Native Infantry " is satisfactory, you will be good enough to convey " to Major Kenny his Excellency's approbation of its " efficiency."

(d.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. G. Woods, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Officer Commanding Southern Division, (No. 9363, dated Fort St. George, 15th December 1860).

I HAVE the honour, by order of the Commander-in-Chief, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 346, of December 1860, with the inspection report, &c. for 1860, of the 13th Regiment Native Infantry, and am to acquaint you that Sir P. Grant considers the latter very satisfactory and creditable to Major Kenny, commanding that corps, and the officers generally, as also to the Regimental Staff, whose merits are prominently brought to notice.

(e.)

Extract from Regimental Orders by Lieutenant-Colonel G. C. Hughes, Commanding Palamcottah, 3rd September 1855.

1. Lieutenant-Colonel G. C. Hughes has great satisfaction in making known to the regiment under his command, by desire, that his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief was much pleased with the appearance and efficient state of the corps when paraded for his inspection on Saturday evening.

(f.)

MY DEAR WILLIAMS,

I HAVE much pleasure in assuring you, that you conducted the duties of Brigade Major for the six months you held that post at Moulmein to my entire satisfaction; also, that from your knowledge of office details, steady business habits, and zealous attention to the duties of your regimental appointment of Adjutant which I have had almost daily opportunities of noticing

APP. G. during the past two years, I consider you to be an officer in every way qualified to hold any military appointment.

(Signed) D. H. STEVENSON, Col.
Commanding, Moulmein.
Moulmein, 29th October 1858.

(True Copies.)

(Signed) J. W. G. KENNY, Lieut. Col.,
Comdg. H.M.'s 13th Regt. M. N. I.
Trichinopoly, 8th October 1861.

(19.)

The humble Memorial of Francis Edward Francis, a Captain in Her Majesty's 14th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry.

To Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the military service of the Honourable the East India Company on the 24th day of June 1842, and has therefore now served nearly 19½ years in Her Majesty's Indian army. That the said army has always been deemed to be a "seniority service," in which officers benefited by every vacancy which occurred in their regiments until they reached the rank of "Major," whether it was by "purchase," "death," "transfers," the "line step," or otherwise.

2. That by Mr. Henley's clause (in the late Act of Parliament transferring the army of the East India Company to Her most gracious Majesty) it is ruled: "That the Indian military and naval forces of Her Majesty shall be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the said territorial limits only, and be entitled to the "pay," "pensions," "allowances," "privileges," and "the like advantages as regards 'promotion,' and 'otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company."

3. That by paragraphs 58 and 59 in the regulations for the Bombay "Staff corps," (organized by order of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, consequent on the above quoted "Act"), the names of officers joining the "Staff corps" will continue to be borne on their former cadres in "italics" only, for the purpose of regulating the promotion of their juniors. This, your memorialist (who has elected to remain in his present position in the "local army") respectfully submits, is a matter very closely touching the interests and welfare of your memorialist, and it is a rule which is calculated to deprive your memorialist of the "rights," "privileges," "expectations," and "advantages" as regards promotion, which are secured to him by the clause in the Act above quoted.

4. That your memorialist is the Second Captain of his regiment, and the officer immediately above him and the officer immediately below him in the same regiment have joined the "Staff corps." Your memorialist, therefore, requires that he should be permitted to benefit by the removal of his "senior officer," (who is now a Major in the "Staff corps,") and by so doing your memorialist would probably obtain his promotion in a few months (which would not be rapid promotion, instances having occurred in your memorialist's regiment of officers having obtained their majority in 13 years 2 months and in 18 years 11 months); whereas, on the other hand, if your memorialist is not permitted to benefit by the transfer of his "senior officer," his promotion will not only be retarded for years, which will bear exceedingly hard on your memorialist, but in June next he will be superseded by his "junior officer" (in the "Staff corps"), and who may hereafter by paragraphs 61 and 70 of the above quoted orders be sent to command the regiment in which your memorialist will then be his "junior," which, by former regulations, he could never have done.

5. Your memorialist, therefore, most respectfully and earnestly solicits that the great grievance above complained of and pointed out may be rectified by the officers transferred to the "Staff corps" giving an effective step in the cadres of their regiments, and that your memorialist be permitted to benefit by the transfer (to the "Staff corps") of his senior officer accordingly, in the same manner as when the 2d and 3d Bombay European regiments, and the 27th, 28th, and 29th Bombay Native Infantry regiments were raised; promotion

being given in those regiments from which officers were taken to form the new corps.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

F. E. FRANCIS, Captain,
Her Majesty's 14th Regiment Bombay
Native Infantry.

Camp Ahmedabad, 30th November 1861.

(20.)

The humble Memorial of Alexander John Vibart, a Lieutenant in Her Majesty's 14th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist entered the service of the late Honourable the East India Company in December 1854, and was in due course posted to the 14th regiment of Bombay Native Infantry; he was assured that he must rise by seniority to the rank of Major in that regiment, his promotion taking place as deaths, retirements; or transfers took place; moreover, he could not be superseded by any of his juniors of his own regiment.

Since the above date an amalgamation of Her Majesty's and the Honourable Company's services has taken place, but by Mr. Henley's clause in the Act of Parliament decreeing the amalgamation, the pay, pensions, rights, and privileges of the old Company's officers have to be preserved to them.

Your memorialist will now proceed to show in what points he feels himself aggrieved, and how he considers his rights and privileges have not been preserved to him.

1. A few years back new corps were raised, viz. the 2d and 3d Bombay European regiments, the 27th, 28th, and 29th regiments Bombay Native Infantry; officers were transferred from various corps, and several from that of your memorialist, the steps were given, and those that remained benefited, and succeeded to the vacancies caused by these transfers.

Since the amalgamation of the two services a new corps has been raised, called the Staff corps; seven officers, senior to your memorialist in his regiment, have been transferred, their names, however, are retained on the list of the regiment (contrary to the system which prevailed in former years) to retard the promotion of your memorialist, who has elected to remain local.

In your memorialist's regiment the two senior Captains are Captains Westropp and Francis, and the two senior Lieutenants are Lieutenants Preston and Forbes; Captain Westropp and Lieutenant Preston have been transferred to the Staff corps, and in former years the next on the list for promotion to Major, and Captain would have been Captain Francis and Lieutenant Forbes; not so now, however, the names of Captain Westropp and Lieutenant Preston still remain, and on the present Major being promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel the names only of Captains Westropp and Lieutenant Preston are promoted, therefore, as it was your memorialist's "right and privilege" to have the names of officers transferred to other corps removed from the list of his regiment, and such not being now done, his "rights and privileges" can hardly be said to have been preserved to him.

2d. In Her Majesty's British regiments the names of officers transferred to the Staff corps are removed from the list of their regiments, and the promotion given to those remaining, which officers are proverbially known already to obtain quicker promotion than those of Her Majesty's Indian regiments.

Your memorialist, in conclusion, therefore, begs most earnestly, at the same time most respectfully, that the names of those officers who have elected for the Staff corps may be removed from the list of his regiment, and he be allowed to benefit by their transfers,

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) ALEXANDER JOHN VIBART, Lieutenant,
Her Majesty's 14th Bombay
Native Infantry.

Camp, Ahmedabad,
29th November 1861.

(21.)

The Memorial of George S. Montgomery, Major and Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel of Her Majesty's 14th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India,

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist has always regarded the attainment of the Colonel's allowance, called the "off-reckonings," as the ultimate reward of his services in India.

2. On the assumption of the Government of India by the Crown this, and all other rights and privileges, present and prospective, were graciously guaranteed to your memorialist, in common with the rest of the army, by Her Majesty's proclamation.

3. These promises were further particularized and again made sure by special Act of Parliament.

4. Your memorialist, therefore, views with apprehension the order recently issued, granting increased pensions to field-officers, because the order goes on to declare that to meet such additional charge the number of off-reckonings shall be reduced, and that the names of all the field-officers so pensioned shall be retained in the list in italics.

5. This places the chance of getting the Colonel's allowance so far off that your memorialist may never hope to obtain it; first, by reducing the number of off-reckonings, and in consequence your memorialist's chance of getting one; and secondly, by permitting so many of his seniors, men pensioned and disengaged from the services, to stand in his way.

6. These pensioned officers will now reside in England, or other healthy climate, and thus doubly alter the very nature of this service, to your memorialist's great hurt, for before all ran equal risks from war and climate, and gave promotion by the many inducements to retire from serving in an unhealthy quarter.

7. Many circumstances concur to prevent your memorialist from availing himself of the present offer to retire; he is, but entitled to a Captain's pension, and hopes very shortly to be able to claim that of a Lieutenant-Colonel; besides, he is not of an age to render it desirable that he should retire.

8. Your memorialist therefore, prays that his prospects of obtaining the off-reckonings be not impaired by the above order, but that the number of off-reckonings be left as they now stand; and that the names of all pensioned officers above your memorialist's name be altogether removed from the list. And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) GEORGE S MONTGOMERY,
Major and Brevet Colonel of Her Majesty's
14th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry.
Camp, Ahmedabad, 2d December 1861.

(22.)

The humble Memorial of William Leigh Cahusac, a Captain in Her Majesty's 11th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India,

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist entered the military service of the East India Company on the 31st day of March 1840, and has therefore now served nearly 22 years in Her Majesty's Indian army. That the said army has always been deemed to be a seniority service, in which no officer was liable to be superseded, except by officers who obtained brevet rank for distinguished service in the field; that by a late Act of Parliament the army of the East India Company has been transferred to Her most gracious Majesty, but by a clause in the said Act (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106) it is ruled that "The Indian military and naval forces of Her Majesty shall be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company, and shall be liable to serve within the said territorial limits only, and be entitled to the like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion, and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company.

2. That, consequent on the above quoted Act, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, issued orders for the organization of a Staff corps for each of the three Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, for which corps officers of both Her Majesty's British and Indian forces were invited to volunteer, your memorialist being one of those so invited. The orders for the organization of the said Staff corps have, however, so ruled promotion therein as to cause a most alarming amount of supercession, your memorialist having already been superseded by several officers who were, previous to the formation of the said Staff corps, junior to him in army rank; whilst amongst other supercessions so caused appears one of an officer who, during the whole period of service, has been junior to your memorialist in the same regiment. Added to the above, the certainty of future supercessions, consequent on the formation of the said corps, are still

more alarming and damaging to your memorialist's future prospects.

3. It may be urged that your memorialist had redress in his own hands, by availing himself of the opportunity tendered him, and joining the Staff corps; but your memorialist begs to point out that, owing to his service on the Staff having been almost entirely in acting appointments, such service, by the orders alluded to, is not permitted to count for promotion in the Staff corps, and that consequently, had your memorialist so volunteered, he would have been nearly in the same position regarding his promotion as he is at present.

4. That by one rule in the regulations for the Staff corps, officers belonging thereto are to take command and precedence in the army, according to the rank and dates of their commissions in the said corps, which your memorialist respectfully submits bears exceedingly hard on officers so superseded, who thus, through no fault whatever of their own, are deprived of the chief honours, "allowances," "privileges," and "advantages as regards promotion" hitherto accruing from length of service, and which are humanely secured to them by the clause in the Act above quoted.

5. That by rules published for regulating the Staff corps, any officer thereof may be appointed to command a native corps. The officer, therefore, who is alluded to in para. 2 of this memorial as having superseded your memorialist in his own regiment may, under the above quoted rule, actually be appointed to command the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, over the head of your memorialist and two other officers, who, but for the formation of the Staff corps, could never have been so superseded, as, even had this officer obtained brevet rank for service in the field, such rank would never have permitted him to command the regiment while three officers, his seniors in the regiment, were present therewith.

6. Your memorialist also begs leave to point out that in the event of any portion of the armies of the three Presidencies being brought together for service in the field, the supercession above complained of will be far greater in extent, and will consequently have a still more baneful effect on the "privileges" and "advantages" of officers who, like your memorialist, have been thus superseded.

7. It is perhaps needless for your memorialist to point out that the consequences of these numerous and constantly increasing instances of supercession are most serious, and must inevitably tend to deprive your memorialist and other officers like situated of advantages hitherto arising from length of service. The injurious result, in a seniority service of one single case of supercession are incalculable, as any officer so superseded may thereby be deprived of "advantages" and "allowances" to an enormous extent.

8. That the very great grievance above complained of, and pointed out, may be easily rectified and removed by it being ordered, that every officer so superseded shall be provided with a commission of relative rank with that of the officer of the Staff corps who has superseded him, and your memorialist therefore prays that a Major's commission, dated 18th February 1861, with its full advantages, may be conferred on him.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) W. L. CAHUSAC,
Captain, Her Majesty's 11th Bombay
Native Infantry.
Camp near Deesa, 22d October 1861.

(23.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, G. C. B.,
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India.
The Memorial of James Turner Hill, Captain, Her
Majesty's 14th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry,
Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist entered the Service in February 1845, under a covenant with the late Honourable East India Company, by which he was assured in due course of time promotion in his regiment to the rank of Major, and the certainty that no junior officer could supersede him in substantive rank in his own corps.

2. That by the amalgamation order lately carried into effect, your memorialist humbly considers that his future prospects are in the following points seriously injured, and he respectfully submits that the said order, in several particulars, is irreconcilable with Mr. Henley's clause in the Act of Parliament decreeing

App. G.

the amalgamation of the two services, and in which clause his "pay, pension, rights, and privileges" have to be strictly preserved.

3. Your memorialist will briefly state the several points referred to in the last paragraph:

1st. That purchase in the army, although not actually sanctioned by the authorities, was recognized by them; so much so, that on several occasions, when officers have not duly paid up for their steps, the Commander-in-Chief, on a representation being made, has always enforced payment. This may be deemed somewhat more than a tacit acquiescence. That your memorialist, before reaching his present position of Fourth Captain in his corps, has paid large sums for the purchasing out of his seniors, that by the formation of the Staff corps, and other details connected with the amalgamation, he has lost all chance of being able in his turn to obtain a bonus on retiring from the service, and which, under the late existing state of affairs, he would have been certain of obtaining.

2d. That officers, junior to your memorialist in his regiment, by joining the Staff corps, will eventually supersede him in the rank of Major, and thus the local service can no longer be regarded as a seniority service, although your memorialist most respectfully submits that it does not appear such a sudden and total change was contemplated by the Act of Parliament above quoted, and it may happen that your memorialist may find himself in the field actually commanded by his junior officer.

3d. That the retaining the names of those officers who have joined the Staff corps on the cadres of their old regiments operates most unfavourably on the interest and prospects not only of your memorialist but on nearly one-half of the late Indian army. It is also a measure your memorialist would humbly bring to notice, contrary to precedent, and opposed to the regulations in force for officers of Her Majesty's home troops. For instance, when the 27th, 28th, and 29th regiments Native Infantry, also the 3rd European regiment, were raised in the Bombay Presidency, the officers to form them were transferred from different regiments, and the promotion duly given in such corps. Again, your memorialist would point out that, should an officer of Her Majesty's home army join the Indian Staff corps, his name is not retained in his old regiment, but his step immediately filled up.

4th. That your memorialist would most respectfully urge that retaining the names of Lieutenant-Colonels on the rolls after retirement till death, in accordance with the new retirement order, will be productive of great and lasting injury to those officers who have declared to remain local—one of whom your memorialist is—retarding, as it will, their promotion for years to that rank which every one looked forward to obtain as a provision for his old age and family; for an officer, too, living in England will, in all human probability, live to a much longer period than he would if compelled to remain in India; the order making two years' service in England count as one year in India shows it. And your memorialist further respectively urges that the "privileges" preserved to him by Act of Parliament are, if not abolished, considerably delayed by the said order.

Your memorialist therefore prays that the foregoing several points may be taken into consideration, and that relief may be granted to your memorialist:

1st. By the award of compensation for sums expended for purchase to such an extent as may be thought fit.

2d. That your memorialist may be promoted previous to the junior officers from his regiment who have joined the Staff corps.

3d. That the names of Lieutenant-Colonels, after their retirement, may not be retained on the rolls.

4th. That the names of officers joining the Staff corps be taken off the cadres, and their steps given in their old regiments.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

(Signed) J. T. HILL, Captain,
Camp, Ahmedabad, 14th Regiment Native Infantry.
7th November 1861.

(24.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, G.C.B.,
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India.
The Memorial of Charles William Wahab, Captain, Her
Majesty's 14th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry.

Respectfully sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the service in June 1846, under a covenant with the late Honourable East India Company, by which he was assured in due course of time promotion in his regiment to the rank of Major, and the certainty that no junior officer of his own corps could supersede him in substantive rank.

2. That by the amalgamation order lately carried into effect your memorialist humbly considers that his future prospects are seriously injured, and he respectfully submits that the said order, in several particulars, is irreconcilable with Mr. Henley's clause in the Act of Parliament decreeing the amalgamation of the two services, by which clause his rights and privileges, as regards his pay, pension, and promotion, are strictly guaranteed.

3. Your memorialist feels that an injustice is inflicted on those officers who may be qualified and desirous of entering the recently formed Staff corps, by the rule that no officer who has not held a permanent Staff appointment for three years is to be admitted without probation, as in the case of your memorialist, who held an appointment up to the end of 1856, when he was obliged to proceed to England on medical certificate.

4. Your memorialist begs to state that officers junior to your memorialist in his regiment, by joining the Staff corps, will eventually supersede him in the rank of Major, and thus the local service can no longer be regarded as a seniority service, although your memorialist most respectfully submits that it does not appear that such a sudden and total change was contemplated by the Act of Parliament above quoted; and it may happen that your memorialist may find himself in the field actually commanded by his junior officer; so that the retaining the names of those officers who have joined the Staff corps on the cadres of their old regiments must operate most unfavourably on the interests of your memorialist, as well as on those of many other officers.

5. That your memorialist would most respectfully urge that retaining the names of Lieutenant-Colonels on the rolls after retirement till death, in accordance with the new retirement order, dated London, 10th August 1861, will be productive of great and lasting injury to those officers who have declared to remain local, one of whom your memorialist necessarily is, retarding as it will their promotion for years to that rank which every one looked forward to obtain as a provision for his old age and family.

Your memorialist therefore prays that the foregoing points may be taken into consideration, and that relief may be granted, by your memorialist being permitted to enter the Staff corps, or by the names of those officers who do enter the corps, and the names of those who retire under the new rules, being removed from the strength of the army, and the promotion given to your memorialist.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

C. W. WAHAB, Captain,
Her Majesty's 14th Regiment Native Infantry.
J. WILLIAMS, Brigadier-General Commanding.
&c. &c. &c.

(25.)

The humble Memorial of Major Alexander Kennedy
Clark Kennedy, Madras Staff corps, to the Right
Honourable the Secretary of State for India.—(Dated
Bangalore, the 5th November 1861.)

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist is an officer of twenty-three and a half years' service, nearly all of which has been passed in India.

That in the year 1849, your memorialist (then a Lieutenant in the 46th regiment Madras Native Infantry), having passed the authorized examination as an interpreter at the college at the Presidency, was appointed Quartermaster and Interpreter to the 20th regiment Native Infantry, on a full vacancy (there being no passed subaltern with the regiment), and joined that corps in Aden on the 1st of May 1849.

Your memorialist continued to serve as Quartermaster and Interpreter to the 20th regiment Native Infantry

until the 31st October 1850, when your memorialist, having served over 12 years in India, obtained a furlough to Europe on private affairs.

In 1853 your memorialist returned to India, and was almost immediately appointed Quartermaster and Interpreter (on a full vacancy) to the 21st regiment Native Infantry; your memorialist being still a subaltern, though a Brevet Captain.

Your memorialist joined that regiment on the 2d September 1853, and continued to serve therewith as Quartermaster and Interpreter until the 8th November 1854, when your memorialist's services being required with his own regiment, under orders to Burmah, he was directed by the then Commander-in-Chief to proceed and join his regiment.

In 1855 your memorialist was appointed Brigade Major at Rangoon, and in 1858 Deputy Assistant Adjutant General of Division.

On the publication of the Royal Warrant, dated 16th January 1861, your memorialist applied for admission into the Madras Staff corps, sending in a statement of his Staff services of over eight years, viz. five years and six months as Brigade Major and Deputy Assistant Adjutant General of Division, and two years and eight months as Quartermaster and Interpreter.

With reference to your memorialist's application for admission into the Staff corps, he was informed "that his Staff service prior to 10th August 1855 is inadmissible for promotion," which your memorialist concludes refers to Question 26* of the Governor-General of India's Order in Council, No. 598, dated Fort William, 9th July 1861, and reply thereto, by which the periods passed by your memorialist as Quartermaster and Interpreter with the 20th and 21st regiments Native Infantry could not be permitted to count for promotion in the Staff corps, as your memorialist could "only be deemed temporarily employed unless he had been eventually appointed to the vacant situation," when in that case the period of "your memorialist's acting in the full vacancy would reckon as service qualifying for promotion."

Your memorialist would most respectfully point out the great hardship and injury he has sustained by this decision.

As the two regiments with which your memorialist

	Ya.	m.	d.	
† With 20th N. Infantry	1	6	0	served† for two years and
" 21st N. Infantry	1	2	6	eight months as Quarter-
				master and Interpreter
Total Years . . .	2	8	6	were not his own, your

have been more effectually appointed to the vacant appointments and confirmed therein than he was.

Your memorialist would also respectfully observe that in the army with which he has served so long, the Commander-in-Chief, your memorialist believes, always considered that an officer withdrawn from his own regiment to serve with another corps as one of its regimental Staff should be considered as included among the number of officers, fixed by regulation, as permitted to be withdrawn from regiments for Staff employ.

Your memorialist having been admitted into the Staff corps from 18th February 1861, would, if permitted to reckon his service as Quartermaster and Interpreter to the 20th and 21st regiments Native Infantry, have been promoted to a majority from same date; but such having been overruled, your memorialist was only promoted to a majority from 10th August 1861.

By this decision your memorialist would most respectfully observe that he has been deprived of six months' rank and pay, and been superseded by very many of his juniors in the service who have become Majors from the 18th February 1861, the date of the warrant, which is naturally hurtful to your memorialist's prospects and feelings as an officer and soldier.

Your memorialist would therefore pray that his case may be taken into consideration, and his commission as Major in the Staff corps be antedated to the 18th February 1861.

Should this not be possible, your memorialist would most respectfully draw your attention to Question 20, ‡

* Question 26, paras. 69, 84, and 87, of G. O. G. G. in C. No. 332, 10th April 1861.—Will an officer who has held an acting appointment on a full vacancy, for example, that of Acting Adjutant or Acting Quartermaster of his own or any other corps, be considered to have performed service qualifying for promotion under the Staff warrant for such period as he may have been so employed?

Answer 24.—No; such an officer can only be deemed temporarily employed, unless he be eventually appointed to the vacant situation. In that case the period of his acting in the full vacancy will reckon as service qualifying for promotion.

† Question 20, paras. 68 and 69.—Are the officers commanding the European Infantry and Native Infantry depôts, and the depôts at Landour, Wellington, Aboo Khandalla, &c., and the Adjutants and

and reply thereto of the above quoted General Order by the Governor-General in Council, No. 598, dated Fort William, 9th July 1861, which your memorialist thinks provides for his case; and by which it will be observed, that Adjutants, Quartermasters, &c. &c. of the Infantry and convalescent depôts at Landour, Wellington, &c. &c., are not considered on permanent Staff employ, and are therefore not entitled as such to enter the Staff corps, but in the event of their subsequently obtaining admission into the Staff corps, they will be entitled to count as Staff service the time passed as depôt officers.

Should the first prayer of your memorialist to antedate his commission to 18th February 1861 not be granted, your memorialist would most respectfully urge that his case may be considered as coming under the clause above quoted, and as your memorialist, from his services as Brigade Major and Deputy Assistant Adjutant General of Division has been admitted into the Madras Staff corps from 18th February 1861, he may be permitted to count as Staff service for promotion the time passed by him as Quartermaster and Interpreter to the 20th and 21st regiments Native Infantry, and your memorialist's commission as a Major be antedated to the 18th February 1861.

Your memorialist has therefore no alternative but to lay his case before you, humbly soliciting to be permitted to count as Staff service for promotion the time passed by him as Quartermaster and Interpreter to the 20th and 21st regiments Native Infantry, and that your memorialist's commission as a Major in the Madras Staff corps be antedated to the 18th February 1861.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c. &c.

(26)

Memorial of Captain C. F. Grant, 3rd Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, having entered the late Honourable East India Company's service with a commission dated 10th June 1836, being then an Addiscombe cadet of February 1835, has served 25 years and a half, in addition to 18 months at Addiscombe College, and is now a Captain in Her Majesty's 3rd Regiment Bombay Native Infantry.

2. That your memorialist, fully relying in the good faith and sincerity of all covenants, rules, and regulations of the service, which he on his part has strictly fulfilled, whereby the Indian army was constituted a seniority service, all promotions and advancement, both regimentally and in the Line, have been heretofore carried out strictly by seniority, and trusting fully in the good faith and sincerity of the several guaranteees and the Acts of Parliament of 1858 (60), that the same rules of promotion would be maintained, as also in the Government General Order by the Governor-General in Council, dated 10th April 1861, paragraph 23, wherein his Lordship distinctly declares that all former claims and rights of officers of the Indian army shall be scrupulously adhered to, your memorialist has continued to serve to this time in the full faith of these pledges, and in the hope of such promotion by seniority being strictly maintained.

3. That your memorialist is now sorely grieved, and feels himself materially injured, both in rank and position, both present and prospective, by being superseded by 40 officers, his juniors, in the Bombay army in particular, as also by numerous others in the Bengal and Madras armies generally, who have been promoted by selection, and not by seniority.

4. By several General Orders lately issued by the Honourable the Governor in Council of Bombay for the formation of the Staff corps, 28 Captains, all junior to your memorialist, have been promoted over your memorialist to be Majors, and in one instance a Captain in your memorialist's Regiment, though five years junior to him, viz. Captain W. D. Dickson, a cadet of 1841, has been thus promoted to Major over your memorialist.

5. That these officers, junior to your memorialist, by being thus promoted to the Staff corps, have obtained

Quartermasters of the same, to be considered to have been on Staff duty while so employed?

Answer 21.—Depôt Staff officers are not on permanent Staff employ, and therefore are not entitled as such to enter the Staff corps, but in the event of their subsequently obtaining admission into the Staff corps, they will be entitled to count as Staff service the time passed as depôt Staff officers.

APP. G.

the substantive rank of Major in the Line, while your memorialist, their senior, still remains a Captain, they having thereby superseded your memorialist, and, in virtue of such rank, on all occasions they must take precedence of your memorialist.

6. That these officers, being junior to your memorialist, both in regimental and army rank, according to the system of promotion by seniority as originally constituted and invariably enforced by rule in the Indian army, cannot be thus promoted to supersede your memorialist without materially violating the very basis and groundwork of that system of promotion by seniority so long established in the Indian army, and those rights and privileges of the officers of that army which the Acts of Parliament and the Government General Order by the Governor-General in Council, above referred to, guarantee shall be scrupulously maintained; and thus your memorialist is injured in his present position and rank.

7. That your memorialist is injured prospectively by the rules now introduced for promotion in the Staff corps, by which many subalterns and Captains much junior to your memorialist, who have been appointed to the Staff corps and promoted, will, in virtue of certain fixed periods of Staff service, be promoted to Majors long before your memorialist can rise to that rank under the old system of promotion established in the service, and consequently under these rules your memorialist will be further superseded by his juniors each year in succession; and thus your memorialist is materially injured prospectively.

8. That whilst so many officers, junior to your memorialist, have been promoted over him by selection, your memorialist has derived no benefit or promotion from those senior to him who have been promoted to the Staff corps, whose names, it has been ruled, shall remain in the Army List in their previous positions, thereby retaining a double and anomalous position; and thus your memorialist suffers a serious and double injury, contrary to all rules, precedents, or customs of the service which have been so positively guaranteed, and declared to be scrupulously maintained.

9. That your memorialist would further point out that the selection and appointment of these officers to the Staff corps, to whom such advantages of promotion have been given, has not been made by seniority or length of service, or from any test of superior attainments, either professional or scientific, but simply on the chance or casualty of their holding a Staff appointment on a fixed date in India, or within a fixed period; and thus service with an irregular native regiment or police during the last three years is ruled to be Staff service, and entitles the fortunate incumbent to all the benefit of promotion; whilst 20 years' service with a regular native regiment, in the field or on foreign service is ruled no Staff employ, and subjects the unfortunate officer to degradation and supercession.

10. That your memorialist, having been for more than 10 years employed on the Staff in India, holding important offices of high responsibility and trust, in which his services have always elicited approval and commendation; has been refused admission to the Staff corps on the grounds that he was not on Staff employ in India on the 18th February 1861, or within the period prescribed. But this condition of exclusion, your memorialist would observe, was compulsory on him, from the fact that in 1858 (59) he was on sick furlough in England; in 1860 he was serving with his regiment in the field, on foreign service in China, and at the time of the formation of the Staff corps in 1861 he was serving on the Staff of the force in South China as Deputy Assistant Adjutant-General.

11. This Staff service in China has now been ruled as not giving your memorialist any title of admission to the Bombay Staff corps, and he is thereby excluded from all its benefits; while a junior Captain in the same regiment, by remaining in India and holding a Staff appointment during this tour of foreign service, is promoted to Major over your memorialist; and thus your memorialist, while in the due performance of military duties in the field, is superseded by his contemporaries and juniors, and the fruits of many years' arduous service on the Staff are ignored and passed over.

12. That your memorialist, after 25 years' service in India, having served through several campaigns, and on his return from field service in China, where he was serving on the general Staff of the army, in the hope of distinction and reward, in which last position his services were publicly acknowledged in orders, and received the high commendation of the distinguished Generals under whom he had the honour to serve, now

finds, on regaining his own Presidency, that instead of any reward or promotion for his services, he is very grievously superseded and degraded, both regimentally and in the Line; and this, so far as he is informed, is caused, not by any fault or incapacity on his part, but by the operation of certain new rules, which your memorialist, with all deference and respect, submits for consideration that they do not bear fairly or equally on him, nor maintain in its integrity that system of promotion by seniority under which your memorialist covenanted to serve, and by which he has been ruled for so many years.

13. Your memorialist, having endured for so many years the hardships of slow promotion through the seniority system, began to look for quicker promotion at last by the retirement of seniors; but so many of his juniors being now placed over him under the change of system and new rules of promotion lately adopted, this promotion is now quite beyond all hope or reasonable expectation.

14. That to avoid the degradation and opprobrium of serving under officers so junior to himself, your memorialist is now constrained to seek for retirement from the service without attaining that rank or pension which, by completing the full period of service under the old system, he might have obtained; he therefore now feels himself further injured, both in rank and pension hereafter, by the change of rules so lately introduced.

15. Paragraph 70 of the Amalgamation Order above quoted distinctly rules that, on the proposed changes in the organization of the native regiments coming into operation, the whole of the officers who will be permanently attached to regular native regiments will be held to be on Staff employ. If service with regular native regiments in future is to be counted Staff service, and to entitle officers to all the benefits of the Staff corps and promotion by length of service, it follows surely that similar service with regular native regiments for years past should entitle those now in the service to similar benefits.

16. Your memorialist would, therefore, with all deference and respect, submit for consideration that this rule may have retrospective as well as prospective effects, and that all officers who have been and were then permanently attached to regular regiments may be held to have been on Staff employ, and have the option of joining the Staff corps with all its conditions, or being placed on a graduated Presidency list according to seniority service with regular native regiments, being counted as Staff service towards promotion according to the Staff corps rules. From a list of officers thus constituted and graduated by seniority according to regimental rank, selection for special Staff service could be made as the interests of the service may require.

17. By this arrangement every officer would retain his proper position and rank in the service, according to seniority and length of service, and those officers who had or could qualify themselves hereafter by superior attainments would reap the benefit of such higher qualification by superior pay and position, and promotion also, by adopting the late rules for the Staff of the royal army, by which a regular scale of substantive rank is assigned to every appointment on the Staff of the army, and which rank is granted in virtue of such appointment on the Staff.

In representing his own case, your memorialist most distinctly disclaims all intention to cavil at or call in question the acts of his superiors, but desires simply to set forth, in the most calm, clear, and respectful manner possible, for the just consideration of Government, the very grave loss and injury in rank, pay, and pension, both now and hereafter, which he suffers by the changes so lately introduced into the service; and your memorialist, fully trusting to the strict sense of justice, impartiality, and good faith of the Government which he serves, confidently petitions for an adjustment of rank by being placed on the list of Majors, with the substantive rank of Major, from the 18th February 1861, as granted to so many of his juniors, or in such other way as the Government may deem just and equitable.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) O. F. GRANT, Captain,
3rd Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry.
Bombay, 30th December 1861.

C. BUNWORTH, Colonel,
Commanding Her Majesty's 3rd Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.

(27.)

The Petition of James George Balmain, Lieutenant-Colonel in the Royal (late Madras) Artillery, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, K.C.B., Secretary of State for India (dated Nagpore, the 1st January 1862).

Humbly sheweth,

THAT on the 13th February 1861 your petitioner had been upwards of 30 years in the army, was a Brevet-Major, and entitled by length of service to the pension of Lieutenant-Colonel, so that he could have retired as such with a handsome bonus from the regimental-retiring fund.

That by the re-organisation he has, it is true, attained to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel regimentally, and might retire on that of Colonel, but without any accession of pension, whilst he has been deprived of the solid advantage of the bonus which he might otherwise have calculated on.

That his prospects, remaining in active employ, are anything but improved, inasmuch as the number of Commands and Colonels Commandant has been reduced, whilst the right conceded to Colonels of living in England, and the extinction of the retiring fund, have put retirements amongst the seniors almost out of the question.

That it is thus only too obvious that your petitioner has been anything but a gainer by the amalgamation.

Under these circumstances he ventures to hope that he may be admitted to the privilege of extra pension granted to his brethren of the Cavalry and Infantry, a boon which would be highly esteemed by those now excluded, cost but little to the State, and add much to the efficiency of the Artillery by weeding out of it a certain number of officers who, though long past the meridian of life, are still without any immediate prospect of command.

Trusting that his prayer may meet with a gracious reception.

(28.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. D. Stewart, 25th Regiment Native Light Infantry, to the Acting Adjutant General of the Army, Poonah (dated Camp, Poonah, 19th October 1861).

I HAVE the honour to submit for the consideration of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and with a view to its being laid before Government, my respectful remonstrance on the subject of the recent notice by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, dated 12th August last.

2. The system therein laid down affects most injuriously my prospects in the service, embracing as it does not only a prospective and unlimited reduction in the number of "Colonels' allowances," but also in that grade, so that my succession to the rank of Colonel is indefinitely postponed.

3. The paragraph describing the principle on which the promotion to Colonel will hereafter be made, states that on a casualty occurring among the regimental Colonels, the name of the senior Lieutenant-Colonel on the list (should he have taken bonus) will be removed.

4. It is, of course, impossible to tell how many Lieutenant-Colonels senior to me will take the bonus, but it is clear that the eventual number of Colonel and Colonels' allowances will be diminished in the same proportion.

5. For instance, let me suppose that the 10 senior full Colonels become casualties, and the 10 senior Lieutenant-Colonels, having taken the bonus, have their names removed from the Army List, my name would rise 10 steps in the list; but the advantage would be nil, as the number of Colonels and Colonels' allowances would be diminished by the same number.

6. The above may seem an extreme example, but I have reason to believe that more than 10 of my seniors will take the bonus, and be retained in italics. The uncertainty which has existed in the minds of the senior officers has of late completely paralysed promotions from retirements, and it is certain that some steps would have occurred but for the recent agitation on the subject.

7. The chances for casualties are, moreover, greater among the seniors in the grade of Colonel than among the juniors; so that the prospect of succeeding to the grade of Colonel becomes diminished in an increasing ratio to those like myself low down in the list for promotion.

8. In Sir Charles Wood's Despatch, No. 320, of the 10th August, allusion is made in para. 16 to a former Despatch, in which the intention is expressed of gradually reducing the number of Colonels in receipt of "Colonels' allowance," by making for the future three promotions to four casualties among their rank.

9. In the succeeding para. even this arrangement is considered too liberal, taking into consideration "the very liberal provision now offered to the senior effective officers of the Indian army;" and in para. 21 the future strength of the establishment of Colonels in receipt of "Colonels' allowances," it is stated, will depend on the result of the several measures now in progress for the re-organization of the Indian army.

10. It may be presumed that the number will be still further diminished from this whole tenor of the Despatch.

11. I would beg most respectfully to point out that, so far from being benefited, my position with respect to expectancies has been materially injured, and that in the discussions which took place in Parliament the present rights of the Indian army were not only admitted as sacred, but the future expectancies.

12. To many officers the option remains of taking the bonus offered, but this is not open to me, for although I entered the service nearly 23 years ago, I cannot count the whole period.

13. Long exposure in the hottest and most unhealthy part of Scinde compelled my return to England on sick certificate, and the renunciation of a Staff appointment.

14. In 1857, on hostilities breaking out with Persia, I volunteered for active service, giving up the command of my regiment, with all its pecuniary advantages, to go as second in command of the Light Battalion on the simple pay of my rank. My health again gave way, and at the close of the campaign I was compelled a second time to return to Europe. I can thus advance no claim to the bonus offered to many of my brother officers.

15. It may be urged that my promotion has been fortunate, but I submit that the question is not affected thereby, while I may advance that it has been purchased at an outlay of upwards of 30,000 rupees, expended in the hope of succession to the rank of Colonel with the concomitant advantages within a reasonable period.

16. This expectation is rendered futile by the rules lately published, which, although beneficial to some, are most detrimental in their operation to myself and others, and contravene in spirit, if not in letter, the guarantee conveyed in Mr. Henley's amendment in clause 1 of the European Forces' (India) Bill, 26th July 1860, too well known for me to recapitulate here.

17. I trust that no due want of respect may be imputed to me in thus urging a re-consideration of the questions involved, and in expressing a hope that the reliance placed on a parliamentary guarantee, expressly framed to meet the claims of Her Majesty's loyal servants in the Indian army, may not be subverted by measures at variance with the conditions of their former position.

18. The retention, in italics, in the list of those officers who have taken the bonus is, I venture to submit, unprecedented and anomalous; but even if carried out, I would remark that no great addition to financial burden would be incurred were the names still carried on in italics, with the Colonels' list, as vacancies occurred in the latter grade, giving, of course, no claim to "Colonels' allowance;" the latter to remain in abeyance or dormant until an officer, still effective, shall succeed to it in ordinary course, or under such gradual diminution as may not destroy the hope of succession to it, or to the advanced grade of Colonel, within any reasonable period.

19. I would lastly urge that the reasons given by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, in his Despatch of the 10th August, para. 17, viz., the very liberal provision offered to the senior effective officers, and the most obvious and equitable mode of making compensation for the severe strain upon the finances consequent thereon, cannot in justice apply to officers who, like myself, are debarred from the benefits.

20. I submit, with great respect, that whatever the advantage to some, no new regulation can (consistently with the Act of Parliament, or in accordance with the guarantee spontaneously afforded by Sir Charles Wood in the House of Commons, that Government was firmly resolved to strictly and scrupulously maintain faith with the officers of the Indian army), carry with it positive detriment, present or prospective, to other

APP. I

APP. C.

officers of the late Honourable East India Company's service.

(29.)

The humble Petition of James Clements, Lieutenant in the Bombay Staff corps, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., Secretary of State for India, dated Hyderabad, Sind, 4th December 1861,

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist was deeply mortified to find, by General Orders of the Right Honourable the Governor of Bombay, No. 621, of 16th November 1861, that his promotion to a captaincy in the Bombay Staff corps had been cancelled under the operations of your Despatch, No. 315, of the 9th August 1861.

That your memorialist entered the Bombay army on the 11th June 1847; was posted to the 3rd regiment Native Infantry, in which he served six years and a half before obtaining his lieutenantancy in November 1853. That he was present with his regiment in the second Sikh war in 1848-49; was at the siege of Moolton; battle of Joozerat; pursuit and surrender of the Sikh army at Rawul Pindee; pursuit of the Affghan army to Khyber Pass, and occupation of Peshawur; subsequently with a field force in the Eusoofzai country, and was present at the actions in the Bazdurrah Valley on the 11th and 14th December 1849. That he was appointed to the Commissariat Staff of the army in January 1857, since which severe sickness compelled him to visit England on 15 months' leave of absence. That he was lately called upon to elect for Staff service, or otherwise, under the new regulations; that on reading in the Bengal "Government Gazette," dated Fort William, 11th July 1861, the answer given by Government to Question No. 41, and published by order of his Excellency the Governor-General in Council, your memorialist immediately sent in his application for permission to join the Staff corps, and was at once appointed and promoted to Captain, with back rank to the 18th February 1861, by the Right Honourable the Governor of Bombay. That subsequently to this your Despatch, dated from England, 9th August 1861, was received, under the operation of which he was, on the 16th November, reduced to the rank of Lieutenant. (Vide General Order, No. 621 of 1861).

That your memorialist trusts you will take into your consideration that he was promoted under the interpretation given by his Excellency the Governor-General in Council to paragraph 84 of the Royal Warrant, and that your Despatch, above quoted, was not published in India until after his promotion appeared in the "Gazette." That he begs you will extend the same boon to him as you have granted in the fifth paragraph of your Military Letter, No. 389, dated 8th October 1861, to certain officers in the Bengal and Madras Artillery, whose promotion you have determined shall not be cancelled. That by the reduction of your memorialist to Lieutenant he has been superseded by numbers of officers junior to him in the army, and by two of his late regiment. That he is a subaltern of fourteen and a half years' service, and after being at last promoted to Captain, feels much disheartened at the promotion being cancelled. That he trusts you will take his case under your kind consideration, and restore him to a captaincy in the Staff corps.

(30.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., M.P., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Major-General Edward Green, of Her Majesty's Bombay Staff corps, and Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath,

Respectfully showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the army of the late Honourable East India Company on the 22nd of April 1827.

2. That on the transfer of the government of the late East India Company to the Crown, and in the later amalgamation of Her Majesty's British and Indian armies, your memorialist was content to continue to serve on the terms of his original covenant, under the protection held out to him by the Act of Parliament, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 56, and of Mr. Henley's amendment on clause 1 of the Local Army of India Bill, 30th July 1860.

3. That your memorialist, having been actively employed during the war in Sindh in the year 1843, and in the Punjaub campaign of 1848-49, received the dis-

tingtion of Companion of the Bath, and the brevet ranks of Major and Lieutenant-Colonel respectively, for his conduct in those campaigns.

4. That your memorialist has, by exercising much privation, expended the sum of 27,000 rupees on regimental purchase, in the hope and expectation that he should by thus (to him) great sacrifice arrive in the usual course to the Colonels' allowance.

5. That under the terms of the Despatch, dated India Office, London, 10th August 1861, a number of Lieutenant-Colonels, regimentally senior to your memorialist, have accepted the annuity offered to them, and consequently the prospect of your memorialist succeeding to the Colonels' allowance has been retarded, inasmuch that those retired officers will now reside in Europe, avoiding the chance of casualty by war and of the mortality incidental to a residence in an Indian climate, while in addition the number of Colonels' allowances will, as deaths occur among the full Colonels, be reduced by as many Lieutenant-Colonels as have accepted the annuity, or till the number of those allowances may be fixed by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

6. Seeing the manner in which this new rule would act to his detriment, and knowing that many Lieutenant-Colonels, senior to him in the Line, would accept the annuity, your memorialist elected to join the Bombay Staff corps, in the hope that his case, together with that of others similarly situated, would be favourably considered.

7. Eleven Lieutenant-Colonels, senior to your memorialist, have accepted the annuity.

8. Ten years has been held to be the average term in the Bombay army required for the junior Lieutenant-Colonel to pass through that grade to the rank of Colonel, and taking this average as correct, your memorialist would, were the former system of promotion observed, attain to the Colonels' allowance in six and a half years from this time.

9. By para. 13 of the Military Letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, dated 3rd of December 1861, 12 years have been fixed as the period after which a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Staff corps shall become entitled to the Colonels' allowance, so that your memorialist, having completed near 35 years' service, 3½ of which as a substantive Lieutenant-Colonel, must still serve 8½ years more, or a total of 43½ years, before he can attain to that allowance, and this, too, after the expenditure of a considerable sum of money.

10. Your memorialist would draw attention to the difference which will exist between his case and that of an officer of an ordnance corps who may have elected for the Staff corps. The latter, promoted under the new organization from Captain at once to Lieutenant-Colonel, with probably a limited service, will succeed to the Colonels' allowance 3½ years after the former, though there may be many years difference of service between the two.

11. Taking into consideration the circumstances above represented, the terms of the Act of Parliament, and of Mr. Henley's amendment above quoted, your memorialist earnestly begs for a re-consideration of the terms laid down, at which old officers of the Line who have joined the Staff corps, without deriving any benefit as to promotion, are to attain to the Colonels' allowance, and trusts that the additional load of two years may not be added to the burden of the long tropical service which Indian officers must undergo in attaining to the rank of regimental Colonel.

12. Even should your memorialist's prayer be granted, it is not probable that any officer, or if any but few, will ever reach the benefit sought for. Out of the many who strive for this prize how few ever live to attain it!

13. Your memorialist therefore prays that, in the event of his surviving, he be permitted to attain to the Colonels' allowance on the completion of 10 years from the date of his commission as regimental Lieutenant-Colonel.

Mahabeshwar, 10th February 1862.

(31.)

The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India. The Memorial of Philip Kearney Macgregor Skinner, a Lieutenant-Colonel and Brevet-Colonel in Her Majesty's Indian Staff corps on the Bombay Establishment,

Humbly showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the army on the 30th December 1824; and that during a service of 37 years, he has served more than 34 years in India.

2. That your memorialist, having incurred an expenditure exceeding 50,000 rupees, in view of expediting his promotion to the colonelcy of a regiment, was not in a position to avail himself of the retiring bonus lately offered to the European officers of Her Majesty's Indian army, which, in your memorialist's case, would, in addition to his pension, have given him a yearly income of 700*l*.

3. That your memorialist was promoted to Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel on the 25th of April 1858; and as the average term for passing through the list of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels to Colonel of a regiment was, prior to the late arrangements consequent on the amalgamation of Her Majesty's British and Indian armies, 10 years, your memorialist would, had the amalgamation not taken place, be entitled to expect Colonels' allowances in about six years and a few months from this date.

4. That your memorialist is now senior Lieutenant-Colonel in Her Majesty's Indian Staff corps on the Bombay establishment; but in consequence of an order lately published, regulating the term of service for Colonels' allowances in that corps, your memorialist is required to serve 12, instead of 10 years, from the date of his promotion to Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel, before he will be entitled to Colonels' allowances.

5. That the addition of two years to the term of service hitherto reckoned on in the Bombay army, as ensuring Colonels' allowances, is a subject of deep concern to your memorialist at his advanced age, and after his long service in India; but feeling assured that every consideration that can reasonably be expected will be granted to the prayer of his memorial, he humbly requests that he may be permitted to receive Colonels' allowances at the expiration of 10 years from the date of his promotion to Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound will ever pray.

P. K. M. SKINNER,

Lieutenant-Colonel and Brevet-Colonel, Her Majesty's Indian Staff Corps on the Bombay Establishment.
Poona, 4th Feb. 1862.

(32.)

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant and Brevet Captain G. L. Fraser, of the late 23d Native Infantry, Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army, to his Excellency the Right Honourable the Earl Canning, G.C.B., Viceroy and Governor-General of India, dated Simla, 16th August 1861.

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist, although an officer of more than 16, and a Brevet Captain of more than one year's service, finds to his great regret and mortification, that he is debarred, after this long servitude, from entering the Staff corps as a Captain, owing to clause 87 of Government General Order, No. 332, of 10th of April last, which rules that only permanent employment in Staff situations conveys a claim to promotion in the Staff corps.

	Ys. m. d.	
From 25th February to 18th May 1849, G. O. C. C., 7th February 1849	- 0 2 23	unfortunate and injurious clause, are not permitted to count as service towards his substantive captaincy in the Staff corps aggregate more than two years and three months, and are those passed by him in the responsible duties of acting Interpreter and Quartermaster of his late regiment, and the 49th
From 3d August 1850 to date unknown, G. O. C. C. 16th September 1850	- - - - -	
From 14th December 1850 to 30th September 1852, G. O. C. C., 20th December 1850	- 1 9 26	
From 19th November 1853 to 19th February 1854, G. O. C. C., 10th December 1853	- 0 3 0	
	<u>2 3 19</u>	

regiment Native Infantry, an appointment which, on one occasion, he held in his own corps for nearly one year and ten months consecutively, and which he could only have held at all by virtue of a high lingual examination successfully undergone at a very early period of his career, and the tests of which are so difficult, that it is seldom or never passed in the present day.

3. Your memorialist would respectfully submit that, as an indispensable requisite for promotion in the Staff corps is a certain term of Staff service, the fair inference to be drawn from this rule is, that service on the Staff is considered to increase an officer's professional knowledge and experience, and qualify him for the increased responsibilities of advanced rank.

4. If he is right in drawing this inference, then surely he is also right in supposing that long Staff service, albeit of an officiating character, must increase an officer's capabilities and qualifications in exactly the same ratio, if not in a greater ratio than permanent Staff service; for the officer officiating in an appointment will, in the hope of being confirmed therein, have greater incentives, it is believed, to acquire a thorough knowledge of his duties than the officer whom fortune placed in it permanently without any probation at all.

5. Your memorialist would moreover solicit attention to the fact, that if, instead of holding the officiating appointment of Interpreter and Quartermaster for more than two years and a quarter, he had held that appointment permanently without any officiating tenure at all, for a month or even a day, that day or month in which he could not have acquired the same, or anything like the same, knowledge and experience of its duties would still count as Staff service, and would be more valuable to his professional advancement than the period of two years and three months in which he officiated in the appointment, and which, so strange is the anomaly, is absolutely in that respect valueless to him.

6. In like manner, but for the chance of his holding a permanent appointment elsewhere,* the responsible and onerous duties of his present position of officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army, which he has held for nearly two years and a half, and during which time he has twice been in independent charge of a portion of the Adjutant-General of the Army's office, would, because they are only officiating duties, give no claim to a step of rank in the Staff corps, or, in other words, would be considered less qualifying for advancement than the adjutancy of a regiment, or the most subordinate position on the Staff of the army, namely, that of a doing duty officer with a native corps.†

7. Under these circumstances, your memorialist, in the full conviction that officiating Staff service of a long tenure must qualify an officer for promotion, at least as fully as permanent Staff service held during a similar period, and that the hardship of his particular case needs only to be represented to your Excellency to secure it a favourable hearing, most respectfully solicits that the clause of the Government General Order, which so injuriously affects his professional prospects, may be re-considered, and the two years and three months in which, he trusts, he zealously and effectively performed the duties of regimental Interpreter and Quartermaster, may be permitted to count as service for promotion in the Staff corps, more especially as in the Royal Warrant upon which the, to him, unfortunate clause is based, your memorialist is unable to discover that there is any distinction whatever drawn between officiating and permanent Staff service.

And your memorialist will pray.

(32-2.)

From the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the Adjutant-General of the Army (No. 890, dated Fort William, 23d September 1861).

WITH reference to your letter, No. 1136 A, of the 10th instant, I am desired to request that his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief may be moved to inform Government under what circumstances it happened that Captain G. L. Fraser acted so long without being confirmed in the appointment of Interpreter and Quartermaster of his regiment.

(32-3.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. Mayhew, Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department (No. 1324 A, dated Head-Quarters, Calcutta, the 12th October 1861).

Service Message by Electric Telegraph from Captain G. L. Fraser, Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army to the Adjutant-General of the Army Calcutta (No. 91, dated Simla, the 4th October 1861).

I WAS not confirmed in the appointment of Interpreter and Quartermaster of my Corps, because just as that post, which I had held and re-held so often and so long during the sickness or absence of Brevet Captain Shaw, became actually vacant by the promotion of that officer, a senior officer (Lieutenant McMullin) returned from furlough, became available for the situation, and obtained it.

* Commandant 42nd Native Infantry.

† See par 70, G. G. O., No 332, of 1861.

APP. G.

(32-4.)

My application for Staff corps was despatched on 2d instant.

True copy.

Forwarded to Adjutant-General of the Army, in reply to Government letter, No. 890, of 23d ultimo, and his telegram of 2d instant.

On the occasions marginally indicated, it was impossible for Captain Fraser to be confirmed in the appointment, as he only held it during those periods for Lieutenant and Brevet Captain Shaw (sick, present, or absent on sick leave), who at their expiration resumed it.

When finally it became vacant by the promotion of that officer, and Captain Fraser could, under happier circumstances, have obtained it permanently, Lieutenant (now Major) McMullin, Captain Fraser's senior officer, returned from Europe and became a successful applicant for it.

After Captain Shaw's promotion, and pending Lieutenant McMullin's arrival at regimental head quarters from Bombay, Captain Fraser again, as is shown on his memorial, officiated as Interpreter and Quartermaster to his corps for three months, namely, from 19th November 1853 to 19th February 1854.

(Signed) G. L. FRASER, Captain.
Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army.

(32-5.)

MEMORANDUM.

Captain G. L. Fraser, late 23d Native Infantry.

G. O. C. C. 7th Feb. 1849.	Appointed officiating Interpreter and Quartermaster to the 49th N. I vice Lieut. Interpreter, and Quartermaster T. H. Plumer, deceased.	Joined the appointment on the 25th February, and relinquished it on the 18th May 1849, the date on which he proceeded on sick leave to Simla.
----------------------------------	---	---

23d Native Infantry.

G. O. C. C. 6th Sept. 1850.	Appointed officiating Interpreter and Quartermaster during the illness of Lieutenant, Interpreter, and Quartermaster R. Shaw.	Took up the appointment by regimental order, dated 3d August 1850, vice Lieutenant Shaw, who was present (sick) in the regiment.
-----------------------------------	---	--

G. O. C. C. 20th Dec. 1850.	During the absence on leave on medical certificate of Brevet Captain Interpreter, and Quartermaster R. Shaw.	Assumed the appointment by regimental order, dated 5th December 1850, and held it till 30th September 1852, the date on which Brevet Captain Shaw rejoined from leave.
-----------------------------------	--	--

G. O. C. C. 10th Dec. 1853.	Consequent on the promotion of Brevet Captain Shaw.	Assumed the appointment by regimental order, dated 19th November 1853, and held it till 19th February 1854, the date on which Lieut. A. L. McMullin* joined the regiment from furlough.
-----------------------------------	---	---

(Signed) W. MAYHEW, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Adjutant-General of the Army.

(32-6.)

From Captain G. L. Fraser, late 23d Regiment Native Infantry, Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army to the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army (dated Simla, 5th December 1861).

I HAVE the honour to acquaint you, that I have been informed by the officiating Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army at the Presidency, that the period passed

* Captain Fraser's regimental senior, appointed Interpreter and Quartermaster, G. O. C. C., 10th December 1853.

by me in the appointment marginally indicated,* will not be permitted to count as service for promotion in the Staff corps.

2. As I conceive that the spirit of the answer to question 23, noted in the margin,† is to entitle me to count such service for promotion in the Staff corps after my admission thereto, I have to beg that you will do me the favour of placing the matter before the Commander-in-Chief, and soliciting his Excellency to recommend to Government that the time referred to may be permitted to reckon for the purpose set forth.

3. Colonel Maxwell's column was in all but name a brigade. It consisted, for the greater part of its existence, of—

- 1 Battery of Artillery.
- 1 Regiment of European Infantry.
- 1 Battalion of Military Police (Punjab).
- 1 Regiment of Native Cavalry.

And it had for some time the following composition—

- 1 Battery of Artillery.
- 2 Regiments of European Infantry.
- 1 Regiment of Irregular Cavalry.

Large detachments of Cavalry of different regiments were also occasionally attached to it.

4. My duties as detachment Staff were excessively onerous, for the column, or portions of it, being constantly on the move, and there being no other Staff Officer attached to the column, the duties of Brigade Major, Brigade Quartermaster, Commissariat Officer, Postmaster, Interpreter, &c. &c., devolved upon me.

5. So constantly were references being made to me, and so continually were reports arriving from spies, the native civil authorities, and officers commanding detachments of the column in the district, or other columns acting in communication with Colonel Maxwell's column, that I do not think that for weeks together, at the hottest season of the year, when suffering from sickness, I had three hours of consecutive rest night or day.

6. That I performed these duties to my Commandant's satisfaction is borne testimony to in the document published with Sir H. Rose's Despatch relative to the capture of Calpee.‡

7. Apologising for trespassing upon his Excellency's time, yet trusting that he will accord to my appeal the weight of his powerful support.

1 Vide p. 11
G. O., 1859

(32-7.)

The humble Memorial of Captain G. L. Fraser, of the late 23d Regiment, Bengal Native Infantry, Officiating Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India (dated Simla, 20th December 1861).

Your memorialist respectfully solicits that the enclosed memorial, with its annexures§ (in which he has endeavoured to show good and sufficient cause why in particular the period of two years three months and nineteen days, in which he officiated as Interpreter and Quartermaster of his own and another corps, and, generally, officiating Staff service of long tenure, should be permitted to count for promotion in the Staff corps, in the same way as permanent Staff service), may receive your kind and attentive perusal, in the firm conviction that a full consideration of the disheartening effect of clause 87¶ of Government General Order, No. 332, of 10th April last, may induce you either to authorize its modification, or, should that be impossible, render its restriction ineffective in the case of your memorialist.

§ See Preceding Papers.

II. Your memorialist is emboldened to make this request for the two following reasons.—

1st. That in that portion of Her most Gracious Majesty's Royal Warrant of the 16th January last, laying down the rules under which previous service on the Staff is to count for promotion in the Staff corps, no

* Detachment Staff Colonel Maxwell's moveable column, and Special Commissioner in the Cawnpore District, from February to June 1858, 3 months 18 days.

† Extract from G. O. C. C., No. 598 of 1861, page 218, question 23. It is concluded that such appointments as Assistant Adjutant-General, Brigade Major, Brigade Quartermaster, &c. to a brigade or division in the field, do not go towards the periods of Staff employ qualifying for promotion under the Staff Warrant.

Answer 23. Such appointments do not of themselves qualify for admission into the Staff corps, but if officers holding such appointments should eventually obtain admission into the Staff corps, they will be entitled to count as Staff service the time passed in such appointments.

¶ 87. The past service on the Staff, counting for promotion in the Staff corps, will include any service of a permanent nature which an officer now on the Staff may, from the date of his first arrival in India, have passed on the Staff.

distinction whatever is drawn between officiating and permanent Staff service.*

2. That he cannot bring himself to believe that the aforesaid gracious Warrant ever contemplated that an officer circumstanced as your memorialist, of 16½ years' servitude, a Captain in the cadre of his regiment, and a Brevet Captain of one and a half year's service, who has passed more than six years† on the Staff, and who would possess in all other parts of Her Majesty's dominions, in virtue of his present high appointment, the relative rank of Colonel, should practically be compelled by the changes the service is undergoing to sink his regimental rank of Captain after so much service, Staff and regimental, and enter the said corps as a subaltern, and thus find himself superseded on all sides by officers of 12 or fewer years' service, who have never filled any but minor and unimportant situations on the Staff, although they may have held those appointments permanently.

III. Furthermore, your memorialist would beg to draw attention to the fact that the situation in which he has for the past three years been officiating is on the head-quarters' Staff of the army, and in its highest and most hard-worked department, and that, moreover, its duties are of so important and comprehensive a character as to give its holder an acquaintance with the system of all the other military departments, and to particularly qualify him for Staff employment; and further, that it is an office held in the British and other armies by field officers of high rank, reputation, and experience.

IV. In conclusion, your memorialist would urgently solicit that, in weighing the claims of his memorial to a favourable hearing, it may be considerably borne in mind that during the long apprenticeship he has now served in the department of the Adjutant-General of the Army, he has twice held, and is now actually holding, independent charge of a large separate portion of the Adjutant-General's office, a position which renders him responsible for the correct publication of all the Army General Orders of the Commander-in-Chief in India, and also for the correct framing and communication of many other important, though unprinted, orders of his Excellency to an army of more than 84,000 men, and the duties of which, through his continuous departmental advancement,‡ have shown that they have been satisfactorily performed, are, it will be readily admitted, quite inconsistent with the rank and standing of a subaltern officer.

V. In the full confidence, therefore, that the careful consideration of the circumstances herein detailed, together with the arguments adduced in the appended memorial, will lead either to its being ruled that officiating Staff service of long tenure is to count for promotion in the Staff corps precisely as permanent Staff service, or that at any rate the period of two years, three months, and nineteen days, in which your memorialist officiated as interpreter and Quartermaster of his own and another regiment, may, as a special case, be permitted to carry with it that advantage (in other words, to the grant of a boon which will enable him to enter the Staff corps as a Captain), he will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(33.)

From Captain W. Fullerton, Officiating Deputy Judge Advocate General, doing duty Onde Division, to the Adjutant General of the Army, Army Head Quarters (dated Lucknow, 13th December 1861).

GOVERNMENT having, I have reason to believe, been pleased to deduct from my roll of permanent Staff ser-

* 3. Officers now in Staff employment in India, joining the Staff corps on its formation, shall count their previous Staff service towards promotion to the following extent. One step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it, according to the above rules. An interval of two years at least must intervene between each succeeding step.

	Ys.	m.	d.
† Officiating Interpreter and Quartermaster, late 23d and 49th regiments, Native Infantry	2	3	19
Interpreter and Quartermaster, Barrackpore Recruit Depot	0	1	10
Detachment Staff-Colonel Maxwell's moveable column, and Special Commissioner, Cawnpore District, in 1853	0	3	18
Officiating Assistant Adjutant-General, Cawnpore Division, and Major of Brigade, Cawnpore	0	3	10
Commandant, 35th (late 42d) Native Infantry, officiating Assistant Adjutant General of the Army, and officiating Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army	3	2	28
	6	3	4

‡ Officiating 2d Assistant-Adjutant-General of the Army, April 1855; Ditto 1st ditto July 1861; Officiating Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army Nov. 1861.

vice the two following items, which I thought would count for promotion in the Staff corps, viz. :—

1. Service as superintendent of Military Transport Train in the years 1857-58-59, between Lahore and Mooltan;
2. Service as in charge of Sudder bazaar and police at Ferozepore in the years 1845-46:

I have the honour, with reference to the second, to solicit that you will submit this letter to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, with the expression of a hope on my part, that his Excellency will be pleased to extend his powerful support to my respectful request that Government will reconsider its decision on this point.

As the circumstances attendant on my police appointment at Ferozepore are most peculiar, I proceed to detail them. Sir John Littler, then commanding at that station, was (as I have always understood) directed, towards the close of 1845, to nominate an officer to the charge of the Sudder bazaar and police.

He was pleased to nominate me, and the confirmation of his nomination by the Commander-in-Chief and Government was published in General Order by the Commander-in-Chief, 1st December 1845. That this was believed at the time to be a substantive appointment was, I think, beyond doubt, and I here detail the following circumstances which would tend to show this :—

1. At the time of my being nominated, I was Interpreter and Quartermaster to the 8th Regiment Light Cavalry, then at Ferozepore. I had to give this appointment up.

2. I was allowed to go to Simla on sick leave in 1846, keeping the appointment. (See General Order by Commander-in-Chief of September of that year.)

3. When nominated to the interpretership, &c, of my own regiment in September 1846, which was then stationed at Ferozepore, I was held to vacate the bazaar appointment, and did so.

4. Captain Bagshaw, who took the appointment up in this last-mentioned month, kept it continuously, I believe, although his own regiment, the 7th Native Infantry, marched from Ferozepore, some time probably in 1848 (judging from General Order by the Commander-in-Chief of 20th March 1849, the regiment was then at Jullundur).

I may further state, that I performed during my tenure of office all the judicial and police duties which afterwards devolved on cantonment magistrates of the first class, most onerous and harassing as they were at that exceptional time, and increased as they were for a considerable period by a general commissariat supervision over the hospitals, the full of wounded men.

I would still further state, that the cantonment magistracy of Ferozepore has been a continuous appointment ever since I assumed charge of it. It is true, that in General Order by the Commander-in-Chief of 31st December 1849, there appears an order confirming in the appointment Captain Bagshaw, who succeeded Captain Showers, my immediate successor. But I would submit that, in reality, it was not the individual who was confirmed, but the existence of the appointment itself.

I was substantive incumbent of an appointment which, at first created for temporary purposes, was never done away with, and was ultimately made permanent. May not then this case, as an analogous one, fall under the rule which allows an officer who has held an officiating appointment, in which he has been subsequently confirmed, to count as permanent service the time during which he has so officiated?

In conclusion, as I have not been permitted to draw any advantage from having held the post of superintendentship of the transport train, on the ground that the appointment was set on foot to suit temporary exigencies, and not as a permanent establishment of the State, I would then respectfully solicit that Government will take into consideration the claim above advanced by me of reckoning for service employment in an appointment which was ultimately rendered permanent, and permit me to count as Staff service towards promotion the period during which I held the cantonment magistracy of Ferozepore, viz., from 1st December 1845 to 2d September 1846.

APP. G.

APP. G.

(34.)

The Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel and Brevet Colonel J. D. Macpherson, C.B., Her Majesty's 10th Regiment, Native Infantry, Bengal Establishment.

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist has attained his present rank in Her Majesty's Indian forces after a service of 33 years; that his commission as regimental Lieutenant-Colonel is dated 4th August 1859.

2. That counting from that date, your memorialist in ordinary course, would have expected promotion to regimental Colonel in the course of from 10 to 12 years.

3. That 44 Lieutenant-Colonels, senior to your memorialist, have retired from the service on the annuities granted by Government of India, General Orders of 22d March 1861, No. 262.

4. That the names of these 44 retired Lieutenant-Colonels are still retained in the Army List "in italics," for the purpose of regulating the future promotion of the juniors to regimental colonelcies (or to Colonel's allowance).

5. That, thus, not only is your memorialist deprived all the benefit he might otherwise have expected from these retirements, but they must prove a positive injury to him.

6. Some of these retired officers, who only waited complete 32 years' service for Colonel's pension, and none from other causes; would have quitted the service had no such inducement as the annuities ever been held out to them, when, instead of being retained "in italics," their names would have been struck out of the Army List entirely, and your memorialist would have had the benefit of these retirements.

7. Again, your memorialist's future promotion to Colonel's allowance must be retarded further by the retirement, under this rule, of these 44 Lieutenant-Colonels, because the same number of casualties cannot be looked for among them; the value of a retired officer's life in Europe being greater than that of an officer who remains exposed to all the dangers and vicissitudes of his calling in India.

8. Furthermore, your memorialist would humbly present that if, in addition to the retention in the Army List (in italics) of the names of these senior Lieutenant-Colonels who have retired, a proportion of regimental colonelcies (or Colonel's allowance) is to be withdrawn, or retained for the Staff corps, it will be evident that he can have little or no hope of ever attaining to that rank and its emoluments, much less in the ordinary 10 or 12 years.

9. In the grades of Major, Captain, and subaltern, no promotion has been granted in room of every two of these retired Lieutenant-Colonels; in other words Major standing 44th on the list will, in virtue of these retirements, have become 22d on the list.

10. Your memorialist would most respectfully crave that he too may be allowed, in like manner, to count 2 steps in the list of Lieutenant-Colonels in room of the 44 retirements, or that, in consideration of what he has above ventured to state, such other measures may be directed as will not preclude him from the hope of succeeding, in due time, to a provision for his old age and for his family, to which he has looked forward during a long course of faithful service.

(Signed) J. D. MACPHERSON,
Lieutenant-Colonel and Brevet Colonel,
Her Majesty's 10th Regiment N. I.,
Bengal Establishment.

Calcutta, 3d March 1862.

(35.)

Junior United Service Club, London,
30th May 1861.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to request that you will solicit the attention of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to a portion of the order for the formation of three new Dragoon regiments, which I venture to consider to be unfair to the officers of the 4th and 5th Bengal Cavalry, inasmuch as it gives the prior option of volunteering for the new corps to the officers of the 1st, 2d, and 3d Bengal Cavalry, a preference in favour of these corps which is likely to exclude the less favoured ones from the exercise of any option whatever. The preference given to the officers of the 1st, 2d, and 3d European Infantry over the officers of the other Infantry corps, is intelligible enough, and based on

grounds which none can dispute, the former being old and distinguished regiments; but in the European Cavalry which have been so recently raised, if consideration were to be shown to the officers of any regiment in particular, it should surely have been rather to the officers of those of the late Native Cavalry corps which did not mutiny, though in stations with troops that did so, there being at least a presumption that the officers of such regiments had more influence over their men, and that the latter were, in consequence, habitually more loyal and well affected. Now the officers of the 5th European Cavalry, to which I have the honour to belong, are those of the late 5th and 8th Native Cavalry combined (neither of which corps mutinied, though in stations with troops that did so), and they owe their present unfortunate position as officers of the junior corps, to the fact of their men having only been disbanded, and replaced by Europeans when the mutiny was over, a fact which should weigh in favour of their officers, rather than be allowed to operate to their disadvantage. It would be fairer, and less open to dispute, since the men of all five regiments of Bengal Cavalry are called on to volunteer, to put the officers into a general list, and give them the option of serving with the new corps, by seniority, in their respective grades.

Believing it to be the desire of Government to do justice to all, I trust that the Secretary of State for India in Council, will be pleased to take measures to redress the injury to the officers of the 4th and 5th Bengal Cavalry, which would be involved in the proposed preference to those of the 1st, 2d, and 3d Regiments.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HORACE DURRANT, Captain,
5th Bengal European Cavalry.

Colonel Baker,
Military Secretary to the Secretary
of State for India.

(35-2.)

Junior United Service Club, London,

3d June 1861.

SIR,

WITH reference to my letter of the 30th ultimo, I have the honour to request that you will submit for the consideration of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, whether the number of officers required for the new Dragoon regiments might not be selected by ballot from amongst those willing to volunteer from each of the Bengal Cavalry regiments, the ballot to take place at the head quarters of each regiment, all furnishing a like number of Captains, Lieutenants, &c., and any odd vacancies to be reserved for volunteers from the Madras and Bombay Cavalry.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HORACE DURRANT, Captain,
5th Bengal European Cavalry.

Colonel Baker,
Military Secretary to the Secretary
of State for India.

(36.)

14, Saint James's Square, London,
5th June 1861.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to request that you will favour me by submitting this letter in respect to the working of the scheme for the amalgamation of home and Indian armies in certain cases, for the consideration of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India; and as I believe that my own case will be far from an exceptional one I trust I may be pardoned for bringing to his notice the great supercession I, and others similarly situated, must suffer in the event of promotion being given with retrospective effect to those who have already served the prescribed time on Staff employ to qualify for promotion, and the hardship that we, who have not had the good fortune to have served a sufficient time on Staff employ to enable us to take advantage of these favourable terms, must necessarily suffer.

I beg to annex a list of supercessions that will take place in my own corps, the late 49th regiment Bengal Native Infantry, in respect to the attainment of the substantive rank of Major, by which it will appear that the two senior Captains, both of whom have received brevets for service in the field, will be superseded by the next five junior officers of the regiment, in as far as attaining the substantive rank of Major goes. It is true that the senior Captain may, by remaining in his old regiment, possibly not be superseded by more than two of his juniors, but in my own case, whether I

remain in my regiment or enter the Staff, the four Captains junior to me, as well as the senior Lieutenant, must attain their substantive majorities before I can hope to do so. I have to point out that I have already done eleven years' service as Captain, and should I elect to remain in the Staff corps, I shall still have more than five years to serve for my majority. I cannot blame myself for not having obtained Staff employ sooner than I did, as I passed the necessary examinations to qualify for it; the fact is the common one, that I was sent home from sickness contracted in the last Sikh campaign, and returned to India to find myself the only Captain available for duty with the corps, and was therefore tied to it; my position could not be held as a sinecure, as I had to act as Quartermaster, with charge of five companies. On the occurrence of the mutiny I volunteered for service, and attained command of a Punjab Irregular corps, but was compelled to relinquish it in consequence of a dangerous wound received in that campaign. I have taken the liberty to point out these facts to show that it has been through no negligence of my own, that I have been unable to put in the necessary amount of Staff service to save myself from such wholesale supercession as I have pointed out must take place, in my own instance, in accordance with the provisions of the new Warrant. And I would earnestly beg that if what I have done myself the honour to point out be found correct, that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India may be pleased to take into consideration the hardship of my own and other similar cases, and to save, if possible, men who have served the Government for long years to the best of their ability, from the pain of being superseded by men long their juniors in the service.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN HOOD, Captain and
Brevet Major, late Commanding
12th Punjab Infantry.

To Colonel Baker,
Military Secretary to the Government
of India.

LIST OF SUPERCESSIONS.

40th Regiment (Bengal Native Infantry), Captains.	Length of Service in Army.		Length of Service on Staff.		Service to complete for Promotion to Rank of Major in the New Staff Corps.
	Yrs	Mths	Yrs.	Mths	
Captain Brevet Major Larkins.	21	6	2	0	4 0
Captain Brevet Major Hood.	21	5	1	0	5 0
Captain Brevet Major Richardson.	20	1	12	0	—
Captain Gordon	20	2	8	0	—
Captain Pollock	17	1	12	0	2 11
Captain Dundridge	16	5	9	0	3 7
Lieut. Williamson	16	5	10	0	3 7

Remarks.—This may not be perfectly correct, but it is sufficiently so to show the supercessions that will actually occur in the corps.

(37.)

Musselburgh, near Edinburgh,
3d September 1861.

SIR,
I BEG to bring to your notice that the promotions in the Madras Artillery consequent on the re-organization have not been made according to orders, and as I have myself been superseded by my juniors in standing in the service in Bengal and Bombay, and can obtain no information why the promotions have not been corrected, I take the liberty of pointing the matter out to you, and beg for a reply, as I am meditating retiring from the service, and although the funds are insolvent I may be affected in my promotion to the higher grade of Colonel regimentally.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE S. CUTLER,
Lieutenant-Colonel, C.B.

Lieutenant-Colonel T. T. Pears, C.B.,
Military Secretary, India Office.

7186,

(38.)

Depôt Office, Woolwich,
3d September 1861.

SIR,
I HAVE the honour to request that you will submit to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India the following statement, and I hope that Sir C. Wood will give to it his favourable consideration.

By general orders of the Right Honourable his Excellency the Governor General of India, dated Calcutta, 10th April 1861, the Indian Artillery regiments are directed to be assimilated to and ultimately consolidated with the regiment of Royal Artillery.

The Bengal regiment is divided into seven brigades of similar strength to that of the Royal regiment as per margin, and by which arrangement the Bengal Artillery are left with five supernumerary Colonels-Commandant, who are to be gradually absorbed by three promotions to four vacancies.

The Indian Government have now resolved that these five supernumerary Colonels-Commandant shall be included among the 14 Colonels of the regiment.

This would be a just and right decision if the officers were Colonels, but these supernumerary Colonels-Commandant are general officers, and by the rules and regulations of the service it is impossible that they can be put back among the regimental Colonels, for, being no longer regimental officers, they cannot be borne on the roll of the effective field officers.

As it would be at least 15 years before the Bengal Artillery would have the 14 Colonels to which they are entitled by Her Majesty's Warrant, I earnestly trust the resolution may be reconsidered, and that an order be issued that the Colonels of the Indian Artillery regiments shall be effectives and not generals.

I take this opportunity of informing the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, that before the amalgamation of the armes the Bengal Artillery had a fund from which field officers received on retirement sums varying from 3,000*l.* to 6,000*l.*

If the present rules be carried out, then the officers of the Indian Artillery will find themselves not only deprived of the advantages that they formerly possessed, and not allowed to participate in those offered to the rest of the Indian Army, but actually refused that promotion to which they are entitled by Her Majesty's Warrant assimilating the Indian Artillery to that of the Royal regiment, and on the faith of which Warrant they loyally and cheerfully accepted general service.

In conclusion, I can only hope that I have written nothing to offend.

Her Majesty does not possess a body of officers more devoted to her person, and to their country, than those of whom I am proud to call myself one.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. H. SMYTH, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Royal Bengal Artillery.

To the Secretary, Military Department,
India Office, London.

(38-2.)

Woolwich, 11th November 1861.

SIR,
HAVING observed in Sir Charles Wood's letter of the 10th August, to the Government of India, that he does not accede to their recommendation that the promotion in the Indian Ordnance corps should be assimilated to that in the Royal Artillery, as ordered in the "Gazette" of the 10th April last, on the plea of extra burthen to the State, and undue supercession in the other branches of the service,—

I beg to bring to the notice of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, that the officers of the Indian Ordnance are now doing duty with the British corps as one regiment, taking rank with each other according to their regimental and not their army commissions; and that therefore if the same system of promotion be not carried out, the Indian Ordnance corps will suffer from a supercession of a much graver character than that of which the officers of the Line complain.

M

APP. G.

APP. G.¹

I annex a statement of the seasons in which the senior officers of each grade entered the service :—

	Royal.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
Senior Lieutenant-Col.	1831	1827	1825	1828
Senior 1st Captain -	1841	1841	1836	1841
Senior 2d ditto -	1848	1845	1845	1845
Senior Subaltern -	1854	1852	1851	1853

From which Sir Charles Wood will observe, that the promotions in the Indian corps are behind those of the Royal, and even this statement does not make out the case as strong as it really is; for instance, Colonel Broome, cadet of 1827, is the junior Colonel in Bengal, while an officer of his standing in the Royal Artillery has been a regimental Colonel since 1857.

Again, in the Royal Artillery there are only two Captains of the season of 1841, who have not obtained their lieutenant-colonelcy in the Bengal Artillery; the senior has just been promoted, and there are 14 below him of the same season.

Trusting that the interests of the officers of the Indian regiments may not be overlooked,

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. H. SMYTH,
Lieutenant-Colonel, Bengal Artillery
Depôt, Woolwich.

To Major-General Pears,
Secretary Government of India,
Military Department.

(39.)

East India United Service Club,
14, St. James's Square,
London, 3d December 1861.

SIR.

MAY I beg the favour of laying the following matter before the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India, in the hope of its meeting with his favourable consideration, viz, 1st, That under the provisions of Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, dated 16th January 1861, for the Amalgamation of Her British and Indian armies, and published in the Calcutta Government Gazette of 10th April 1861, I was induced to apply for admission into Her Majesty's Bengal Staff corps, mainly relying, as I did, on the assurances embodied in that document,* to compensate in some measure for my previous backwardness in promotion (having been superseded by many of my juniors in the army, although having paid considerably for my steps up to the rank of Captain), by securing to me an early pension on promotion to the rank I so much coveted in event of my then wishing to retire; and furthermore believing, in common with others, that the offer of 50l. additional pension, as conveyed in the notice heading the said Warrant, as an inducement to the senior officers of the Indian army to retire, was final.

I was accordingly gazetted as a Major to that corps, in Government General Orders, dated Fort William, 1st July 1861.

2d. That I have very recently learned with infinite disappointment and dismay, that since my appointment before mentioned, not only has it been ruled that the benefit of clause 9, para. 2, of Warrant cannot be conceded to officers obtaining their substantive field rank in the Staff corps;† but, furthermore, that far higher encouragement to retire † has since been held out to my seniors (in the Line, which I had so lately been induced to relinquish) in the shape of exceedingly enhanced rates of pension.

3rd. That these subsequent changes most materially and grievously affect my prospects in a service to which I have devoted by far the greater and best portions of my life (more than a quarter of a century), as the views I had been led to entertain with regard to each of the foregoing points have been all of a sudden completely dispelled, inasmuch as, being qualified both by length of army and of Staff service for promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff corps, on the 18th of February 1863, and having already served the prescribed period of 22 years (required by regulation 32 of the new Furlough Code of 1854, and to which clause 9, para. 2, of the Royal Warrant bears reference), to entitle

* *Vide* Military Letter, 296, para. 6, of July 1861, from Secretary of State for India to Governor-General.

† *Vide* Despatch 320, dated 10th August 1861, from Secretary of State for India.

me to the pension of that rank, I am now informed that a further service of some years in India is made imperative on me before I can realize the prospect which I had been taught to believe would be my right.

Whilst the effect of the immensely accelerated promotion which may be expected through the retirements of field officers on the higher pensions now offered them (in lieu of the 50l. first held out at the head of the Royal Warrant) must obviously be still further to supersede me at every point, as Captain, and many of them, my juniors, may now obtain their regimental majorities and lieutenant-colonelcies, and may claim the pensions of those grades after 22 years' service (and long before me), under the very regulation in question (32 of new Furlough Rules of 1854) from which I am excluded.

4th. In thus viewing my case as one of peculiar and severe hardship, but as one perhaps which may not as yet have called for special consideration, and confidently relying on Sir Charles Wood's sense of right and justice to protect the interests of Her Majesty's Indian officers, I would humbly venture to express the hope that the late decision herein-before referred to, be so far modified as not to operate to the injury of an officer who, like myself, had been appointed to the Staff corps under a totally different view of regulations so seriously affecting his interests; in short, who had been led to elect the Staff, under the interpretation hitherto borne by rule 32 of new Furlough Regulations of 1854; for had I conceived that any other meaning could have been attached to that rule, it is perhaps needless to add, I should, of course, have chosen the local service.

Or, should such concession be deemed inadvisable, I would most respectfully and earnestly solicit that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India be moved to order, with the concurrence of Her most Gracious Majesty, that my promotion in Her Majesty's Bengal Staff corps be cancelled, and that I be permitted to revert to my former position of senior Captain in the cadre of the late 55th regiment Bengal Native Infantry, with the benefit of any promotion or other advantages which may have accrued since my transfer, or may prospectively accrue to that position, as my only hope of retrieving the prospects I have lost through relinquishing that line for the Staff.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. RICHARDS, Major,
Her Majesty's Bengal Staff corps,
Deputy Adjutant-General,
Presidency Division.

To the Military
Secretary to the Council of India.

(40.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel C. F. North, Her Majesty's Bombay Engineers, to the Military Secretary to the Council for India, India Office.

SIR, 14, St James's Square, 15 February 1862.
I HAVE the honour to request that the enclosed memorial may be laid before the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES FREDERICK NORTH, Lieut. Col.
Her Majesty's Bombay Engineers.

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for
India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel C. F. North, of
Her Majesty's Bombay Engineers,

Showeth,

THAT it was laid down as a principle by the late Honourable East India Company about eight years ago, and it was directed in their Despatches* to the Government of India, that all distinctions between the Artillery and Engineers of the East India Company's and Royal services should be abolished.

2. But in reply to an application to the Home Government to carry into effect the intentions of the late Honourable East India Company, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India wrote that the complete assimilation of the Indian Ordnance Corps with those of the British army, by increasing the proportion of officers of superior rank, would remove the inequality of promotion between the two divisions of Her Majesty's Ordnance services, but it would cause extensive supercession of the other arms of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and would involve considerable expense, and that therefore the proposal could not then be entertained.

* Despatch No. 183, of 8 July 1853; re-published by order of the Council for India, No. 1238 of 1858.

3. Since the foregoing reasons were given, however, the measure of the amalgamation of the late East India Company's forces with those of Her Majesty, has been more or less matured and effectually carried out. The complete assimilation intended by the late East India Company became a part of that measure, was authorized by the Royal Warrant for amalgamation, and was directed to be carried out. In the Despatches from Her Majesty's Secretary of State to the Government of India,* it is directed that the organization of the Indian regiments of Artillery shall be assimilated to that of the Royal Artillery, and that the process by which local regiments of Engineers shall be assimilated to the Royal Engineers, shall be precisely similar to that prescribed for the Artillery. The strength of officers to each brigade of the reorganized Indian Artillery is directed to be as follows :

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Colonel-Commandant. | 8 Captains. |
| 2 Colonels. | 9 Second Captains. |
| 4 Lieutenant-Colonels. | 24 Lieutenants. |

which was believed to be the establishment of a brigade of Royal Artillery. And it was further directed that each battalion of the Indian Engineers shall consist of the established strength of a battalion of Royal Engineers, viz.,

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Colonel-Commandant. | 8 Captains. |
| 2 Colonels. | 8 Second Captains. |
| 5 Lieutenant Colonels. | 24 Lieutenants. |

It is also further directed that in the execution of the measures to bring about the proposed amalgamation, the pledge that due regard be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces be scrupulously adhered to.

4. Notwithstanding the explicitness however of the foregoing orders, several distinctions between the two Ordnance services are still allowed to exist, to the prejudice of the promotion of a very large body of officers, as exhibited in the following instances. The new organization by reducing the number of brigades of Indian Artillery, and battalions of Indian Engineers, caused several Colonels-Commandant of Artillery and Engineers to become supernumeraries, being in excess of the re-organized establishment. Many of these being

Supernumerary Colonels- Commandant :	
Bengal Artillery -	4
Bengal Engineers -	2
Madras Artillery -	8
Madras Engineers -	1
Bombay Artillery -	2
Bombay Engineers -	1

Major Generals in the army, cannot possibly be made available as effective of the next lower grade of Colonel, inasmuch as Colonels of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers are invariably effective regimental officers,

who are at once removed from their respective regiments on attaining the rank of Major-General in the army, and promotions are made in their places. It is obvious that Major-Generals and Colonels-Commandant cannot do duty as Colonels, and that to retain them virtually as belonging to the inferior grade is literally to disrate them, thereby depriving an equal number of Lieutenant-Colonels, Captains, and Lieutenants of that regimental promotion to superior grades which they regard as one of those "rights and claims," to the due regard to which they believe the Government to be "pledged scrupulously to adhere." The retired full pay-list of the Royal Artillery and Engineers is fixed by the Royal Warrant at 48,000*l.* per annum; under clauses 31 and 32 of this Warrant,† a certain number of unattached General Officers and regimental Colonels receive retiring pensions of 600*l.* a year, and a certain number of Lieutenant-Colonels of 30 years' service with the rank of Colonel, receive retiring pensions of 400*l.* a year. The extension of this scheme to the Indian Artillery and Engineers is involved in the measure of the amalgamation of the two services.

5. The reasons assigned for the refusal of complete assimilation by the removal of the above-mentioned distinction are, that the effect of complete assimilation would be to burden the Government with the expense of maintaining a large number of officers in superior and highly paid grades for whom there is no suitable employment, and to cause a needless amount of supercession in the other branches of the service. But as those reasons have not apparently been allowed to interfere with other details of the scheme of amalgamation, nor with the recent measure for inducing senior officers of the Line to resign by the offer of enhanced retiring pensions, neither can they consis-

tently be urged against that complete union of the two Ordnance services which was evidently originally designed, and at the non-completion of which the officers of the Indian Ordnance corps have felt much disappointment.

6. It was directed* that the recent measure of an offer of a scale of increased retiring pensions to old officers of the late East India Company's service should not be made applicable to the Indian Artillery and Engineers, because their organization was simply modified, not broken up, and because the modifications were on the whole very favourable to those officers. The recommendation of the Amalgamation Commission in the 55th paragraph of their report, that compensations should be granted to the Artillery and Engineers for the loss of their regimental retiring funds, was declined as inadmissible, on the grounds that some value for their subscriptions had been already received by subscribers and that the funds might still be maintained.

7. The Amalgamation Commission, however, did not recommend that enhanced pensions should be offered to the Artillery and Engineers, because they considered that the adoption of their recommendation for the grant of compensation for regimental retiring funds was an equivalent for such an offer, and there is no doubt that if those funds were re-established by the Government guaranteeing, at an inconsiderable expense, a retiring bonus to every original subscriber who would agree to continue his subscription, the Ordnance officers could have no reason to complain that the enhanced retiring pensions had not been offered to them as well as to their brethren of the Line. A guarantee of this nature would probably amount to an equivalent for the retiring pension alluded to in the latter part of the 4th paragraph.

8. The immediate result of amalgamation was the abolition of the Artillery and Engineer retiring funds, because as no officers are for the future to be appointed to the Indian Ordnance corps, there can be no new subscribers to support those funds, and because original subscribers refused to provide bonuses solely for their seniors without the prospect of obtaining one for themselves, whether measures can be devised for the re-establishment of the funds and for their maintenance without Government aid, and until the extinction of the East India Company's officers, is at present very doubtful. Their abolition has caused considerable loss and injury to every subscriber, more especially to those senior officers who had been subscribers since they entered the service, and who, but for the amalgamation, would have received from those funds bonuses of 5,000*l.*, or more, on their retirement. These funds consisted entirely of the accumulated subscriptions of the members. The Government never contributed towards them, nor did it formally authorize them. Some of them were established 25 years ago, with the permission of the late East India Company; and although the power of putting a stop to them whenever expedient was retained, still there was no probability of such an event so long as an army for India was necessary, and the Government remained with the East India Company.

9. It is obvious that in all matters of organization, one uniform principle should be observed in the amalgamated services. In the event of those services becoming augmented by the addition of new brigades of Artillery or new battalions of Engineers, the Indian Artillery and Engineers should benefit proportionably with the Royal Artillery and Engineers. There should be one uniform system of "seconding" as regards officers employed out of the line of their regimental duty. And all distinctions and differences that at present exist to the prejudice of the promotion of the Indian Ordnance officers should be swept away, so that the complete union and assimilation of the two services may be fully and equitably carried out.

10. In conclusion, your memorialist most respectfully represents that in his corps of the Bombay Engineers, one of the Colonels-Commandant is a Major-General in the army. There is also one supernumerary Colonel-Commandant who is retained virtually as senior of the next grade of Colonels. Although the despatches quoted in the 3d paragraph of this memorial distinctly specify that there shall be two Colonels to a battalion of the reorganized Indian Engineers, there are actually in your memorialist's corps only (3) three Colonels to (2) two battalions; your memorialist being senior Lieutenant-Colonel is thus kept out of his legitimate promotion to a superior grade. Your memorialist would have been entitled to a bonus of about 5,000*l.* from the retiring

* Despatch No. 29, clause II., para. 1, dated 1 January 1861, and para. 3 of Despatch No. 36, dated *idem*.

† Clauses 31 and 32 of the Circular Warrant, No. 334, dated 14th October 1858, and additional clauses of Nos. 643 and 675, of 5th November, 1860 and 28th March 1861, respectively.

* Para 27 of Despatch No. 320, dated 10th August 1861, and General Order of Government of India, No. 807, of 12th September 1861.

APP. G. fund of his regiment, had it not been abolished in consequence of the amalgamation. Your memorialist therefore prays that Her Majesty's Government will abolish all distinctions between the Royal and Indian Engineer regiments, and that the officers of the latter may be compensated for the loss of their regimental retiring funds, or that enhanced retiring pensions may be offered to them as well as to the Line.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c. &c.

(Signed) C. F. NORTH,
Lieut.-Col. H.M. Bombay Engineers.

15th February 1862.

(41.)

The Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel T. Brougham, of the Royal Artillery, to the Right Honourable Sir C. Wood, G.C.B., Secretary of State for India in Council.

Showeth,

1st. THAT in the despatches from Her Majesty's Secretary of State to the Government of India*, it is directed that the organization of the Indian regiments of Artillery shall be assimilated to that of the Royal Artillery; and the strength of officers to each brigade of the reorganized Indian Artillery is directed to be as follows.—

I Colonel-Commandant.	8 Captains.
2 Colonels.	9 Second Captains.
4 Lieutenant-Colonels,	24 Lieutenants.

Clause 6,
par 1, of
Despatch
No 29, of
18 Jan. 1861.

Which was believed to be the establishment of a brigade of Royal Artillery. It is also further directed, that in the execution of the measure to bring about the proposed amalgamation,† the pledge that due regard be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces be scrupulously adhered to

2d. Notwithstanding the explicitness of the foregoing orders, several distinctions between the two Ordnance services are still allowed to exist, to the prejudice of the promotion of a very large body of officers, as exhibited in the following instances—The new organization, by reducing the number of brigades of Indian Artillery, caused several Colonels-Commandant to become supernumeraries, being in excess of the reorganized establishment.

Supernumerary Colonels	Generals in the army, cannot possibly
Commandant	be made available as effectives of
Bengal Artillery - 4	the next lower grade of Colonel;
Bengal Engineers - 2	inasmuch as Colonels of the Royal
Madras Artillery - 3	Artillery and Engineers are invari-
Madras Engineers - 1	ably regimental officers, who
Bombay Artillery - 2	are at once removed from their respective
Bombay Engineers - 1	regiments on obtaining the rank of Major-General in the army; and

promotions are made in their places. It is obvious that Major-Generals and Colonels-Commandant cannot do duty as Colonels, and that to retain them virtually as belonging to the inferior grade is literally to disrate them, thereby depriving an equal number of Lieutenant-Colonels, Captains, and Lieutenants of that regimental promotion to superior grades which they regard as one of those "rights and claims," to the due regard to which they believed the Government to be "pledged" scrupulously to adhere."

Par. 21 of
Despatch
No 319,
dated
10 Aug. 1861.

3rd. The reasons assigned for the refusal of complete assimilation by the removal of the above-mentioned distinction are, that the effect of complete assimilation would be to burden the Government with the expense of maintaining a large number of officers in superior and highly paid grades, for whom there is no suitable employment, and to cause a needless amount of supercession in the other branches of the service. But as these reasons have not apparently been allowed to interfere with other details of the scheme of amalgamation, nor with the recent measure for inducing senior officers of the line to resign by the offer of enhanced retiring pensions, neither can they consistently be urged against that complete union of the two Ordnance services which was evidently originally designed; and at the non-completion of which, the officers of the Indian Ordnance corps have felt much disappointment.

Par. 27 of
Despatch
No. 320,
dated
10 Aug. 1861,
General
Orders,
Government
of India,
No 807, of
12 Sept. 1861.

4th. It was directed that the recent measure of an offer of a scale of increased retiring pensions to old officers of the late East India Company's service should not be made applicable to the Indian Artillery and Engineers, because their organization was simply modified, not broken up; and because the modifications were on the whole very favourable to those officers. The recommendation of the Amalgamation Commission, in the

55th paragraph of their report, that compensation should be granted to the Artillery and Engineers for the loss of their regimental retiring funds, was declined as inadmissible, on the grounds that some value for their subscriptions had been already received by subscribers, and that the funds might still be maintained.

5th. The Amalgamation Commission, however, did not recommend that enhanced retiring pensions should be offered to the Artillery and Engineers, because they considered that the adoption of their recommendation for the grant of compensation for Regimental retiring funds was an equivalent for such an offer; and there is no doubt that if these funds were re-established by the Government guaranteeing, at an inconsiderable expense, a retiring bonus to every original subscriber who would agree to continue his subscriptions, the Ordnance officers would have no reason to complain that the enhanced retiring pensions had not been offered to them, as well as to their brethren of the Line.

6th. The immediate result of amalgamation was the abolition of the Artillery and Engineer retiring funds, because as no officers are for the future to be appointed to the Indian Ordnance corps, there can be no new subscribers to support those funds, and because original subscribers refused to provide bonuses solely for their seniors without the prospect of obtaining one for themselves. Whether measures can be devised for the re-establishment of the funds, and for their maintenance without Government aid, until the extinction of the old East India Company's officers, is at present very doubtful. Their abolition has caused considerable loss and injury to every subscriber, more especially to those senior officers who had been subscribers since they entered the service, and who, but for the amalgamation, would have received from those funds bonuses of 5,000*l.* or more, on their retirement. These funds consisted entirely of the accumulated subscriptions of the members. The Government never contributed towards them, nor did it formally authorize them. Some of them were established 25 years ago with the permission of the late East India Company, and although the power of putting a stop to them whenever expedient was retained, still there was no probability of such an event, so long as an army for India was necessary, and the Government remained with the East India Company.

7th. It is obvious that in all matters of organization one uniform principle should be observed in the amalgamated services. In the event of these services becoming augmented by the addition of new Brigades of Artillery, or new Battalions of Engineers, the Indian Artillery and Engineers should benefit proportionally with the Royal Artillery and Engineers. There should be one uniform system of "seconding," as regards officers employed out of the line of their regimental duty; and all distinctions and differences that at present exist, to the prejudice of the promotion of the Indian Ordnance officers, should be swept away; so that the complete union and assimilation of the two services may be fully and equitably carried out.

8th. In conclusion, your memorialist respectfully represents that in his own corps (the late Bengal Artillery,*) there are four Major-Generals, and also four Lieutenant-Colonels in civil employ, not available for regimental duty, but who are retained, contrary to practice, in the Royal Artillery, as effective officers in the grades of Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel respectively, to the prejudice of the promotion of your memorialist as well as all his juniors. Your memorialist would have been entitled to a bonus of nearly 3,000*l.* from the retiring fund of his regiment on retiring from the service, had it not been abolished by the amalgamation.

Your memorialist therefore prays Her Majesty's Government will abolish all distinction between the Royal and Indian Regiments of Artillery as regards the promotion of officers, and that the officers of the late East Indian Artillery may be compensated for the loss of their retiring funds, or that enhanced retiring annuities may be offered to them in the same proportions as to the Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian armies.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c., &c.

(Signed) T. BROUGHAM, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Dépôt Brigade, Royal Artillery,
late Bengal Artillery.

Woolwich, 28th February 1862.

* Major General E. Huthwaite, C.B., Major General George Twombow; Major General Sir A. Wilson, Bart., K.C.B.; Major General Augustus Abbott, C.B.

Lieutenant-Colonel David Reid, Superintendent Engineer, Lieutenant-Colonel W. Maxwell, Superintendent Engineer, Lieutenant-Colonel H. E. L. Thullier, Surveyor General of India; Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Douglas, Superintendent of Electric Telegraphs.

* Despatch, No. 29, clause 2, paragraph 1, of 18th January 1861, and paragraph 3, of Despatch, No. 30, of 18th January 1861.

† Despatch, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, and General Orders, Government of India, paragraph 23, of No. 332, dated 10th April 1861.

(42.)

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel G. Rowlandson, of the Royal Artillery, Madras Presidency, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council, dated Madras, 11th November 1862.

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, believing himself to be entitled to his promotion to the rank of "Colonel of Brigade" from the date of the Amalgamation Order, viz., 18th February 1861, begs to state the ground on which he rests his claim, as well as other points in which he considers himself injuriously affected, and for which he solicits a just and generous consideration.

1. By the fundamental principle of the service to which your memorialist has been attached for 36 years, guaranteed as a "right and claim" by Her Majesty's Government, by the Houses of Parliament, and by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, first, on the transfer of India to the Crown, and again, on the amalgamation of the Indian with the British Royal Artillery, your memorialist is entitled, when senior of his grade, to succeed to the first vacancy in the next higher grade.

2. To assimilate the Indian with the Royal Artillery, a new organization was established* for the Madras Artillery, whereby the number of brigades was reduced from seven to four, and two new grades, viz., "Colonel-Commandant," with allowances, and "Colonel of Brigade," were substituted for "Colonels with Allowances," and other changes as represented in the margin (a).

—	Organiza-tion.		Results.	
	Old	New.	Gain	Loss
(a) Colonel-Commandant, with allowances.	7	4	0	3
Colonels of Brigade	—	8	*5	0
Lieutenant-Colonels	14	18	2	0
Captains	42	33	0	10
2d Captains	42	36	0	2
Lieutenants	98	96	0	2
Brigade Commands	7	4	0	3
Ditto Staff	7	4	0	3

* Only 5 Colonels given, three withheld.

3. It was declared by Her Majesty's Government in the opening paragraph of the published despatch, as per margin,† that "no interference with the present course of promotion in either service was "involved" in the scheme determined on for the said assimilation.

4. Officers of Artillery holding appointments in the Ordnance Department and manufactories were at the same time ordered to be "seconded," in accordance with the practice in the British Royal Artillery.‡

5. According to the provisions of the above-quoted orders, your memorialist was entitled to the promotion due to his standing from the 18th of February 1861, as shown in the margin §

6. Five only, instead of the eight, "Colonels of Brigade," belonging to the new organization, were promoted; the other three have been withheld to this date, and their places filled by the three reduced supernumerary "Colonels-Commandant," who, holding superior regimental commissions, and being "Major-Generals," were, therefore, according to all rule and precedent in either service, doubly ineligible to occupy the vacant inferior grade of "Colonels of Brigade," which, by the organization granted, are still due to the regiment.

7. By the operation of the course set forth in the preceding paragraph, it will be apparent that the guaranteed fundamental principle of a seniority service has not been observed, but the promotions due to the seniors, contrary to all precedent, withheld, and their places occupied by senior officers ineligible to hold them; secondly, that the established course of promotion in the service has been seriously interfered with; and, thirdly, that the measure has been carried out to "the full extent (as declared,|| and fully expected, on the faith of that declaration) only so far as the infliction of the loss re-

† No. 29, 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India.
‡ General Order by the Governor-General, No 832/1861, 10th April, para. 26. Published Despatch, No. 29, para. 9, from the Secretary of State for India.
§ General Order by the Governor-General, No 832/1861, para. 25, and Published Despatch, No. 29, para. 6, from Secretary of State for India.

sulting to your memorialist from the measure, while a large and important part of the benefits equally due therefrom have been and are withheld.

8. To the above simple statement of facts, which your memorialist believes to be unquestionable, he confidently appeals for the establishment of the claim, which he now most respectfully submits, to be granted the position in the service to which the acts of Her Majesty's Government have entitled him.

9. The rank and privileges of "Colonels-Commandant" is the highest aim and ultimate hope of the service, and the reduction of their number, without corresponding reduction of numerical strength of officers, is an irremediable loss to your memorialist.

10. By the recent reduction of three-sevenths of the Artillery "Colonels-Commandant," while the numerical strength of the officers of the regiment remains nearly the same, the chances of rise to the enjoyment of that legitimate hope of the service have been at a stroke reduced from as 1 in 27 to 1 in 48 only.

11. As compensation for the contingent eventual loss of their Colonels' allowances on retiring on their pension, handsome additional pensions, in present possession, have been liberally tendered to the other branches of the service, from which your memorialist has been altogether excluded, notwithstanding that the actual present loss of nearly half his chances of ever enjoying them has fallen unmitigated upon him at the end of a long service.

12. The condition of those other branches of the service remains nearly as before. With eight regiments of Infantry and three of Cavalry reduced, the remaining regiments of Cavalry and Infantry retain their chances of rise to their Colonels' allowances as before, viz., 1 in 22, while to the new Staff corps they have been recently awarded as 1 in 30, while to your memorialist they have been cut down to 1 in 48.

13. Your memorialist has been 36 years last June in the service; he at present finds himself hopelessly superseded by officers of all branches of the service, and his conditions of service have been seriously and injuriously altered, and his future prospects marred, while he has been denied participation in those advantages proffered to the other branches in compensation for the contingent eventual sacrifices which will irremediably overtake your memorialist in the loss of the Colonels' allowances.

14. Your memorialist, having attempted to represent the, as he deeply feels, injurious effects of the mode in which the Amalgamation Act has been applied, and the distinction made between his service and the other branches, concludes with the earnest humble prayer that the organization for the assimilation of his regiment may be carried out to its full extent, the benefit with the loss, whereby your memorialist may be restored to the position due to him as Colonel of Brigade from the 18th February 1861; and that he be permitted, in due seniority rotation, to succeed to Colonel's allowance; or that the additional annuities granted to the Cavalry and Infantry branches may be extended to your memorialist, according to the same principle of relative standing to the aforementioned Colonel's allowance. And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

—	Major Generals	Colonels.	Lieutenant Colonels
Royal Artillery	—	23 out of 30	47 out of 70
Bengal Artillery	—	9	10
Bombay Artillery	—	4	—
Indian Army, three Presidencies.	4	48 above	all but one

(43.)

The Memorial of Colonel G. W. Y. Simpson, in the regiment of Royal (Madras) Artillery, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India; dated Madras, 19th November 1862.

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist has served faithfully for a period of 38 years in the regiment of Madras Artillery.

2. That your memorialist has risen to stand first in succession to the next Colonels' allowances falling vacant.

3. That your memorialist, during his long service in India, has looked to succeed to the Colonels' allowances in due succession, provided no reduction in the strength of your memorialist's regiment took place, in like manner as heretofore his predecessors, under the regulations of the Indian service have done.

APP. G.

Despatch, Military, No. 29, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor General in Council, 18th January 1861, paras. 4 and 5.

4. That the Despatch quoted in the margin first made known to your memorialist that of the seven Colonels' allowances enjoyed by the late Madras Artillery, under the regulations of the Honourable the Court of Directors, and, as your memorialist fully believed, assured under the Parliamentary guarantee to your memorialist, no fewer than three were proposed to be withdrawn.

5. Your memorialist here most respectfully begs permission to refer to the Report* of the Committee convened by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to consider the measures to be taken for effecting the amalgamation of the European forces of the Indian army with the general army of the Crown, composed of officers specially selected for this most important and, touching the interests of your memorialist, most vital question, on the final disposal of which the hopes and prospects of your memorialist are utterly dependent.

6. Your memorialist, as grounds on which he would base this prayer for reconsideration, begs to bring under notice that the reasons assigned, in the despatch quoted below,† for withdrawing a certain number of Colonels' allowances from the Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian service are wholly inapplicable, and have no reference whatever to the Artillery, inasmuch as in the regiment to which your memorialist belongs there is not a single instance of the appointment of a field officer to the Staff corps, and only five other officers of subordinate grades, nor has there been any reduction in the strength of the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, but on the contrary, the number of field officers and men have been largely increased, and the only change, therefore, of any description that has taken place in your memorialist's regiment is simply that referred to in the Report of the Committee quoted in note to para. 5; that is to say, the change was simply for the "purpose of effecting a new organization, while the number of men remained the same, or nearly the same as before."

7. Your memorialist may further solicit permission to show the just and liberal consideration shown to the interests of the senior officers of the Cavalry and Infantry branches of the Indian service, when a certain number of this same great prize, Colonels' allowances, were withdrawn; and, although the annuities entered in the margin,‡ may not represent the exact value of each receiving officer's position, yet they do bear an approximate value to each position, as regards the relative, near or distant, prospect of succession to the Colonel's allowance.

† Military Despatch, No 320, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India.

‡ SCALE OF ANNUITIES (in addition to Pensions) to which entitled under the Regulations.

Cavalry.	Infantry.
550	550
450	500
350	450
300	400
280	350
250	300
	280
	260
	250

regards the relative, near or distant, prospect of succession to the Colonel's allowance.

* Report of Committee to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, G. C. B., Secretary of State for India, para. 8, page 10.

† In the Indian army there is a Colonel to every battalion of Artillery, and all regimental Colonels receive the allowance which, under the designation of Colonel's allowance, has always been allowed to be their common and peculiar property.

‡ We are of opinion that this principle cannot properly be departed from, either immediately or prospectively. If, in a process of passing from a war to a peace establishment, any regiments are reduced absolutely, then the number of Colonels must be reduced also, and the number of allowances also. But if the measure in operation be not the reduction of the strength of the army, but simply "for the purpose of effecting a new organization, while the number of men maintained is the same, or nearly the same as before, we are of opinion that, under such circumstances, it would be scarcely fair to diminish the number of Colonels' allowances.

We do not think it necessary to enter into the question how far the expectation of officers to succeed to Colonels' allowances may be regarded as included among the rights and advantages secured to them by the Parliamentary guarantee. But as a matter merely of policy or expediency, we would observe that the regimental colonelcy, with its corresponding allowance, is the prize to which the officers of the local army have been accustomed from their first entrance into the service to look forward to as the termination of their active career; and it is almost needless to add that any measure which postpones the prospect of succession to the highest paid rank of the Service must inflict a very heavy disappointment, and carry with it the sense of serious injury, if not of positive wrong, in the minds of all the officers of the Indian army.

(Signed) HOTHAM, Lieutenant-General.
C YORKE, Lieutenant-General.
A CLARKE, Major-General.
D. RUSSELL, Brigadier-General.
P M MELVILL, Colonel.
E R WETHERALL, Lieutenant-Colonel, and
H W. NORMAN, Lieutenant-Colonel.

From the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India,

8. Your memorialist, therefore, most humbly, and with the utmost deference, represents that all those grounds which led to the withdrawal of a certain number of Colonels' allowances in the Cavalry and Infantry branches of the Indian service; that is to say, first, diminished number of regiments; second, officers withdrawn from the Staff corps; and third, the annuity scheme, granting large additional pensions, have, neither directly nor indirectly, any application whatever to the artillery, although the number of Colonels' allowances withdrawn in your memorialist's regiment is, as before stated, no fewer than three out of seven, or nearly one-half of the whole number.

9. Your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly begs permission to bring under special consideration, that, while the proportion of Colonels' allowances granted to the Staff corps, is one allowance to 30 officers, the withdrawal of the three Colonels' allowances from your memorialist's regiment will leave only one Colonel's allowance to 48 officers; while, in the late Madras Artillery, before the simple conversion of organization for the purpose of amalgamation, the proportion was one Colonel's allowance to 24 officers.

10. Your memorialist may be permitted also to represent that he has paid a sum much exceeding 2,000l. to attain his present position for Colonel's allowance by the agency of the Artillery Retiring Fund,* which fund was formed and conducted under the express and cordial sanction of the Government of India as then existing, in trust for Her most Gracious Majesty the Queen; and now, after duly attaining by seniority to the next succession to the Colonel's allowance, the obtainment of which has been for years the sustaining hope of your memorialist, to find that the allowance which should fall to your memorialist is to be absorbed by Government, and that a new life is then to intervene before the allowance be obtained, is to an officer of your memorialist's length of Indian service a most grievous disappointment and great injury.

11. Your memorialist is fully sensible that, in the execution of the measures necessary to effect amalgamation, some individual interests may suffer, but your memorialist relies on the assurance that these measures shall be as little injurious to your memorialist as may be compatible with the object in view. Your memorialist, therefore, most humbly prays that he may, when he obtains the next step, and would succeed to the full allowance, if the succession were as heretofore, be granted a two-third allowance, and your memorialist receive the remaining third of the Colonels' allowance only on obtaining the second step, which, under the amalgamation rule, would give your memorialist the allowance in full.

12. Your memorialist humbly represents that by this measure the contemplated absorption of the three Colonels' allowances in the late Madras Artillery may take place without entailing that great individual distress and disappointment which must otherwise ensue, and your memorialist most earnestly prays that this measure of liberal consideration, which can be effected at a cost to the State of only one floating annuity of 400l., and which annuity, after passing in succession to each officer as he succeeded to an absorbed Colonel's allowance, would also finally disappear when the three Colonels' allowances in excess under the amalgamation had become absorbed, may be sanctioned.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

manner described in my Despatch, No. 320, of 10th August, was made upon a consideration that a certain number must be withdrawn from the list of Colonels in a given ratio to the number of officers appointed to the Staff corps, and that some further reduction would have to be made in consequence of the reduction of the number of regiments.

11. A considerable impulse has been lately given to promotion amongst the officers (Infantry and Cavalry) generally, by the retirements under the annuity scheme.

* The Artillery Retiring Fund, Madras, was broken up in 1861, consequent on amalgamation with Royal Artillery, G O G, 7th September 1832, No 205 of 1832.

† The following extract of a letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors in the Military Department to the Supreme Government, dated 6th March 1832, No. 15, is published in General Orders—

"We are very solicitous for the comfort of our officers upon retirement, and are therefore disposed cordially to encourage the institution of funds in furtherance of that desirable object.

"We regret that it is not in our power to aid the funds by direct contribution."

(44.)

The humble Memorial of Captain C. E. Taylor, Madras Staff Corps, Acting Assistant Adjutant-General of the Army, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State of India, dated Madras, 13th March 1862.

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, after a service of 20 years, of which more than 12 have been in the rank of Captain, having under the late change in the construction of the army, been obliged to make his election of future service, and finding himself grievously superseded on every side, has felt that the only course open to him was to enter the Staff corps.

2. That although your memorialist's service amounts to 20 years, and his Staff service to six and a-half years, the independent interpretations, which at different times have been passed upon the Staff corps' rules, when taken together, act so as to deprive him of no less than $\frac{2}{3}$ two-thirds of his Staff service, and consequently of his promotion to a majority in the Staff corps, which the rules, as originally issued, gave him every reason confidently to rely upon.

3. That the severity of the rules as now interpreted is so apparent, that your memorialist cannot suppose they would, under any circumstances, have been so promulgated as a whole, and he therefore feels the greatest confidence that it only requires that their operations be clearly shown to lead to their being at once dealt with on those principles of equity and justice which have ever characterized the acts of the British Government towards all under its authority.

4. That on the rules, as now interpreted, your memorialist is thus affected by them.

In the first place, your memorialist is not allowed to count as Staff service the period during which he acted in an important Staff situation, during the absence of an officer on medical certificate, and performed all the duties of the appointment and bore all its responsibilities, neither can that officer himself count it.

In the second place, your memorialist is denied the period during which, as a Staff officer, he himself has been absent on leave.

In the third place, while all officers who proceed on leave out of India, are by the new Furlough Regulations, placed on an equality, by being permitted to count as service for retirement, the necessary time allowed by regulations to enable them to reach the port of embarkation and again to rejoin, like consideration is withheld from your memorialist, in respect to his service as counting for promotion in the Staff Corps.

5. With regard to the first of these serious disabilities, it has been ruled that officiating Staff service cannot be admitted towards promotion, unless performed on a full vacancy, and then only, provided it were followed by confirmation permanently in the appointment. Your memorialist would, however, most respectfully urge, that just and equitable as this ruling may have been while an officer was deemed eligible to reckon as Staff service the period passed by him on leave, the case is quite altered when the absentee is denied that privilege, for there has been Staff service rendered to the Government, and it cannot be that Government will deny the advantages thereof, both to the absentee and also to the officer who has performed his duties and borne their responsibility; your memorialist, therefore, feels every confidence that, in soliciting the consideration of Her Majesty's Government to this, to him, important matter, his memorial will meet with a most favourable reception, and that the period* during which he acted as a Staff officer will be liberally accorded to him in full effect as Staff service.

6. It will be seen that your memorialist has served continuously in the same department since January 1856, with the short interval of four months, and while conceiving that he has a peculiarly strong claim to the period from the date of second appointment, he would earnestly urge a liberal construction to the whole, and in doing so, would further respectfully represent that the service for promotion of officers once appointed to the Staff corps is allowed in the most handsome manner to reckon as Staff service, not merely while holding acting appointments, but without ever holding any

* From January 1856 to 31st March 1857, as Brigade Major of the Provinces of Malabar and Canara, during the absence of the permanent incumbent, on sick certificate, to the Neulherries, and from July of the same year during the absence of the same officer on sick certificate to England. Your memorialist having, while acting on the last occasion, been eventually confirmed in the appointment on the officer in question obtaining his majority while in England, and since served continuously therein.

appointment at all; and your memorialist, seeing that this most liberal consideration has been granted to them by paragraph 84 of the Amalgamation Order, and further confirmed to them by answers Nos. 59 and 85, to question on the Amalgamation Order, published in General Order by the Governor General, No. 606, of 11th July 1861, and General Order by the Governor-General, No. 681, of 2d August 1861, is inspired with the strongest hope that his claim above represented, when viewed on its relative merits, will be most favourably entertained.

7. The second point of your memorialist's representation, being the rule laid down by Her Majesty's Government, in regard to the exclusion of leave from service for promotion, your memorialist has only set it forth, in order that its operation, in conjunction with the orders regarding officiating service, and the incalculable injury which your memorialist sustains by the double operations of the rules may be plainly seen.

8. That adverting to the third point instanced by your memorialist, he feels sure that a concession which has been granted on the avowed principle of justice to officers in calculating their service for retirement under the new Furlough Regulations, will, in like justice, be at once accorded to your memorialist in respect to the Staff service for promotion, and that he will be allowed the period necessarily occupied in reaching the port of embarkation and in rejoining after return on the occasion of his loss of health, requiring a return to his native country.

9. In conclusion, your memorialist would respectfully represent how very galling it is to him, after his long service as a captain, to see officers promoted over him to a majority in the Staff corps who have not performed more Staff service than himself, and he humbly hopes that, in a matter so seriously affecting his future in the army, Her Majesty's Government may be graciously pleased to pass such an equitable decision as will relieve him from the double disability under which he now suffers, and permit him to count as Staff service, either the period during which as a Staff officer he was on leave, or that during which he performed the Staff duties of another absent officer.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(45.)

From Colonel J. Fordyce, of the Bengal Artillery, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, Calcutta, dated Blackheath, 20th August 1861.

WITH reference to the 27th para. of General Order by the Governor-General of the 10th April 1861, detailing the operation for gradually reducing the number of commandants to the regiment of Her Majesty's Indian Artillery, "by promoting only three officers for every four vacancies in the number of those receiving Colonels' allowances" until the supernumeraries have been absorbed, I do myself the honour to submit, for the consideration of his Excellency the Governor-General in Council, the serious injury to my future prospects by carrying out this rule, based on no apparent principle, when the same object may be obtained in a manner which will give greater satisfaction to every officer in the junior ranks of the regiment.

The first point to be considered is the due proportion of Colonels-Commandant to the strength of officers in each regiment of Her Majesty's Indian Artillery, and this is found to be fourteen (14) to Bengal, eight (8) to Madras, and six (6) to Bombay. It is only after this number is fixed that any reduction of Commandants can be entertained with justice to the whole body of officers of Artillery at each Presidency.

The battalions of Artillery having been reorganized, to place them on the same formation as Her Majesty's Royal Artillery, consisting of eight (8) batteries each, thus doubling up the Commandants for each brigade, it is evident that instead of seven (7) there should be fourteen (14) Commandants for the Bengal Artillery, eight (8) for Madras, and six (6) for Bombay; and the present deficiencies should therefore be made good by promoting—

Colonel Horsford	} in the Bengal Regiment.	
„ Alexander		
„ Croggan		„ Madras
„ Trevelyan		„ Bombay

to complete the proper establishment in this grade.

The reduction of Commandants should follow by this rule, and agreeably to the principle established by the late Honourable Court of Directors in their letter to the

APP. G. Governor-General, dated 25th November 1823, and General Order by the Governor-General, 6th May 1824, and 31st March 1841, viz. :—

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
After 23 casualties in the General List to strike off	1	1	1
" 46 ditto ditto - - -	1	1	1
" 69 ditto ditto - - -	1	1	1
" 92 ditto ditto - - -	1	1	1
" 115 ditto ditto - - -	1	—	—
" 138 ditto ditto - - -	1	—	—
" 161 ditto ditto - - -	1	—	—
TOTAL - - -	7	4	3

—all these casualties being filled up, according to the strength laid down in the 25th para., by the infusion of officers of the Royal Artillery, as detailed in para. 33.

Any delay that may be anticipated in the reduction of Commandants by the process now submitted is clearly recognized and admitted by the 36th par. of General Order by the Governor-General, No. 332.

(46.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Poona, 17th October 1862.

THE memorial of Major-General John Hobson, of Her Majesty's Bombay Army, respectfully sheweth,—

That your memorialist entered the army of the late East India Company in the year 1820, is now upwards of 42 years and 7 months in the service, and has served 39 years and 4 months in India.

That under the terms of the despatch, dated India Office, London, 10th August 1861, ten (10) Lieutenant-Colonels, regimentally senior to your memorialist, having accepted the annuity offered, placed him in a more favourable position for the obtainment of Colonel's allowance; but he regrets to find that the names of the Lieutenant-Colonels are to be retained in italics to regulate the promotion of those who stood below them in the list.

Your memorialist begs respectfully to observe, such a measure is neither in accordance with the rules and customs that prevailed in the late Honourable East India Company's Service, nor is it in conformity with paragraph 23 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General in Council, dated Fort William, 10th April 1861; and it appears to your memorialist to invalidate part of the parliamentary guarantee of 1853, confirmed in 1860.

Your memorialist begs to bring to notice the very great injury that will thus be entailed on him, he having elected for "local service," his promotion will be greatly retarded, thereby adding to his already almost unprecedented slow promotion.

Your memorialist further begs to observe, that officers who have joined the Staff Corps can obtain Colonel's allowance in 33 years; he has already served 42 years and 4 months, four years and four months as substantive Lieutenant-Colonel; but for the ten (10) Lieutenant-Colonels above alluded to having been italicised, your memorialist might reasonably have expected in five years and a half to have obtained his Colonel's allowance, the last 20 Lieutenant-Colonels having obtained their promotion to regimental Colonel on an average of nine years, ten months, and seven days.

Should the Lieutenant-Colonels be continued on the list, contrary to your memorialist's vested rights, guaranteed to him by Acts of Parliament and General Orders, he sees but little hope of obtaining his Colonel's allowance under the 12 years specified in paragraph 12 of the Secretary of State's letter, dated 31st July 1862, to his Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor in Council, thereby making a service of upwards of fifty (50) years.

Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully solicits your protection and favourable consideration, and earnestly prays,—

That the names of the Lieutenant-Colonels who accepted the annuity may be erased from the Army List, in accordance with the usual custom and vested rights guaranteed by Acts of Parliament.

Should the number of Colonels in receipt of Colonel's allowance have to be reduced, your memorialist prays it may be done gradually, by making for the future

three promotions to four casualties, as alluded to in the Secretary of State's Despatch, No. 320, of the 10th August 1861.

(Signed) J. HOBSON, Major-General,
Her Majesty's Bombay Army.

(47.)

From Captain H. E. T. Williams, 108th Regiment (late 3d Madras European Regiment), to the Adjutant General of the Forces, Horse Guards, London; dated Jaulnah, the 8th August 1862.

With reference to the recent posting to the new line regiment, Her Majesty's 108th Foot, of Captain Shuldham, late of the 26th Madras Native Infantry, I have the honour to request it may be submitted for the favourable consideration of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, that I desire respectfully to protest against the same upon the following grounds:—

2. That Captain Shuldham volunteered for general service conditionally on being posted to the 108th Regiment, but that belonging to a Native regiment, and not to one of the "older local European regiments," he was not by the Amalgamation Order permitted the privilege of so selecting the regiment he might be desirous of belonging to, but simply to volunteer for general service unconditionally.

3. By the Amalgamation Order, para. 55, officers of the Native Army volunteering for "general service" are eventually to receive new commissions from Her Majesty, bearing the same dates respectively as the "commissions they now hold," but no reference is made to the position they may ultimately hold in the new corps; whereas to us, the officers of the "three older local European regiments," it is pledged by para. 53 "that we shall hold a position in the new regiments as far as possible the same as that which we held in the old ones." Captain Shuldham, by his condition, avails himself of the pledge to the officers of the "old local European regiments," finds his position in the three regiments by comparison of dates of commission, and, in the faith of the pledge of my not losing (and probably gaining) in position, chooses the 108th Regiment, as in taking precedence of me, the date of his commission being six months prior to that of mine, he at once secures himself several steps, his position in the list of Captains in the 26th Native Infantry being considerably lower than that of mine in the 3d Europeans. This, I would respectfully submit, is at variance with the letter and the spirit of the "Amalgamation Order," in giving an officer of the Native army a most undue advantage over the officers of the local European regiments.

4. His Royal Highness will not fail to observe that by giving the officers of Native regiments the privilege of selecting the corps to which they were desirous of belonging, they thereby obtain the undue advantage of having an opportunity of ascertaining, with a tolerable degree of accuracy, what advantage they would gain in making their selection between three corps; whereas the officers of the old local European regiments, by para. 52 of the Order, had only the option of taking general service in their own corps, or the miserable alternative (to which Captain Shuldham was not subjected) of finding themselves in the local service without a regiment.

5. I accepted the conditions of general service after due consideration of the Order in its every bearing; and when, on my return to India in February 1862, I heard that Captain Shuldham had volunteered conditionally on being posted to the 108th Regiment, I at once applied to the Adjutant-General's Office, Fort St. George, for confirmation of the report, which was refused; and I was told by Lieutenant-Colonel Cook, the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army, that I had no authority or grounds for supposing such to be the case, and that an appeal I suggested making would be premature, and not likely to be attended to. It has been accordingly deferred. The posting has now been duly gazetted, and I at once respectfully but most earnestly appeal to His Royal Highness against it, as a deviation from the literal interpretation of the Order.

6. The "original" of this letter has been forwarded through the prescribed channel; and I therefore trust, as it is to obviate delay, His Royal Highness will not disapprove of my sending the "duplicate" of my letter direct.

(48.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Major George Baldock, of the Madras Staff Corps,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, previous to his admission to the Madras Staff corps, on its formation in February 1861, held the appointment of Fort Adjutant of Fort Saint George, and that on being necessitated, in December 1855, to return to England on sick certificate, he was compelled, in order to retain his appointment, to elect for the new Furlough Regulations* as laid down in para. 2 of those regulations.

2. Para. 3 of the same regulations applies the General Order of the Governor-General, quoted in the margin, to Staff officers thus situated with retrospective effect; consequently all leave from date of admission to the service, on private affairs or on sick certificate, in India or beyond sea, excepting to the authorized extent as laid down in para. 30 of the above-quoted General Order of the Governor-General, is deducted from their service in computing time for retirement; the result being that those officers of the Staff Corps who were in Staff employ between the publication of the new Furlough Regulations in November 1854, and the formation of the Staff corps in February 1861, who were so unfortunate as to have been compelled to take sick-leave during that period and elect those rules, are now unable to reckon service for retirement in the same way and under the same regulations as their brother officers. Moreover, since it has been ruled that officers of the Staff corps shall be pensioned according to length of service only, the question submitted for consideration has increased greatly in importance as affects their prospects.

3 Officers joining the Staff Corps, although having no option as to Furlough Regulations, are permitted, in reply to Question 56, in General Orders of the Governor-General, Nos. 584 and 606, of 9th and 11th July 1861, to reckon service for pension by whatever rules may have applied to them up to date of joining, thus setting aside the provisions of para. 3 of the new Furlough Regulations in their case, and granting them the benefits of both old and new regulations.

4. In conclusion, your memorialist respectfully prays to be placed on a more equal footing with his brother officers on the Staff corps in computing service for retirement, and that he may therefore be permitted to count service for retirement, according to the old Furlough Regulations, up to the 27th November 1855, on which date he was obliged to elect for the new Furlough Regulations.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

(Signed) G. BALDOCK, Major,
Madras Staff Corps.
Fort St. George,
20th November 1862.

(49.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel John Stewart, Retired List Madras Infantry, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort St. George; dated Boulogne, 4th August 1862.

PREVIOUSLY to leaving England for the continent a few weeks ago, I received a communication from the Secretary, Military Fund, informing me that as my promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff corps had been cancelled by order of Government, I could no longer be allowed to subscribe to the fund as a Lieutenant-Colonel.

2. Averse as I am to bringing anything like a personal grievance before the notice of Government, still as this is a penalty affecting not merely myself, but my family, I trust his Excellency in Council may be pleased to refer my case for the re-consideration of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, on the following grounds, should they appear to him sufficient to warrant such a step being taken:—

3. When I accepted the terms so liberally offered by the notification dated "India Office, 12th August 1861," to field officers of the Line and Staff Corps, I certainly never anticipated that they were, in my case, to be followed by any penalties. The order* itself is clear and unequivocal, admitting of no capricious interpreta-

* The Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors of Cavalry and Infantry who have elected for service with the new Line regiments, or in the Staff, will have the option of retiring on the terms now offered.

tion, as all orders affecting the rights and privileges of officers should be.

4. It is true an after order was issued by the Home Government before I left the service, prohibiting officers from joining the Staff corps for the purpose of retiring. I write from memory merely, having no means of referring to orders here.

5. I was anxious to ascertain whether this order could possibly be made applicable to me, who had joined the Staff corps before the offer of extra retiring annuities had been received or heard of. Being unable to obtain any official information on the subject, I consulted several officers, who, from their experience, ability, and position, might be supposed able to read an order in the sense which it was intended to convey, and they all expressed their opinion that it did not and could not apply to my case.

6. I venture again respectfully to repeat that on joining the Staff corps, I did so with the full intention of remaining in the service, and would submit that it is but scant justice to an old officer, who has served the State to the best of his ability for 31 years, to visit him with pains and penalties enacted by *ex post facto* rules after he had retired from the service.

7. So evenly was my mind balanced about taking or not taking the extra pension offered, that had I for a moment understood that my acceptance of it would be followed by my degradation from the rank to which I had been promoted, and the forfeiture of advantages for which I had subscribed in the Military Fund, I declare upon my honour that I would not have retired.

8. I was within a year of full Colonel's pension from length of service; I had health, I had a good appointment, the duties of which, I may perhaps be allowed on this occasion to state, I had always performed to the satisfaction of my official superiors. Whatever, therefore, may have been the temptation held out to old officers generally by the offer of extra pension to retire, to me, circumstanced as I was, the extra pension was a matter of very little moment, although my gratitude for it would not on that account have been diminished had I been left free to enjoy it, without the unpleasant reflection that I had, in accepting it, seriously affected my wife's claims on the Military Fund.

9. It is far from my wish or object to draw invidious comparisons, but I cannot be blind to the fact that Artillery and Engineer officers, who had been promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel under the reorganization rules of their branch of the service, have been allowed to retire without any loss of privileges.

10. On the foregoing grounds, and considering my position in the Line when I retired, I should be greatly obliged by a reconsideration of my claims to retain the rank I held in the Staff corps, and to the additional honorary step of rank usual on retirement. I trust his Excellency the Governor of Madras in Council will acquit me of presumption if I say that my services have not merited degradation on retiring.

(50.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Alexander Tod, Major in the Madras Staff Corps, and Paymaster of the Nagpore Force, Kamptee.

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT a direct and serious injury has been inflicted upon him by the alteration of the conditions on which he elected to serve in the Madras Staff corps.

2. That whereas under the Retiring Regulations of the Indian Service, alike those of 1796 as of 1836, both made applicable to the Staff corps, when he was called upon to elect, as well by the Governor-General's Order of the 10th April 1861 as by the Royal Warrant of the 5th February 1861, he was (and had been from the 1st January 1861) entitled to retire on the pension of the substantive rank he had attained, he will not, under the ruling of Despatch 799 of 1861, dated 10th September, be entitled to the same in the Staff corps until the 1st January 1863.

3. That he is thereby placed in a worse position for retirement by entering the Staff corps than if he had remained with his old regiment, the 42d Madras Native Infantry, and in lieu of receiving any undue advantage, suffers a direct and serious injury.

4. That this could not possibly have been foreseen or anticipated by him when he made his election, under the distinct and explicit terms of para. 9 of the Royal Warrant, para. 95 of the Governor-General's Order of

APP. G.

10th April 1861, and the Governor-General's answer to Question 50, published in General Order of the Governor-General, 11th July 1861.

5. That he was mainly influenced to elect the Staff corps by the consideration that it would give him the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and the pension of the same on the 18th February 1863, a little earlier than he could have anticipated the same promotion if he had remained in his old regiment.

6. That this impression was almost, if not quite, universal in the army, and appears to have been held by those in authority in India; for your memorialist wrote privately to Colonel Woods, Adjutant-General of the Madras army, when he volunteered to enter the Staff corps, to the effect that he did so under the full impression that his service, general and Staff, was such as entitled him to promotion to the rank of Major from the 18th February last, and that all the privileges as to pay and pension pertaining to that substantive rank belonged to it in the Staff corps; that otherwise he did not wish to enter it with his prospect of early regimental promotion.

7. That this title to promotion and pension in respect to rank obtained in the Staff corps would not seem to confer any undue advantage upon an officer of 29 years' standing, as from the statement of service accompanying it will appear your memorialist will be on the 18th February 1863, if he lives.

8. That any benefit it may confer can but be justly viewed in the light of limited compensation for the injury amalgamation has inflicted upon officers of long service, whose promotion has been slow, through the destruction of their prospects of receiving a retiring bonus from their brother officers. Your memorialist's direct loss in this respect may be fairly estimated at 2,000*l*.

9. That your memorialist has, through no fault of his own, but through the misfortune of having suffered in health, been twice compelled to resort to his native land in the course of his service, and so alone has failed to complete the period of actual Indian service required to entitle him to the pension of his present rank, irrespective of regimental promotion. He is thus peculiarly thrown upon the beneficent provision in such cases of the paragraph (32 New Furlough Regulations), just now so unexpectedly excerpted from the regulations made generally applicable to officers going into the Staff corps.

10. He does therefore earnestly pray—

1st That the privilege he so unwittingly abandoned, viz., that of retiring on the pension of his substantive rank, may be restored to him in the Staff corps, unconditionally, or,

2d That he may be allowed to retire on the pension of the rank he has attained or may attain in the Staff corps, so soon at least as his name appears posted to corresponding rank in the cadre of his old regiment, or,

3d That he may be allowed to reconsider his election; and further,

4th. That his service as an orderly officer for two years and two months, in 1839-40, at the Military College, Addiscombe, may be allowed to count as service towards retirement, on the principle which is now accorded in respect to service out of India.

(Signed) ALEXANDER TOD, Major,
Madras Staff Corps, Paymaster,
Nagpore Force.

Kamptee, 28th October 1861.

STATEMENT OF SERVICE.

Major ALEXANDER TOD, Madras Corps.

Date of First Commission, 15th February 1834. Admitted on the Establishment, 10th June 1834.

	yrs	mths	dys.
Total period of Service, up to 31st December 1861, will be	27	6	21
Leave—England and India (all but two months of it on medical certificate), and of it two years and two months spent on duty as an orderly officer at the Military College, Addiscombe	7	6	21
Of which counts for retirement	3	0	0
Leaving to be deducted from service		4	6
And to count for retirement on 1st January 1862	23	0	0
Staff service in India	11	0	0

(Signed) ALEXANDER TOD, Major,
Madras Staff Corps.

Kamptee, 28th October 1861.

(51.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, &c. &c., London.

The humble Memorial of Major C. C. M'Callum,
Madras Staff Corps.

Showeth—

1. THAT with reference to a military letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, No. 296, dated 25th July 1861, promulgated by the Government of India in General Orders, dated Fort William, 10th September 1861, wherein it is decided that officers of the Staff corps shall not be entitled "to claim the pension according to rank, in respect of rank obtained in the Staff corps," your memorialist has the honour respectfully to solicit a reconsideration of this question, in as far as it affects your memorialist's future prospects and position, on the following grounds:—

2. That in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant of the 16th January 1861, in para. 9, after providing a scale of pensions for officers who may hereafter join the Staff corps, it is explicitly stated that "officers of Her Majesty's Indian Forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pension under the Regulations of the Indian service."

3. That in the "Old Furlough and Retiring Regulations" of the Indian service, para. 9, it is stated, "Every officer who has completed 22 years' service in India is allowed to retire with the pay of the rank to which he has attained."

4. That in the "New Furlough and Retiring Regulations" of the Indian service, it is stated, in para. 32, "Officers to be entitled to retire on the full pay of their regimental rank, under the Regulations of 1796,* must have served 22 years in India, out of which leave of absence for two years in the aggregate, and no more, will be allowed to count as service for the retiring pension."

5. That these are the rules and regulations under which officers of the Indian service have been permitted to retire and claim their pension for the past 66 years, and are the only "Regulations of the Indian Service" referred to in the paragraph of Her Majesty's Royal Warrant above quoted.

6. That it was again announced to the army, by the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, in the General Order of the 10th April 1861, para. 95, that "officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the regulations of the Indian service;" and the order then proceeds to lay down a scale of pensions for officers of the British army hereafter entering the Staff corps, thereby, as it seems to your memorialist, in accordance with Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, clearly establishing that officers of Her Majesty's Indian service then joining the Staff corps, were not to be placed in the same category as officers of Her Majesty's British Forces hereafter entering the Staff corps as to the rules regarding claim to pension.

7. That the rank given to officers in the Staff corps by Her Majesty's Royal Warrant is substantive and not brevet rank, and should therefore, your memorialist respectfully submits, under every interpretation of the "Retiring Rules" of the Indian service, carry with it the right to retire on the pension of that rank, after 22 years actual service in India.

8. That your memorialist has been 25 years in the Indian army, and will shortly have completed 22 years' actual service in India. That your memorialist entered the Staff corps as Major; and his right to retire on a Major's pension at any future period, should he elect to do so under the regulations of the Indian service, is annulled by the present decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India before quoted.

This decision is now for the first time made known to the Indian army. Your memorialist begs most respectfully to submit that this decision sweeps away a most vital and essential part of the "Retiring Regulations" of the Indian service, which regulations have been in existence now for the past 66 years, and which, after the assurances given in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, and the orders of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, published to the army, your memorialist never could have contemplated would now have been set aside.

9. That by paras. 4 and 5 of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State's letter before quoted, it is shown that the modified right still preserved to local officers of retiring under the "Indian Regulations" with that rank only which they may hold at the time of joining

* Com known the "C Furlough Regulat ions," quoted above.

the Staff corps, would operate favourably only for those very few officers who might have been unusually fortunate in their previous promotion.

Your memorialist submits that there is probably not one single officer in the Madras Staff corps who would derive any advantage whatever from the above decision.

Your memorialist begs, therefore, respectfully to ask that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India may be pleased to extend some consideration towards your Memorialist, who hitherto has not been fortunate in his promotion.

Your memorialist begs most respectfully to represent that one of his chief aims in joining the Staff corps was, if possible, to remedy in some degree the inequality of fortune in promotion; and one of the greatest incentives was the gracious and liberal boon, which your memorialist thought was conveyed in explicit and unmistakable terms in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, namely, that your memorialist would be allowed to retire on the pension of his rank, whenever he might elect to do so, after 22 years' actual service in India, in accordance with the "Pension and Retiring Regulations" of the Indian Service.

10. Your memorialist ventures to hope that it cannot be the intention of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India to place an officer joining the Staff corps in a worse and more disadvantageous position, as to pension, than he would have been in had he remained with his regiment.

But this must be the effect of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State's present decision in your memorialist's case.

For your memorialist is senior Captain of his former regiment, the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry; your memorialist may, therefore, at any moment become a Major regimentally by the decease or retirement of the officer above him in the regiment; and your memorialist will most certainly be a Major in his former regiment years before he is entitled, under the present decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to take his Major's pension.

Yet, had your memorialist remained in his old regiment, and not joined the Staff corps, your memorialist would have been entitled, directly he attained his majority, to take the pension of a Major. As your memorialist has shown, this may occur immediately; but your memorialist is denied his right to pension by the present decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, only because your memorialist has joined the Staff corps.

11. The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India has decided that officers should not be permitted to enter the Staff corps for the mere purpose of immediately retiring in the rank to which they might be promoted in the Staff corps.

But your memorialist ventures to hope that this rule, just in itself, may not be made to operate with undue rigour against your memorialist, who may wish to claim his right to retire from the service in years to come.

12. On all the foregoing grounds, therefore, your memorialist most respectfully requests a reconsideration of this matter, and that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India may be pleased to restore to your memorialist the right to retire, after 22 years' actual service in India, on the pension of whatever rank your memorialist may eventually attain to, in accordance with the "Pension Regulations" of the Indian Service, guaranteed by Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, by the Orders of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, and by the repeated assurances of Her Majesty's British Government, and the decree of the High Court of Parliament, that all rights and privileges of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces should be scrupulously preserved intact.

And, as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) C. C. M'CALLUM,
Major, Madras Staff Corps.

Ootacamund, 9th November 1861.

(52.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, &c &c., London.

The humble Memorial of Major J. E. MAYNE, Madras Staff Corps,

Humbly sheweth,—

THAT, it having been decided by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India "that officers of the Staff corps shall not be entitled to claim the pension according to rank in respect of rank obtained in the

"Staff corps," your memorialist humbly solicits a reconsideration of that decision, as being, for the following reasons, most detrimental to your memorialist.

APP. G.

1st. That in the Royal Warrant of 16th January 1861, para. 9, it is stated in so many words that "Officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pension under the regulations of the Indian Service," in contradistinction to officers of the Royal Army so joining the Staff corps, for whom, and for whom alone, a scale of pensions is laid down in the paragraph alluded to.

2dly. That in para. 9 of the Old and 32 of the New Furlough and Retiring Regulations respectively, it is provided that "every officer who has completed 22 years' service in India is allowed to retire with the pay of the rank to which he has attained," and "officers, to be entitled to retire on the full pay of their regimental rank under the regulations of 1796, must have served 22 years in India, out of which leave of absence for two years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service for the retiring pension," and that these are the "Retiring Regulations of the Indian Service" alluded to in para. 9 of the Royal Warrant above quoted.

Para. 9

Para. 32

3dly. That the rank held by officers of the Staff corps is substantive, and may be said to be their *only* rank; for that held by them in the cadre of their former regiments, and on the full pay of which they would have been entitled to retire after 22 years' actual service, is not recognized after having joined the Staff corps. Thus, were a Major of the Staff corps at the expiration of 22 years' actual service in India, to find himself a Major in the cadre of his former regiment (with the late rapid promotion, consequent on so many retirements, by no means improbable) he would not be permitted to retire on the full pay of that rank, but only on that of a Captain, because, according to the scale laid down in para. 9 of the Royal Warrant (intended solely for officers of the Royal Army), it is provided that they must serve 24 years to entitle them to a Major's pension. This will in all probability be your memorialist's case.

4thly. That your memorialist humbly submits that he could not with justice be asked, "Then why did you join the Staff corps?" for the disadvantage in the matter of retirement, to which he has alluded, could not, from the wording of para. 9 of the Royal Warrant, have been foreseen by him or any other officer joining the Staff corps; on the contrary, it appeared to your memorialist that it guaranteed that the Retiring Regulations of the Indian Service, as applicable to him, were to be in no way changed by his having joined the Staff corps, and that there was no possibility of his finding himself in a *worse* position, as regards retirement, than if he had remained in his regiment.

5thly. That it appears that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State has been partly led to this decision by the apprehension that some officers had joined or might join the Staff corps solely with a view to get a step in rank, and then immediately or shortly afterwards to retire on the full pay of that rank, or, so to speak, to make a convenience of the Staff corps; that, had your memorialist had any intention of so acting, he would not now presume to address you: and he humbly trusts that a decision which has been published to prevent such an abuse may not be permitted to act injuriously on your memorialist, who joined the Staff corps in all good faith, and whose intention was and is, if health and strength are granted to him, to serve Her Majesty for years to come.

6thly. That, for the above reasons, your memorialist most respectfully begs a reconsideration of this question, and humbly trusts that thereon he may find himself enabled (should he wish to do so) to retire on the pension of his rank in the Staff corps after 22 years' actual service (including two years' leave); a privilege granted to him by the Pension Regulations of the Indian Service, and further, he humbly submits, guaranteed to him by Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, and included, moreover, among those rights and privileges enjoyed by the officers of Her Majesty's Indian Forces, which the High Court of Parliament have decreed shall be faithfully preserved to them.

And, as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) J. E. MAYNE, Major,
Madras Staff Corps,
Late 8th Regiment Light Cavalry.

Trichinopoly, 10th January 1862.

APP. G.

(53.)

From Lieutenant J. G. Lindsay, Madras Engineers, to the Right Honourable Sir C. Wood, Bart., Secretary of State for India.

Hallcraig House, Carlisle, N.B.,
19th May 1862.

SIR,
I HAVE the honour to bring the following circumstances to your notice, with a request that you will have the goodness to take the matter into consideration:—

When the order for the amalgamation of the Indian Army with Her Majesty's troops was issued, it was stated that the Indian Engineers would be assimilated in every way with the Royal Engineers, and, to a certain extent, this has been done.

The Indian corps of Engineers did not gain in promotion by these changes, because at the same time the number of battalions was reduced.

To complete the assimilation to the Royal Engineers, but one further change was wanted, and to that all officers in the Indian Engineers eagerly looked forward. It was the system of "seconding," which has long been carried out in the Royal Artillery and Engineers.

"Seconding" simply means that, when an officer is appointed to some duty of a nature foreign to the usual duties of engineer officers, his name is placed in "italics," and another officer is brought on the strength of the corps; thus, officers of the Royal Engineers, when employed as Consuls, are always "seconded," and other officers are placed on the effective list.

I am unaware why the system of "seconding" has not been carried out in the Indian corps. The promotion it would give is but trifling, and would still leave the junior officers far behind their contemporaries in the Royal Engineers; it would, however, be a great boon, and would cause much satisfaction if conceded.

Officers in the Department of Public Works in India are in exactly the same position as district officers in the Royal Engineers. I have served in both, and am, therefore, qualified to speak of the similarity of the duties. It would be out of the question to consider appointments in the Department of Public Works as "Staff" and to "second" all officers employed in it.

If it were ruled that officers employed on duties other than Public Works or Sappers should be seconded, it would cause just five steps in the Madras Engineers; three officers in civil employ, one the Principal of Civil Engineering College, and another in the Railway Department, would have their names put in "italics;" and five junior officers would be promoted to take their places on the effective list.

As officers of the Indian Engineers now belong to corps that are being allowed to die out, they cannot look to an augmentation or other occasional promotion; and as they are already so far behind their brother officers in the Royal Engineers, I respectfully submit that the benefit arising from the system of "seconding" might with justice be granted. I beg, therefore, that you will kindly take it into your consideration.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JAS. G. LINDSAY,
Lieutenant, Royal (late Madras) Engineers.

(54.)

3, Moira Place, Southampton,
30th August 1862.

DEAR SIR,

I VENTURE to hope that an old soldier, who entered the Madras Cavalry so far back as the year 1811, may be excused the liberty he takes in respectfully soliciting the attention of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India to the very serious injury apparently impending over the Madras Cavalry officers by their almost total exclusion from the newly formed Hussar regiments, for which, in common with the officers of the Bengal and Bombay Cavalry, they were invited to volunteer.

The Amalgamation Order, promulgated, after mature consideration, by Her Majesty's Government, provided for the officering of the intended new European cavalry regiments on the following specific basis, namely, that two of those regiments should be officered by volunteers from the Bengal Cavalry, and the remaining one by volunteers from the Madras and Bombay Cavalry.

Considering that the conjoined Presidencies exhibit 11 cadres of cavalry corps to 10* of Bengal, a more equal division might not unreasonably have been anticipated; but Government having, on whatever grounds, determined otherwise, it only remained to hope that the arrangement ordered would be carried out in its integrity, and that the minor portion thereby assigned to

the Madras and Bombay Cavalry would be secure to them intact, in accordance with the implied pledge of Government. Reference to the list of postings published in "Allen's Indian Mail" of the 22d instant, and stated to have been transmitted for the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, will show that, in so far at least as the Madras Cavalry officers are concerned, this expectation is not likely to be realized.

According to that list, the officering of the three Hussar regiments has been made over substantially to the Bengal Cavalry. Bombay, from its three cadres of Cavalry corps being, however, allowed to supply one Lieutenant-Colonel and two Captains, the proportionate equivalent of three from Madras would be, at the lowest estimate, two field officers and five Captains, or one field officer and seven Captains; instead of which, Madras, from its eight cadres of Cavalry corps and 18 Volunteers (exclusive of the general list), has only had one Captain and one Lieutenant posted to the Hussar regiments, and this notwithstanding that, from the list, it would appear that four field officers and five Captains are wanting to complete.

The apparent hardship of the case is not a little aggravated if considered with advertence to the damage already sustained by the Madras Cavalry consequent upon the reductions which have been found necessary. The summary disbandment of four out of the eight regiments of Madras Cavalry threw out of employ, with considerable loss of emoluments, a large body of officers, who, having no field for employment, as at the other two Presidencies, in corps of irregular Cavalry, were posted to do duty with the remaining four regiments, to take position therein according to rank and relative dates of commission; thence of necessity depriving of command and its emoluments many officers belonging to those regiments who, in their own right as Captains or by virtue of seniority, had become entitled to the same. That much of heart-burning and unpleasant feeling would result from these circumstances might be naturally expected, and when to this be superadded the very serious inconvenience and discomfort to officers, married and single, from want of houses, caused by the sudden doubling of the commissioned ranks, it must be conceded that officers could not well be placed in a more disagreeable position. And here, where an opening had occurred for easing the pressure, and affording suitable provision for a few of these unfortunate officers, it is apparently closed against them.

But having brought the case to your notice, I feel sure that I have done all that is necessary, and that in completing the arrangements for officering the Hussars, the just claims of the officers of the Madras Cavalry will meet with due consideration. This will involve no interference with promotion to the grades of field officer, the volunteers from the Madras Cavalry being below the rank of Major.

Trusting that my long connexion with this arm of the service will plead an excuse for the liberty I have taken in trespassing thus largely upon your attention,

I beg to remain, &c.
(Signed) S. BULLOCK,
Major-General, Retired Service.

(55.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Major-General J. Swanson, late of the Bombay Staff Corps,

Showeth,

THAT Major-General Swanson entered the military service of the late East India Company on the 13th February 1821. He arrived in Bombay on the 11th July 1821, and served in India, without intermission, until the 12th October 1859, a period of 38 years and three months, when he was compelled, by the loss of health, to return to England on medical certificate. He was absent on this account for 18 months, and again arrived in Bombay on the 13th April 1861. He had then been a regimental Colonel for five and a half years; and as the officers of this rank in the Infantry of the Bombay army had seldom, if ever, been more than 10 years before being promoted to the rank of Colonel regimentally, he had every reason to expect the same promotion and the Colonel's allowance in the same period, or within a further period of about four and a half years.

2. The General Order by the Government of India, No. 332, of the 10th April 1861, gave publicity to Her Majesty's Warrant, dated the 16th January 1861, for the formation of Staff corps at each of the three Presi-

dencies, and to the Despatches from the Secretary of State for India, announcing Her Majesty's gracious intentions regarding the officers and men of the Indian forces, and the conditions prescribed and offers made to them on their amalgamation with Her Majesty's general forces.

3. In the Royal Warrant it is laid down, in Rule 2, that "promotion in the Staff corps to be governed by length of service;" and in Rule 3, "officers now in Staff employment in India, joining the Staff corps on its formation, shall count their previous Staff service towards promotion, to the following extent: one step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it, according to the above rules." No mention is made in the Royal Warrant of the substantive rank of Colonel, or of Colonel regimentally, and consequently no period of service is prescribed for such rank; but it is provided in the 8th Rule, that "eventually a certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps will receive Colonel's allowance;" and it is declared in the 11th Rule "that this Warrant shall be administered and interpreted by our Secretary of State for India in Council, who shall be the sole and standing authority upon the matters therein contained."

4. In the Despatch from the Secretary of State, No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, accompanying the Warrant, it is announced in the 30th paragraph, "the 8th Rule provides, that a certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps shall receive Colonel's allowance. Eventually the number will be fixed in the proportion of one for every 30 officers on the Staff corps, but this number can only be filled up as the establishment of Colonels on the old footing diminishes, so that the aggregate number of officers receiving Colonel's allowance at one time shall never exceed the regulated number of Colonel's allowance for each Presidency." And in the 8th paragraph of the same Despatch: "the promotion of field officers (of the Indian army) will go on as usual, in separate lists of Majors, Lieutenant-Colonels, and Colonels regimentally of Cavalry and Infantry; but a gradual reduction will be made in the number of regimental Colonels entitled to Colonel's allowances, in due proportion to the reduction in the number of regiments. The extent to which this reduction is to be carried will be determined hereafter; but it must be commenced at once in Bengal, by promoting only three Lieutenant-Colonels for every four vacancies in the rank of Colonel regimentally."

5. A reduction of four regiments of Infantry of the Bombay army was then made, and Major-General (then Colonel) Swanson had every reason to apprehend that a corresponding reduction would be made in the number of Colonels receiving Colonel's allowance before it came to his turn to be promoted, by which his promotion would be retarded in the proportion of three to four, or from about four-and-a-half to at least six years; and as he expected to be one of the first of the senior officers in the Staff corps to receive the Colonel's allowance he applied, and was appointed to the Bombay Staff corps in the month of September 1861.

6. He was the senior Lieutenant-Colonel of all the officers appointed to the Bombay Staff corps; and, as it was announced in paragraph 102 of the General Order by the Government of India, No. 332, of the 10th April 1861, that "officers of the Staff corps will succeed to Colonel's allowance, according to their seniority, as Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff corps," he would have been entitled to the first Colonel's allowance in the Staff corps had the reduction in the number of regimental Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry been carried out as announced in paragraphs 8 and 30 of the Despatch No. 27; but another Despatch from the Secretary of State, No. 320, of the 10th August 1861, was afterwards published, in which annuities, according to a graduated scale, were offered to the regimental field officers of the three Presidencies; and it was announced in the 17th paragraph, "considering the very liberal provision now offered to the senior effective officer of the Indian army, and the very great expense that will be entailed upon the Government of India thereby, the most obvious and equitable mode of effecting the reduction, so as at once to make compensation for the severe strain that would otherwise be imposed upon our finances, will be to retain upon the list of Lieutenant-Colonels in the several Presidencies the names of such of their body as retire under the conditions now offered, and to regulate the succession to Colonel and to Colonel's allowance thereby. This arrangement, therefore,

"will supersede that detail in paragraph 8 of my Despatch, No. 27."

7. The reduction that had been ordered in the Despatch, No. 27, by making only three promotions for every four casualties in the rank of regimental Colonels, would have retarded the promotion of Major-General Swanson in the same proportions; and he therefore joined the Staff corps, but the reduction as ordered in the Despatch No. 320, of the 10th August, by making no promotions, only when it came to the turn of a Lieutenant-Colonel to be promoted who had retired on an annuity, would have little or no effect in retarding the promotion of Lieutenant-Colonels for some years, and Major-General Swanson would have been promoted to Colonel regimentally in the usual period, if he had not entered the Staff corps. The provision contained in the 30th paragraph of the Despatch No. 27, for filling up the authorized number of Colonel's allowances in the Staff corps "as the establishment of Colonels on the old footing diminishes," was also rendered null by the Despatch of the 10th August, the saving by the reduction in the number of Colonels being required to compensate the Government for the very great expense entailed by the grant of the annuities. Major-General Swanson therefore applied on the 30th November 1861, to have his appointment to the Staff corps cancelled, the conditions in the Despatch No. 27, under which he had entered the corps, having been abrogated by the Despatch of the 10th August 1861, but to his application he received no reply.

8. The health of Major-General Swanson, which had not been completely re-established by a short residence of 16 months in England, after a continuous service of more than 38 years in India, again failed, and he was advised by the medical authorities in Bombay to return to England. If he had not been in the Staff corps, he would have left India on medical certificate, and he would have been nearly certain to be promoted to Colonel regimentally, within the period during which he might be absent without prejudice to this promotion; but according to paragraph 33 of the Despatch No. 27, "No unemployed officer of the Staff corps under the rank of Major-General will be allowed to draw pay for a longer period than one year on the Indian scale, and three years on the lower scale after which period he will be placed on half-pay," and as he was then without any near prospect of being promoted to Major-General, if he had left India, he must not only return, but be again employed within a period of four years, or leave the service. Even the succession to Colonel's allowance would not apparently have saved him from this contingency. As his health would not allow him to remain in India, and he had no certainty of being able to return and be again employed within the period of four years, during which he might be unemployed, he very reluctantly availed himself, on the last day on which it was open to him, of the offer of an annuity contained in the Despatch No. 320, of the 10th August 1861, and retired from the service on the 31st December 1861, on the very inadequate annuity of 280*l.*, after a service of nearly 41 years.

9. He left India on the 12th January 1862, and after his departure another Despatch from the Secretary of State, No. 467, of the 3d December 1861, was published, the 12th to 14th paragraphs of which are as follows: "Her Majesty's Government have therefore decided that Colonels' allowances shall at once be assigned to the several Staff corps in the proportion of one Colonel's allowance to every 30 officers who have actually joined the Staff corps. To these allowances officers who have attained the rank of Colonel in the army, and have served not less than 12 years in the substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, will succeed according to seniority as Lieutenant-Colonels, until the proposed establishment is completed to the relative strength of one in 30 officers of all ranks. The necessity for a qualifying term of service will then cease, and officers will succeed by seniority as vacancies occur."

10. According to the Royal Warrant, promotion in the Staff corps is to be governed entirely by length of service, and officers become Captains, Majors, and Lieutenant-Colonels respectively, after certain specified terms of service, but no service is required in any rank beyond an interval of two years between each succeeding step, except for the rank of brevet Colonel, for which a service of five years as Lieutenant-Colonel is required, this being the service required in all other branches of Her Majesty's Forces. A Lieutenant who joined the Staff corps on its formation may become a Lieutenant-Colonel in four years if only he has been sufficiently long in the

APP. G.

army and on Staff employment. But by the Despatch of the 3d December, an officer in the Staff corps must serve not less than 12 years as a Lieutenant-Colonel, before he is qualified to succeed to the Colonel's allowance, until the full establishment of one to every 30 officers is completed, and this in a corps the promotion in which is regulated entirely by length of service, and for a position which brings no increase of rank, and can cause no supercession. The rule will operate unequally on the officers of the Staff corps, for while all officers entering the Staff corps after its formation will be fully qualified after a service of 38 years, of which 20 will have been in the corps; those who entered the corps on its formation may have much longer to serve; for instance, Major-General Swanson would have had to serve 47 years and seven months to complete a service of 12 years as regimental Lieutenant-Colonel. The only officers who derive no advantage from previous Staff service, are the Lieutenant-Colonels who have entered the corps with the rank of brevet Colonel or General Officer. It would only be a fair application of the rule to add the service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel required by the Despatch of the 3d December 1861, to qualify for the Colonel's allowance, to the periods of service required by the Royal Warrant to entitle to promotion to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; all officers in the Staff corps would then be equally qualified for the Colonel's allowance after a service of 38 years, and of 20 in the Staff corps or on Staff employment, and this is all that is necessary on the part of officers who have entered the corps since its formation.

11. A military letter from the Secretary of State, No. 270, of the 31st July 1862, was published in India on the 12th September last, in which it is admitted that the rules laid down in the Despatch, No. 320, of the 10th August 1861, have given just cause of complaint, and it is announced in the 12th and 13th paragraphs of the letter—"In order to remove any reasonable ground of complaint Her Majesty's Government have determined that all regimental Lieutenant-Colonels remaining on the general list of the local armies in the three Presidencies, whose commissions as such date prior to the 1st January 1862, shall be considered entitled to promotion to the rank and allowances of Colonel, when they shall have been 12 years in the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel; provided, however, that no promotion under this rule shall take place until those not in any way affected by the retention of the names of the retired officers on the list shall have received the step in ordinary course. All officers who may have held the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on the 1st January 1862, will also be entitled to promotion to the superior grade of Colonel, with Colonels' allowances, if the step come to them in ordinary course before the completion of 12 years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel; but when these Lieutenant-Colonels have been removed from the list, the promotion of those whose commissions bear date on the 1st January 1862, or subsequently, will only be made, as in the Staff corps, after 12 years' service in that grade." It appears to have been lost sight of, that it is laid down in the Despatch of the 3d December 1861, that the necessity for a qualifying term of service in the Staff corps is to cease when the established proportion of Colonels' allowances in that corps has been completed, and that officers will then succeed by seniority as vacancies occur. Nothing more is required than what is contained in this letter of the 31st July last to show that the measures adopted for regulating the succession to Colonel's allowance, on the reorganization of the Indian army, were incomplete and unsatisfactory.

12. Major-General Swanson complains that he was induced by the announcements in paragraphs 8 and 30 of the Despatch, No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, to leave the local army and to enter the Staff corps, which inducements were afterwards annulled by the Despatch, No. 320, of the 10th August 1861; that he was not allowed to leave the Staff corps and to revert to the position which he had previously occupied when the conditions under which he had joined the Staff corps were abrogated, that he was then compelled, by the position in which he found himself, to retire from the service on a very inadequate annuity for his length of service, and that the modifications in the rules which it has since been necessary to make by the Despatches, No. 467, of the 3d December 1861, and No. 270, of the 31st July 1862, were not adopted, in the first instance, and made known before he left the service.

13. He prays that he may be allowed to benefit by his past service, to qualify him for the Colonel's allow-

ance in the same way that previous Staff service is allowed by the Royal Warrant to count for promotion; and as all officers who have joined the Staff corps since its formation will be duly qualified for the Colonel's allowance, after a total service of 38 years, of which 20 will have been in the Staff corps, that he may be considered qualified by the same periods of service, and thereby be entitled to one of the Colonels' allowances assigned to the Staff corps by the Despatch, No. 467, of the 3d December 1861, he having been duly appointed to the Bombay Staff corps on its formation, having been the senior Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff corps, and a brevet Colonel, and having completed a service of 40 years when he entered the Staff corps, of which 38 had been on Staff employment, and that the Colonel's allowance may be continued to him, instead of the annuity, from the 1st January 1862.

And he will ever pray.

(Signed) J. SWANSON,
Major-General.
Paris, 7th April 1863.

(56)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Alexander Young Sinclair, a Captain in Her Majesty's 26th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry.

Most humbly sheweth,

That your memorialist was, by Act of Parliament, guaranteed his rights and privileges on the amalgamation of the European officers and men of the Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces.

That your memorialist, however, most respectfully submits that such Act has not been strictly observed.

That on the amalgamation of the services officers had the option, on certain conditions, of joining the Staff corps, volunteering for general service, or remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff corps officers, senior to your memorialist, on the cadre of his regiment, prevents his regimental rise, while his juniors (Staff corps officers), must supersede him.

That, consequent on the officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, all his contributions, to enable his seniors to retire, have been lost to him, as under existing circumstances no officer will contribute, and consequently promotion is rendered less speedy than heretofore.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded, and that he may not be superseded by the retention of the officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of his regiment.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) A. Y. SINCLAIR, Captain,
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment,
Camp, Poona, Bombay Native Infantry.
12th September 1862.

EXPLANATION how your Memorialist's Seniors (Staff Corps Officers) retained on the Cadre of his Regiment prevents his Regimental Rise.

	Probable time of obtaining the rank of Major in Cadre of Regiment.	
Captain J. S. Kemball	- 1864	} Though now that seniors to retire cannot be raised, the promotion will more than probable be subsequent to those dates.
" W. B. Gray	- 1869	
" J. T. Annesley	- 1874	
" A. Y. Sinclair	-	- Will be 20 years' service on the 13th March 1864, on which date he claims promotion to the rank of Major, together with pay, allowances, and all other benefits accruing therefrom.
" G. L. Thomson	-	- A local corps officer also.

Whilst the under-mentioned officers of the Staff corps retained on the cadre of his regiment supersede him, for it is next to impossible that he can be promoted (under the present rule) to the rank of Major, before even the last-mentioned officer, who is at present but

Second Lieutenant on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment.

These officers will be Majors in the Staff corps on the following dates :—

Captain F. P. Mignon	} Captains in Staff corps.	{	14 May - 1866.
" C. A. Collier			7 Sept. - 1866.
Lieutenant C. F. F. Cham- berlain			8 June - 1866.
Lieutenant Davies			31 May - 1867.

Thereby infringing on your memorialist's rights and privileges as an officer in a seniority service.

(Signed) A. Y. SINCLAIR, Captain,
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.

Camp, Poona,
12th September 1862.

(57.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Alfred Becher, a Captain in Her
Majesty's 8th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry,

Most humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, on the amalgamation of the Indian Army with Her Majesty's general forces was, by Act of Parliament, guaranteed his rights and privileges.

That your memorialist, however, most respectfully submits that this Act has not been observed in carrying out the amalgamation.

That on the amalgamation of the two services officers had, under certain conditions, to elect for general service the Staff corps, or remain local.

That the retention of the names of those officers senior to your memorialist, now on the cadre of his regiment, retard his regimental promotion, while several of his juniors in the Staff corps must in a few years supersede him.

That in consequence of the names of the officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, all his contributions to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as under existing circumstances no officer will contribute, and promotion has been much hindered in consequence.

Your memorialist has been very nearly twenty (20) years in the Indian army, and in a few years will be superseded by (four (4) at least) officers junior to him in his own regiment, and by several officers in every regiment in the Bombay army, who were lucky enough to be eligible for, and joined the Staff corps; this supercession is caused by no fault of your memorialist, and is not in accordance with the seniority system which obtained when he entered the army.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded, and that he may not be superseded by the retention of the officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of his regiment.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) A. BECHER, Captain,
Her Majesty's 8th Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.

Sholapore, 2d October 1862.

(58.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of George Leslie Thomson, a Captain in
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment Bombay Native In-
fantry.

Most humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist on the amalgamation of the European officers and men of the Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces was, by Act of Parliament, guaranteed his rights and privileges.

That your memorialist, however, most respectfully submits that such Act has not been observed.

That on the amalgamation of the services, officers had the choice, on certain conditions, of volunteering for general service, of joining the Staff corps, or of remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff corps officers, senior to your memorialist, now on the cadre of his regiment, prevent his regimental rise, while his juniors in the Staff corps must supersede him.

That consequent on the officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, all his contributions (which have been considerable) to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as under existing circumstances no officer will contribute, and consequently promotion is rendered less speedy than it was before.

Your memorialist has been nearly nineteen (19) years in the Indian army, and in about four years more will be superseded by four officers, his juniors, in his own regiment, besides many others of his juniors in the service who were fortunate enough to get into the Staff corps; and this supercession is caused by no fault of your memorialist, and is contrary to what he was led to expect when he entered the Indian army.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded in any way, and that he may not be superseded by the retention of the officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of his regiment.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) GEORGE LESLIE THOMSON, Captain,
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.

Camp, Poona, 25th September 1862.

(59.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for
India.

The humble Memorial of Herbert Henderson James, a
Captain in the 10th Regiment Bombay Native In-
fantry, Her Majesty's Indian Forces.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist has served in the Indian army for 17 years and 10 months (six years of that period on regimental and general Staff)

That when the amalgamation scheme was carried out, he had no option given him of joining Her Majesty's Staff corps, on the plea that he was at the time only filling a "temporary" Staff situation, though in other respects he was qualified, consequently, your memorialist has been compelled to continue a "local" officer.

That by the formation of the Staff corps your memorialist will be subjected, after 10th December 1864 (when he will have completed 20 years' service) to be superseded by every officer (now his juniors) of the Staff corps, as each completes the same period of service, until your memorialist himself obtains his majority regimentally, and which can scarcely take place in less than (8) eight years from this time

That by the system recently introduced of leaving the names of Staff corps officers "in italics" on the cadres of their former regiments, the prospect of promotion to local officers is greatly diminished, such Staff corps officers not now being liable to the same regimental and war risks as before, their names remaining on the lists, whilst the officers themselves form no longer part of the corps.

As now situated, even under very favourable circumstances, your memorialist cannot look for his promotion to Major, regimentally, in less than six years. Had he been permitted to join the Staff corps, he would have been sure of it in half that time. The consequence will be readily seen, viz. : all his juniors by three years in the Staff corps (at least 60 in number) must supersede him, and this from no fault whatever of your memorialist. The injury he will thus suffer will not be confined to his next step in promotion only, but will cause him to rank below all these officers for future advantages, such as commands, &c.

Your memorialist feels sure that so serious a supercession as nearly all local officers must suffer sooner or later within a few years by the new system could never have been intended.

Your memorialist, therefore, respectfully solicits that the names of Staff corps officers, now "in italics" on cadres of regiments, be removed, and promotion given in local corps in their place, as has hitherto been the custom in cases of officers being transferred from a regiment permanently; or, should this plan not now be feasible, that local officers may be placed on the same footing with regard to promotion as Staff corps officers, viz., that their promotion may be regulated by length of service, which would effectually prevent the serious supercession to your memorialist, which he has shown will otherwise result in his whole after service, and which will have been solely caused by the amalgamation scheme.

N 4

APP. G.

APP. G.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray, &c.

(Signed) H. H. JAMES, Captain,
Her Majesty's 10th Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.

Kolapore, 3d October 1862.

List of OFFICERS (alluded to in para. 5 of this Memorial) taken from the "Bombay Army List," published by authority, who, though junior to the Memorialist, will supersede him in attaining to the rank of Major regimentally, supposing him to be a Major by 10th December 1863, *i.e.*, three years after Memorialist would have become a Major, had he been permitted to join the Staff corps, as well as these officers.

First Commission.	Rank and Names.	First Commission.	Rank and Names.
1846	Captain Prescott.	1847	Captain Blowers.
1845	" Beynon.	1846	" Naylor.
1845	" Miles.	" "	" Milliss.
1847	" Ford.	" "	" Atkins.
1848	" Leith.	1847	" Bingham.
1846	" Currie.	" "	" Robinson.
1845	" Thomas.	1846	" Lester.
1846	" Laughton.	1847	" Elphinstone.
" "	" Dods.	1846	" Colher (40).
" "	" Macauley (10).	1848	" Watson.
1846	" Chutty.	1847	" Griffiths.
1844	" Law.	1846	" Chamberlain.
1846	" Scott.	1848	" Bambridge.
" "	" Bolton.	1846	" Mason.
" "	" Benmor.	1847	" Davies.
1846	" Haig.	1847	" Wallace.
1847	" Tyrwhitt.	" "	" Waddington.
" "	" Eales.	" "	" Wodehouse.
" "	" Harpur.	1848	" Barton (50).
" "	" L'Estrange (20).	" "	" Heathcote.
1846	" Mignon.	" "	" Chapman.
1845	" Mackeson.	" "	" Gordon.
" "	" Creagh.	" "	" Hobson.
1847	" Griffith.	" "	" Nicholetts.
1846	" Shortt.	" "	" Dickenson.
1845	" Beville.	1847	" Newall.
1846	" King.	1846	" Shephard.
" "	" Gordon.	1848	" Bagra.
1845	" Weddington.	1847	" Plomer (60).
1846	" Dusbrowe (30).	" "	" Johnstone.
" "	" Taverner.	1848	" Hogg.

(Signed) H. H. JAMES, Captain,
Her Majesty's 10th Regiment, Bombay Native
Infantry.

(60.)

The humble Petition of Captain W. Walker, First Bombay Grenadiers N. I. (Local), to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

1. Your petitioner humbly sheweth, that he entered the service of the late East India Company in 1843, and arrived in Bombay in May 1844; that the terms of agreement (as understood by petitioner), between the said Company and petitioner regarding promotion, was rising from grade to grade by seniority.

2. On the transfer to the Crown, Government undertook that our rights were not to be interfered with. Promotion by seniority was a right.

3. The amalgamation by forming a Staff corps, has, your petitioner humbly submits, upset the terms of agreement originally entered into with the said late East India Company. Your petitioner, in the first instance, will be superseded, in 1864, by every cadet his junior of the season of 1844 (and by every succeeding year's cadet) who may have joined the Staff corps.

4. The general service officers will also supersede your petitioner.

5. Your petitioner has paid for promotion (permitted by the late East India Company), close on 1,000*l.* This sum your petitioner had a right to look forward to receive when it became his turn to avail himself of pension. Now, on account of amalgamation, there is no such thing as purchase, and the above sum is lost to your petitioner's family for ever.

6. Promotion is stopped by the formation of the Staff corps; officers in that corps generally holding such appointments as save them from exposure in the field, the chances of war, and the hard work, wear, and tear of the regimental officer. Your petitioner is fifth Captain of his regiment, and all his seniors having joined the Staff corps, he sees no hope of the promotion he had a right to expect (there being now no inducement in the shape of purchase for the seniors to retire), after having expended a sum so large, and that with the permission of the said East India Com-

pany. All chance of command of regiments or brigade is lost to the local officer of petitioner's standing, on account of the more rapid and certain promotion of the Staff Corps officers. Formerly, to hold either brigade or regimental command it was not necessary to have passed in Hindostanee; now they are to all intents and purposes Staff appointments.

7. Your petitioner, has set forth the above six paragraphs, not in the hope of Government altering the amalgamation, but merely to show the disadvantages the local officer suffers under.

8. Your petitioner would now humbly and respectfully venture to show how, in his estimation, Government, without in any way altering the amalgamation, may, at little cost to the State, make the position of the local officers more on a footing with the Staff and general service officers:—

1st. Let the staff and general service officers' names be taken off the cadres of regiments, thereby giving the steps, and a general list of local officers formed by seniority.

2d. Let Government sanction a purchase scheme in the general list of local officers, to prevent the present stagnation in promotion; this would to a certain extent prevent the wholesale supercession now going on by the Staff and general service officers, and would give regimental officers a chance of recovering money paid for steps, and, at present, irretrievably lost. There would be nothing to the disadvantage of the Staff and general service officers in this, as they might be allowed also by Government to form their own purchase-scheme.

3d. That corps be officered from the general local list by seniority of grades; commands, &c., being as equally distributed, as the good of the service would permit, between the local and Staff corps officers.

That the above may be taken into favourable consideration, your petitioner will ever pray.

(Signed) Wm. WALKER, Captain,
First Grenadier Regiment, N. I.,

Camp Bhooj,
23d October 1862. Bombay Army.

(61.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Francis Adam Ellis Loch, a Captain and Brevet-Major in Her Majesty's 1st Regiment Bombay Light Cavalry "Lancers."

Most humbly sheweth,—

THAT your memorialist most gratefully acknowledges that when the Indian army, a seniority service, was amalgamated with Her Majesty's Royal army, all his rights and privileges were guaranteed to him by an Act of Parliament.

Your memorialist, however, begs most respectfully to submit that the said Act has not been strictly adhered to in Her Majesty's Indian army.

That on the two services being amalgamated, officers of the Indian army had the option of volunteering for general service, of joining the Staff corps under certain conditions, or of remaining with their own regiments.

Your memorialist most respectfully begs to point out that his senior regimental officers, Lieutenant-Colonel William Frederick Curtis, Captain and Brevet-Major Edmund Armitage Hardy, and Captain Henry Erskine Forbes, elected general service, and were transferred to Her Majesty's 21st Hussars, and Captain and Brevet-Major Edward Penfold Arthur, elected the Staff corps, and was permitted to join it.

That the names of the said Lieutenant-Colonel William Frederick Curtis, Captain and Brevet-Major Edmund Armitage Hardy, Captain Henry Erskine Forbes, and Captain and Brevet-Major Edward Penfold Arthur, have been kept on the cadre of the 1st regiment Bombay Light Cavalry, "Lancers," for the purpose of regulating promotion.

Your memorialist would therefore most respectfully beg to point out that he has not gained the steps by these said officers voluntarily leaving their regiment and joining another service and corps to which your memorialist considers himself entitled by the former rules of the service, guaranteed to him by this said Act of Parliament, and which is also the rule in Her Majesty's Royal army in the case of an officer leaving his regiment for another service, or joining the Staff corps.

That the names of Lieutenant-Colonel William Frederick Curtis, Captain and Brevet-Major Edmund Armitage Hardy, Captain Henry Erskine Forbes, and Captain and Brevet-Major Edward Penfold Arthur

being retained on the cadre of the 1st regiment Bombay Light Cavalry, "Lancers," is the cause of very serious injury to the future prospects of your memorialist, as it will hereafter retard his promotion, and he will be superseded by officers of Her Majesty's Royal army, because the names of officers who leave their regiments voluntarily for another service or join the Staff corps are not kept on the cadre of their old regiment to regulate promotion.

Your memorialist most humbly and earnestly prays that his memorial be taken into consideration, and that the names of Lieutenant-Colonel Wilham, Frederick Curtis, Captain and Brevet-Major Edmund Armitage Hardy, Captain Henry Erskine Forbes, and Captain and Brevet-Major Edward Penfold Arthur may be removed from the cadre of the 1st regiment Bombay Light Cavalry "Lancers," and promotions made in their places, whereby your memorialist will enjoy the benefits of the rights and privileges guaranteed to him by the aforesaid Act of Parliament.

And for this act of justice your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) FRANCIS LOCH, Captain and
Brevet-Major, 1st Regiment
Bombay Light Cavalry "Lancers."

Sattara, 28th October 1862.

(62.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Alfred Butler Little, a Captain and
Brevet-Major in Her Majesty's 25th Regiment Bom-
bay Native Light Infantry.

Most humbly showeth,—

THAT the rights and privileges of your memorialist on the amalgamation of the Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces, were by Act of Parliament guaranteed him.

That your memorialist, however, would most respectfully submit that notwithstanding such Act, that guarantee has not been observed.

That on the amalgamation of the services, officers had the option of joining the Staff corps, of volunteering for general service, or of remaining in the local army (in which your memorialist now is), on certain conditions.

That the retention of those officers of the Staff corps senior on the cadre of his regiment to your memorialist prevents his regimental rise, and at the same time those junior to him on the cadre of his regiment (Staff corps officers) must supersede him. As an instance of this latter point, your memorialist would beg to draw attention to the fact that the officer whose name on the cadre of his regiment stands immediately below that of your petitioner will, during the present month, obtain his substantive majority in the Staff corps (which your memorialist would also have done had he been permitted to enter that corps); whereas from the position he now holds in his regiment, namely, that of third Captain, he cannot expect to obtain that rank for more than six years, during which time, though in a "seniority service," he is liable to be commanded "regimentally" by one junior to him in his own regiment; and moreover at the expiration of that period the same officer will, by the performance of six years' Staff service, be eligible for promotion to the higher grade of Lieutenant-Colonel, your memorialist still remaining a regimental Captain.

That, consequent on the retainment of the officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, the contributions he has made for retirement of his seniors have been lost to him, as no officer will now, under existing circumstances, contribute, and, consequently, promotion is rendered less speedy than heretofore.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion be not impeded, and that by the retention of officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of his regiment he may not be superseded.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) A. B. LITTLE, Captain,
Brevet-Major Her Majesty's 25th Regiment,
Bombay Native Light Infantry.
Sholapoor, 1st December 1862.

(63.)

To the Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B.,
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of W. H. C. Lye, Colonel Retired List,
Her Majesty's Bombay Army, Boxley, Maidstone,
9th April 1863

Respectfully showeth,

In the year 1835, being 17 years of age, and having passed through the Military College at Addiscombe, I entered the Indian army as a cadet of Infantry on the Bombay establishment.

2. The terms on which I entered the service I understood to be these, that I should receive regimental promotion by seniority until I attained the rank of regimental Colonel, when I should be permitted to reside in Europe upon full pay, and should also receive a share of off-reckoning, now called Colonels' allowance.

3. In the year 1861, I had attained the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel, and was then in command of H.M.'s 3d Bombay European regiment. My prospects were good, as I was many years junior to the Lieutenant-Colonels on the list (with two or three exceptions), and if my life and health were spared, it appeared certain I should attain my regimental Colonelcy and be able to leave India on Colonel's full pay and allowance far under the average time of service, which in the Bombay army rarely exceeded 10 years from the date of the lieutenant-colonelcy.

4. In May 1861, I received a circular letter (marked A and attached), asking me if it was my wish to remain in my regiment when it became the 109th regiment of the Line, or in other words, to volunteer for Her Majesty's general service; requesting an early decision, as I had priority of choice. At the same time I was given to understand, and it was so notified in the General Orders of the army, that in the event of my volunteering, I should forfeit all claim to Colonel's allowance (*vide* Question No. 15, India Army Amalgamation) Not having private means sufficient to enable me to live in England on these terms, and my future prospects by this proviso being rendered quite uncertain, I was most reluctantly obliged to decline.

5. I may be permitted to mention that in the year 1861, I was, according to the regulations of the army, entitled to retire upon the full pay of my rank.

6. Having thus lost my chance of further command in the European branch of the army, I made up my mind to remain in India on general duty until such time as I should attain my regimental Colonelcy by seniority in the usual course. In this, also, I was disappointed.

7. About the middle of the year 1861, a scale of compensation or bonus was offered to the Lieutenant-Colonels to induce retirement, and at the same time it was declared in the Orders that the Lieutenant-Colonels who did not avail themselves of this offer, should not benefit, in any way, by the steps of those who did avail themselves of it, as the names of the officers taking the bonus should remain on the list to regulate promotion, or, as I may say in other words, till they died.

8. Being, at that time low down on the list of Lieutenant-Colonels, and having heard that a large proportion intended to avail themselves of the Government offer, I found my term of service in India would by this arrangement be prolonged to an indefinite period, and my chance of attaining my regimental Colonelcy made more remote than ever. I, therefore, felt that retirement was the only course open to me, and I accepted the bonus of 200*l.* a year, in the hope of being able to obtain some employment at home; but in this I have not as yet succeeded.

9. I retired from the service, and had no reason to think that the Government arrangements, which caused me to do so, were not final until the latter part of the year 1862, when I received the copy of a letter, dated the 31st July 1862, from the Home Government to the Government of India, granting Colonel's allowance after a period of 12 years' service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, to all Lieutenant-Colonels, including those who had volunteered for the new Line regiments.

10. By disallowing, in the first instance, my claim to Colonel's allowance, in the event of my volunteering to remain in my regiment when it became the 109th regiment of the Line, my prospects were blighted, and I declare that had I been told in proper time, that Colonel's allowance would be granted to Lieutenant-Colonels volunteering for the new Line regiment, I would have accepted the offer made in the circular letter above mentioned, and remained in my regiment as the 109th of the Line.

APP. G.

APP. G.

11. In conclusion, there is one other point, as bearing upon my case, that I beg leave most respectfully to bring to notice. A system of giving gratuities to senior officers on their retirement from the service prevailed under authority in the Indian army, the permission of the Home Government for the same having been granted and published in the General Orders of the Bombay army in the year 1837. In accordance therewith, during the course of my service, I paid to senior officers on retirement, for the purpose of adding to their comfort, and hastening my own promotion, various sums amounting in the aggregate, to nearly 3,000*l.*, being the whole of my savings during a period 26 years' service. This sum, as well as the benefit that would eventually have accrued to me, I have utterly lost, through the different causes mentioned in this memorial; and I therefore most earnestly solicit such relief or reconsideration of my case, as may be considered due.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) HENRY LYE, Colonel, Retired List,
Her Majesty's Bombay Army.

(64.)

91, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W.,
21st March 1862.

SIR,

I RESPECTFULLY beg to submit, for the further information of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, these additional notes of detail and explanation:

1. That I entered the service on the 22d July 1845; my Lieutenant's commission dates from 29th July 1849, and that of brevet Captain from the 22d July 1860. I am, exclusive of brevet rank, the senior Lieutenant of the Bengal army, unpromoted. There are a few officers, I believe six at most, who are subalterns of longer standing than myself, but who were promoted to Lieutenant after I obtained that rank; these also may since have been promoted in the Staff corps or otherwise.

2. That in 1849-50 I accompanied my regiment, which formed part of the Sikhim field force, to Darjeeling, and for 18 days was detached in command of my company at the most advanced post on the Teesta river.

3. That in 1851, I passed the interpreter's examination in Persian and Hindostanee, having the year previous passed the lesser examination in Hindostanee.

4. That in 1854, at Mooltan, I was compelled, as stated, to resign the adjutancy of my regiment and proceed to England, by severe illness, the effect of climate aggravated by the very brackish water obtained on the line of march, particularly at the stages along the cross road from Ferozepore till it joins the dāk road between Lahore and Mooltan. The disease might not have assumed so severe a form had I earlier consented to place myself on the sick list; but as the regiment had just completed a march of 3½ months' duration, from Dinapore to Mooltan, and was shortly to be inspected by the Brigadier commanding at the latter station, I considered it very desirable not to deprive my commanding officer of my services as Adjutant until that ordeal had been passed, and all papers, returns, &c., connected therewith had been made out and forwarded to head-quarters.

5. That, at this distance of time, and unable to refer to regimental records, I cannot state the exact time I held the appointment; but, to the best of my belief, I officiated as Acting Adjutant and Adjutant for upwards of two years. I have a distinct recollection of preparing the regimental rolls of the native officers and men for the General Annual Invaliding Committees of 1852, 1853, and 1854, which used to be held on the 1st April of each year. I here beg to state that the time I acted as Adjutant would count as time for Staff employ by the rules of the Staff corps; as, at the same time, the vacancy was a *bona fide* vacancy, my predecessor never rejoining the appointment.

6. That though the new furlough regulation came into force from 1st February 1854, yet they were not definitely promulgated in India (*vide* G. O. G., 17th November 1854) until I had quitted that country; and though, like others, I had the option afterwards of abiding by the old or new rules, the chief, indeed the only inducement, the retention of appointment during furlough, was in my case impracticable, it being already filled up.

7. That also, for the first nine (9) months, from the time of introduction in 1853 until I left the corps, I prepared and compiled regimental pay abstracts, according to the new plan.

8. That in 1855 I served a short period with the Turkish Contingent, and whilst on leave in the Crimea, I was present as a volunteer with Her Majesty's 49th regiment at the attack on the "Redan" on the 18th June, for which I have received the medal and clasps from Her Majesty's Government, also the Turkish medal. I was wounded, but very slightly, on that occasion.

9. That in 1856, I completed a term of instruction at the School of Musketry, Hythe, and obtained a first class certificate from that establishment.

10. That I also, during my furlough, voluntarily underwent a course of instruction under a Civil Engineer in London, with a view; on my return to India in 1857, of passing the examination in civil engineering and surveying, but the events of that year, and the severe wounds I received, prevented me carrying out that intention.

11. That on my return to India, I at once applied to be sent up to the front in any capacity, and that within a week of my landing in Calcutta, I was appointed Interpreter to the 2nd battalion Rifle Brigade, and immediately proceeded up country, with a detachment of that corps. I was wounded, as stated, on the 29th November 1857, and thus a second time compelled to give up Staff employment.

12. That the supersession I have experienced by the formation of the Staff corps and other changes is and continues enormous. In the cadre of my old regiment (late 14th Native Infantry), four of my juniors have obtained the rank of Captain in the Staff corps; in the cadre of my present regiment (late 10th Native Infantry) the same thing has occurred, though not to so great an extent. In fact, I am liable to see any officer 4½ years my junior, who has been so fortunate as to complete the four years' Staff service, pass over my head. I am of longer standing in this service than all the 2d Captains of the Bengal Engineers and Artillery, except about the first ten (10) in the latter branch, who are my seniors by one month and eight days; while in the Cavalry, 49 out of 70 Captains, and in the Infantry upwards of (200) two hundred Captains, are of shorter service than myself. In the ordinary course of events, I cannot expect my promotion in the cadre of any corps, until in its turn it becomes entitled to the line step, which would be in two or perhaps three years, as the Major of the corps stands about half way in the gradation list of Majors of Infantry.

13. That had I remained in India unwounded or less severely so, I may venture to state that by this time I should have more than completed six years' Staff service, the full time to entitle me, on completing (20) twenty years' service, to promotion to the rank of Major in the Staff corps.

14. That as I am on furlough without pay, the promotion I seek would not necessitate increase of allowance until I had effected an exchange, or failing that returned to India. Even if back rank carried with it back pay, the difference would be for a few months only.

15. That the promotion in the Staff corps would but give me my right standing in the service, and it would interfere with the interests of no one; as by the rules of that corps, any officer can enter it, subject to approval on fulfilling certain conditions, and his further promotion depends entirely on his own merits, and the opportunities afforded of fulfilling other conditions.

16. That I trust the objections to form a precedent will not be taken in my case, as a parallel one could scarce be found, considering the severity of my wounds, my length of service, and the manner in which on two occasions I unfortunately have had to relinquish Staff employment.

I herewith beg to attach the accompanying extracts of sick certificates; also copies of letters, &c., from my Commanding Officer, certifying their opinion of the ability and zeal with which, I trust, I have ever performed my duties.

I have, &c.

(Signed) C. ARMSTRONG, Brevet Captain,
Late 10th Bengal Native Infantry,
and formerly late 14th Native
Infantry.

(a.)

Extracts from Medical Statement of Case by Surgeon
S. H. Batson, in medical charge 14th Native Infantry.
Mottan, 22d April 1854.

On the march of the regiment from Dinapore to Mooltan, he (Lieutenant Armstrong) was attacked with derangement of the bowels, &c.

After his arrival at Mooltan, he consulted me, labouring under a diarrhoea. I gave him a purgative of rhubarb, &c. &c.; this checked the diarrhoea, and he continued to perform his duties.

On the 18th March he was attacked with acute dysentery, attended with severe griping, &c., &c.

On the 28th March Dr. Beatson was called in consultation, as Lieutenant Armstrong began to get worse, and the acute symptoms ran on to a decided tendency to sloughing of the mucous membranes, &c., &c. I was apprehensive for several days he would sink under the disease.

Lieutenant Armstrong is recovering; but after a severe attack of this nature, he must naturally be much exhausted, both from the effects of a severe disease as well as from treatment; and it is not only mine, but Dr. Beatson's opinion, that nothing but a thorough change to Europe will restore Lieutenant Armstrong to health. I therefore strongly recommend his being permitted to proceed to Europe for three years.

(Signed) S. H. BATSON, Surgeon,
In Medical Charge, 14th Native Infantry.

(True extract.)

(Signed) C. ARMSTRONG, Brevet Captain.

(b.)

Extract from the proceedings of a Board on the wounds of Lieutenant C. Armstrong, 14th Native Infantry, attached as Interpreter to 2d Battalion Rifle Brigade.

General Field Hospital, Cawnpore,
28th February 1858

Lieutenant Charles Armstrong, 14th Native Infantry, attached as Interpreter to 2d Battalion Rifle Brigade, received, during the action at Cawnpore, on the 29th November 1857, two dangerous gun-shot wounds, one across the inside of the left knee joint, and the other penetrating and opening the right knee.

The latter, after a period of a month spent in fruitless attempts to save the limb, necessitated the amputating of the thigh.

The former, after remaining an open suppurating wound for three months, has just healed. This wound, also, for some time threatened to open the left knee-joint, and its effects will probably leave the limb, though saved, permanently injured.

(Signed) CHAS. PLANK, Assist. Surgeon,
Cawnpore General Field Hospital.

(True extract.)

(Signed) C. ARMSTRONG, Brevet Captain.

(c.)

Copy of a letter from Major-General Innes, then Commanding 14th Bengal Native Infantry.

MY DEAR ARMSTRONG, Mooltan, 1st May 1854.

HERE is an order I issued on your departure, although you require no record to show the high position you have placed yourself in your regiment, for you have taken with you the esteem and attachment of your brother officers and the respect of the men. The sincere regret all have at your being obliged to give up the Adjutancy evinces that you have performed your duty to the happiness of all grades, and I can sincerely say to the satisfaction of your Commanding Officer, and I know, from an experience of 30 years' service, 14 of which I was an Adjutant, what was required of you.

I may not be with the regiment on your rejoining it; I therefore, in justice to those who may come after me in command, record my opinion of your zeal and of your attachment to your profession, and I am sure, Armstrong, if you are spared, you will be a credit to my opinion; and that you may be rewarded with advancement is the sincere wish of your friend and Commander Officer.

(Signed) P. INNES.

(True copy)

(Signed) C. ARMSTRONG.

(d.)

Copy of extract of Regimental Orders issued by Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel P. Innes, Commanding 14th Regiment Native Infantry.

Mooltan, 25th April 1854.

Lieutenant-Colonel Innes sincerely regrets the loss of the services of Lieutenant Armstrong, who has so assiduously assisted in maintaining the discipline of the regiment, and has so zealously performed his duty as Adjutant to his Commanding Officer's satisfaction,

and Lieutenant-Colonel Innes trusts that he may soon be completely restored to the enjoyment of his health.

(True extract.)

(Signed) THOMAS TAYLOR, Lieutenant,
Officiating Adjutant 14th Native Infantry.

(e.)

Copy of Certificate of Service.

THIS is to certify that Lieutenant Charles Armstrong, of the 14th regiment of the Infantry, Bengal army, served as a volunteer with the grenadiers of Her Majesty's 49th regiment at the assault on the Redan, at Sebastopol, on the 18th June 1855, with the sanction of the Major-General Commanding Second Brigade, Second Division.

(Signed) J. P. GRANT, Lieut.-Colonel,
Commanding 49th Regiment.

Camp, Shorncliffe, Kent,
30th September 1856.

(f.)

Extract from a Letter from Major-General C. A. Windham, C.B., Commanding Lahore Division.

Meean Meer, 11th July 1858.

I SHALL be delighted to write to any one you like, but you must remember that your Commanding Officer, (who, I think, was Colonel Walpole) is the chief man for you to get hold of.

I can, however, say with truth that I have never heard either officer or men speak of you but in the most flattering terms; and when a private soldier really speaks out, I think his praise the highest an officer can have. I deeply regret the severity of your wounds, I was in hopes, when I saw you in bed at Cawnpore, that your limbs would have been saved.

It was about the hardest work the troops had anywhere.

Write, and let me know to whom I shall write

(Signed) C. A. WINDHAM.

(g.)

Extract from a Letter from Major-General Sir R. Walpole, K.C.B., Rifle Brigade.

MY DEAR ARMSTRONG, Bareilly, 26th July 1858.

I THINK you are quite right to endeavour to get some appointment in England connected with your profession, and, considering the severity of your wounds, I should hope your claims will be attended to.

As you served under me in the Rifle Brigade during those four severe days' fighting at Cawnpore, viz., 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th of November, I shall always be happy to bear testimony of the zeal, capacity, and courage you displayed on that occasion.

Whenever you have made up your mind, and have applied for any place, do not scruple to write to me; I shall at all times be ready to promote your interests, if in my power, and urge your strong claims upon the Government.

Believe me, &c.

(Signed) R. WALPOLE.

(h.)

Copy of a Letter from Lieutenant-Colonel W. A. Fyers, C.B., Rifle Brigade.

MY DEAR ARMSTRONG,

I AM delighted to hear from you, and that your health is so far restored after the very great sufferings which your severe wounds have caused you. No one could have more powerfully regretted those sufferings and the loss you have sustained than I have done, and I have continued to feel a lively interest in your welfare and prospects.

At the time of receiving your wound, I was in command of the battalion with which you had been attached as Interpreter; and on the occasion when I went out with two companies into the suburbs of Cawnpore, to drive the enemy from a position which had become exceedingly troublesome to our little garrison and to the sick, of whom we had so many in hospital, you at once volunteered to accompany me, and chiefly with the view of giving me the advantage of your voice, my own having quite failed me, when by my side you were severely wounded through both legs, much to my pain and loss.

Owing to my admiration of your gallant conduct, I proposed to you, should you recover, to recommend you to his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, to be transferred into your own service and corps; your severe loss, however, of a limb has precluded the

PP. G.

possibility of this; and it only remains for me now, in thus expressing my sense of your gallantry and ability in the field, and of my appreciation of your merit, to express in strong and earnest terms the high estimation in which I hold you, together with the hope that the highest authority and influential power of the Council of India may record the views and hopes of one so richly deserving and so able and willing in some departments to be of value to the public service.

Believe me, dear Armstrong, I wish you every success, both professionally and privately, in life; and I trust you will always believe me to be most sincerely yours.

(Signed) W. A. FYERS,
Lieutenant-Colonel Rifle Brigade.

(65.)

Application of Major H. E. Walpole for Brevet Promotion, dated 30th June 1862.

By the formation of the Staff corps, Major Walpole has been superseded, not only indirectly, by many officers junior to him in the Madras Army, but also directly by two officers junior to him in his own regiment who happen to hold subordinate Staff appointments, but who have never been employed on active service, nor distinguished themselves in any way. Officers in the Staff corps are eligible to military commands, and Major Walpole may be placed under the immediate orders of a junior officer, who has not the soldier's first claim to promotion, service in the field. Before the changes made in the organization of the Indian Army, Major Walpole was silent as to his claims to advancement on account of services rendered; but, now that he finds himself superseded by junior officers, who took no part in the crisis through which India has passed, he is emboldened to beg that his claims to a brevet lieutenant-colonelcy, in recognition of his services in North Canara, may be taken into consideration.

(a.)

Statement of Services of Major H. E. Walpole, 16th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.

Major Walpole entered the service in 1837; served with the field force against Kurnool in 1839.

Appointed Interpreter to his regiment in 1846.

Appointed Acting Paymaster in Malabar and Canara in General Order of the Governor in Council, 20th April 1852.

Commanded, from March to December 1858, ten companies of Native Infantry, and (during a portion of that time) three companies of Her Majesty's 74th Highlanders, employed in the suppression of the rebellion in North Canara.

Received the thanks of the Governor in Council for his services on that occasion (General Order of the Governor in Council, 25th January 1859); received the Indian medal.

(b.)

Extract of a Letter from Brigadier Fitzgerald, Commanding Malabar and Canara, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Fort St. George; May 1858.

"Para 3. I would now take this opportunity of bringing Captain Walpole's position to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's most favourable notice, and trust his Excellency may see fit to recommend, as an especial case, that that officer should receive a suitable allowance for the laborious and responsible situation he holds. * * * He has in every way conducted himself entirely to my satisfaction. He has evinced considerable ability, conducted himself with judgment and with untiring energy under great labour and fatigue. * * * I trust, as this officer has had all the labour, he may not be superseded by a senior officer, but be allowed to reap the credit due to his exertions. This officer has at present under his command three companies of European and ten of Native Infantry."

(c.)

Extract from Minutes of Consultation, 5th June 1858.

"His Lordship in Council sanctions an allowance of 200 rupees per mensem to Captain Walpole while holds his present important command."

(d.)

Extract from Provincial Orders by Brigadier Fitzgerald, Commanding, Head-Quarters, Malabar and Canara, 6th December 1858.

"Para. 1. Brigadier Fitzgerald cannot allow the troops composing the Madras Field Force to separate and proceed to their several destinations without putting on record his approbation of the conduct of the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men generally, and his appreciation of the energy, activity, and untiring perseverance evinced by all, when necessary, in the pursuit and destruction of the rebels during the period they have been employed in North Canara."

"Para. 3. Brigadier Fitzgerald takes this opportunity of recording his sense of the zeal, judgment, and energy evinced by Captain Walpole since assuming the command of the Madras Field Force. He attributes much of the general efficiency of the force, as above stated, the extreme general good health of the troops, and the cordiality and good feeling which has prevailed, to Captain Walpole's judgment and discretion, for which the Brigadier tenders his best thanks to that officer."

(e.)

Extract of a Semi-Official Letter from Captain Falconer, Commanding three Companies Her Majesty's 74th Highlanders.

"Should there be another campaign in North Canara, with even more to do than the present one, I shall be happy to find myself under your command."

"Major Walpole, though suffering from repeated attacks of jungle fever, the effects of which he still feels, with the exception of a fortnight, remained at his post from March to December 1858. The command he held, as a Captain on active service, was larger than that usually entrusted in garrison to a Field Officer. The native troops were out in the jungle during the whole of the south-west monsoon, and occupied posts on a line of ghauts, where even more rain falls than on the coast."

(66.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. Dickinson, Engineers, to Colonel Commandant W. B. Goodfellow, Commandant of Engineers, Poona; dated Bombay, 19th March 1862.

In many of the Government Gazettes lately published, have appeared questions and answers relative to the recent alterations in the army. The questions have, I imagine, to a great extent, been put by officers of the army, and must have had reference to their own individual positions; that they have been guilty of no impropriety in asking the questions appears by their questions having been answered.

2. I trust, therefore, that I may be as kindly dealt with in submitting the following, for the final orders of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

3. Para. 83 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, No. 332, of the 10th April 1861, is to the effect that officers of the British Army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belonged.

4. From this I infer that an officer of the Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers, allowed to join either Staff corps, would give an effective step in his regiment.

5. The several Ordnance corps in India have been consolidated with those corps at home, and the officers composing them are, I believe, considered as portions of the British army serving in India; an officer, therefore, from either of those corps joining one of the Staff corps should, I very humbly and respectfully conceive, "be removed from the strength of the regiment to which he belonged."

6. This view of the case Her Majesty's Government of Bombay have apparently not taken, or the question may not have attracted their notice; for up to this date, no promotion has taken place in the corps to which I have the honour to belong on Lieutenant-Colonel Marriott's joining the Staff corps, though he left us now upwards of 12 months ago.

7. Or perhaps the Government have been guided by para. 25 of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India's Despatch, No. 319, dated the 10th August last; but if so, I would respectfully urge that that would appear to have no reference to officers of Artillery and Engineers who permanently join the Staff corps. It disposes of the question whether officers of the Ordnance Corps in miscellaneous Staff employ shall be seconded, but not whether those who elect to join the Staff corps permanently shall be removed from their regiments.

8. I therefore beg respectfully to hope, that the question I now put—namely, whether officers of either Her Majesty's Indian Ordnance corps, on being permitted to join the Staff corps, should be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belong—may be favourably entertained by the Government, and recommended by them to the Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to be answered in the affirmative.

9. I have the honour to request that you will do me the favour to forward this letter.

(67.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., M. P.,
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of William Warden Anderson,
a Major in Her Majesty's 1st Regiment Bombay
Light Cavalry (Lancers), in the Bombay Presidency,
Showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the military service of the Honourable East India Company, as a Cornet, on the 4th of December 1840; attained his present rank of Major by brevet, for service before Gwalior, on the 28th of July 1858, and regimentally on the 26th of November 1860; and is now the senior Major on the Cavalry list of the Bombay Presidency.

2. That on the transfer of the army of the Honourable East India Company to the Crown, your memorialist elected to remain in Her Majesty's Local Indian Service.

3. That in coming to this determination your memorialist had full confidence that the Parliamentary guarantee, expressed in the enactment which authorized the transfer of the military forces of the Honourable East India Company to Her Majesty Service (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 56), that officers so transferred would be entitled to the like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages, as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the said Company, would be punctually observed; and this confidence was strengthened by the repetition of the same guarantee in a subsequent Act of Parliament (23 & 24 Vict. c. 100), and the assurance contained in Despatch No. 27 of 1861, from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India to his Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 18th January 1861, that "in the execution of the measures to be adopted in reference to the officers of Her Majesty's Indian army, the pledge that duo regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces will be scrupulously adhered to," an assurance which was repeated in the General-Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

4. That a chief and undoubted privilege of officers in the military service of the Honourable East India Company was regimental promotion by seniority, provided no special reason existed for making an exception; and under this rule, whenever an officer was removed from his regiment by death, retirement, or any other cause, his next immediate junior succeeded to the rank thus vacated. So, too, on the raising of new regiments, all transfers to them made promotions in the old regiment. This was the case on the formation of the late 27th, 28th, and 29th Regiments of Bombay Native Infantry; and thus, in the case of your memorialist, who is regimental Major on the cadre of the 1st Bombay Light Cavalry, the transfer of Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis, his immediate superior, to the 21st Dragoons, would have led to the promotion of your memorialist to the lieutenant-colonelcy of his own regiment, whereas, under the present system, he still remains a Major.

5. That under paras 58 and 59 of the Amalgamation Order the name of Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis is, notwithstanding his removal to another regiment, still retained on the cadre of the 1st Bombay Light Cavalry, and the regimental promotion of your memorialist thereby prevented; while at the same time, and under the same paragraphs, the rise of officers in new regiments and in the Staff will be entirely irrespective of their position in their former cadres, but will depend, in the one case, on their promotion in their new regiments, and in the other on their length of service. Thus it is possible, nay probable, that your memorialist may remain a major for the rest of his service, and see his regimental juniors, who have joined the new regiments or the Staff corps, one by one pass over his head, and take rank above him,

6. That your memorialist is informed that it has been declared, in order to effect a reduction in the number of officers, that in cases similar to his, two death vacancies or retirements must take place before promotion is allowed. Before the amalgamation, one death vacancy or retirement would have given the step. Your memorialist will now have to wait for his promotion for a much longer period than he would have had to wait if there had not been any amalgamation.

7. That your memorialist respectfully submits that the operation of the Amalgamation Order is, in his case at least, an infraction of the Parliamentary guarantee, inasmuch as he has not had "the like advantages, as regards promotion," which he would have been entitled to had he continued in the service of the Honourable East India Company.

8. That your memorialist has served in India for upwards of 20 years, and is able to point with pride to many gratifying recognitions of his service during that period; but his career in India is, under the circumstances above stated, deprived of advantages to which he was entitled to look forward; and the conditions on which he entered the service will be practically set aside, if his future promotion is to depend solely on his position in the cadre of his regiment.

9. Your memorialist, therefore, humbly solicits your favourable consideration of the circumstances of his case, and that he may be declared entitled to such promotion in the service of Her Majesty as he would have obtained in the service of the Honourable East India Company.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) W. W. ANDERSON, Major,
Her Majesty's 1st Light Cavalry (Lancers),
Camp, Rajcote, Bombay Presidency.
24th January 1863.

(68.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart.,
Secretary of State for India, &c. &c. &c.

The humble Memorial of Captain John Bates, Her
Majesty's 8th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry,
Humbly showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist, who has served upwards of 20 years in India, having filled the appointment of Adjutant to his regiment for nearly nine years, and acted in various Staff situations, has not been permitted to join the Staff corps.

2. More than three years having elapsed since your memorialist held the appointment of Adjutant to his regiment (which he was obliged to vacate on promotion), he is debarred under the 73d rule, by the G. G. O. of the 10th April 1861, from entering the Staff corps.

3. The appointment of Line Adjutant at Sattara, which your memorialist held within the three years required, and only vacated on the station being abolished, having been ruled to be a temporary appointment only, not entitling your memorialist to admission into the Staff corps.

4. Your memorialist prays that this may be taken into consideration, viz., that he would have been appointed Brigade Major in 1859, but that his services were required as Line Adjutant at Sattara; and had your memorialist been allowed to take up the appointment of Brigade Major, but which the exigencies of the service would not admit of, the doubt of his eligibility would have been removed, and he would not have had to make this appeal to the Secretary of State for India.

Your memorialist would further respectfully beg to be allowed to point out, that under clause 2 of the Royal Warrant, and paragraphs 13 and 17 of the Despatch No. 27, from the Secretary of State for India, as well as article 72 of G. G. O., dated 10th April 1861, (which say, "Officers of the Indian Army now holding Staff appointments of any description will have the option of joining the Staff corps," &c.), your memorialist might be allowed to join the Staff corps, as your memorialist held at that time the appointment of Staff officer at Aurungabad, and which your memorialist prays may be taken into consideration.

6. That your memorialist has never quitted his duties, during the above long term of service, and that he holds high testimonials from the officers he has served under.

7. The long service on the Staff, upwards of 11½ years, your memorialist prays may, with the above circumstances, be also taken into favourable consideration

APP. G. in permitting him to join the Bombay Staff corps from the 18th February 1861; and your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) J. BATES, Captain,
8th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry,
Camp near Dessa, 8th January 1863.

(69.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, G. C. B., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India. The humble Memorial of Captain James Turner Hill, Her Majesty's 14th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, Showeth,

THAT your memorialist recently memorialised regarding several points connected with the amalgamation of Her Majesty's and the late Honourable East India Company's Forces, which, however, were given against him; but your memorialist now most respectfully begs to bring forward, for favourable consideration, a point that he believes has not yet been touched upon in any of the memorials transmitted from India.

It is a fact beyond doubt that your memorialist will eventually be superseded in the rank of Major by junior officers of his own regiment who have elected for the Staff corps; your memorialist therefore prays that, when such an occurrence takes place (or after 20 years' service), he may be granted the brevet of Major, which would prevent his supersession by his junior officers, and at the same time cause no extra expense to the Government.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

(Signed) J. T. Hill,
14th Regiment Native Infantry.
Camp Ahmedabad, 6th August 1862.

(70.)

From Lieutenant Colonel H. B. Lumsden, C.B., Commanding Corps of Guides, to the Military Secretary Punjab Government, Lahore (No. 387); dated Murdan, 23d November 1861.

I HAVE the honour respectfully to solicit that the following may be submitted for the favourable consideration of Government—

2. Having been called on by General Order, No. 332 of 1861, dated Fort William, 10th April 1861, to select before the 21st October between Staff corps, general service, or the local army for the remainder of my service in India, on the 2d August I made an application to be admitted into the Staff corps, on the understanding that "officers of Her Majesty's Indian Forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pension under the Regulations of the Indian service," as distinctly laid down in Her Majesty's Warrant. These regulations permit an officer of 22 years' service to retire on the pension of his rank.

3. Now, however, in letter No. 296 of the 25th July, published in General Order by the Governor-General, No. 799, of 10th September 1861, it is stated that officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps, do not retain this privilege of retiring on the pension of their rank, as it is supposed that some officers might enter the Staff corps with a view to promotion and immediate retirement, thus securing an undue advantage.

4. As I have not entered the Staff corps with any such intent, but on the contrary, hope to serve Her Majesty for many years to come, I respectfully solicit a reconsideration of the case, and that I may be allowed to retain the privileges guaranteed by Her Majesty's gracious Warrant establishing the Staff corps, more especially as by joining the Staff corps I gain no advantages, but, on the contrary, have to pay increased subscriptions to all the funds.

(71.)

From Lieutenant-Colonel A. Wilde, C.B., Commanding 4th Punjab Infantry, to the Military Secretary, Government of India, Calcutta; dated Kohat, Punjab, 15th October 1861:—

I HAVE the honour to request you will bring the following case, in connexion with the amalgamation of the armies, to the notice of Her Majesty's Supreme Government, with a view to the provisions of letter No. 296, dated 25th July 1861, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, being favourably reconsidered by the Home Government.

2. On the 29th August 1861, I addressed the Adjutant General of the Madras Army, to which I belong, electing appointment to the Staff corps. By this act I renounced all prospective advantages, either of accelerated promotion consequent on the retirement of my seniors with increased pensions, about to take place in the local army, or by sale of my commission should I have retired myself. I entered a corps which had no royal designation, and the position of which in the army was still undetermined, and in which the substantive rank of Colonel did not exist. In addition, the number of the senior officers of my new regiment who would become entitled to Colonels' allowances was left to future arrangement, and the emoluments of its present appointments were still under discussion and re-adjustment.

3. In deciding upon this step, affecting in every way my future career in the service, I was guided by the Warrants, Despatches, and Orders published under the authority of Her Majesty's Supreme Government. In the Royal Warrant, dated Windsor, the 16th day of January 1861, it was expressly stated "that officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the Regulations of the Indian service." The promise contained in the above-quoted clause of the Royal Warrant, together with the advantage of being allowed 20 instead of 15 months' furlough to Europe, induced me to abandon the local service, the rights and privileges of which were guaranteed by Acts of Parliament, and voluntarily to enter the Staff corps, the future prospects of which were doubtful and uncertain.

4. In the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India's military letter, No. 296, dated 25th July 1861 (published to the Army in General Order by the Governor, No. 799 of 1861), the provisions and promises of Her Majesty's Warrant have been entirely abrogated and annulled; and I find that the Retiring Regulations of 1796, under the rules of which I entered the army in 1838, have in my case been changed, and that I no longer retain the right to retire on the pension of the substantive rank I may hold at any future period of my service in India, although I have completed the prescribed period of 22 years' actual service in the army.

5. In making this appeal, I beg to state that, in volunteering for the Staff corps, it was not done with the view of obtaining a step of rank, and then immediately retiring from the army. My intention is to serve the State as long as I am fit to perform its duties; still I respectfully claim the right, should sickness, wounds, or other causes compel the measure, of retiring under the provisions of the Pension Regulations, which I enlisted under in former years, and the full benefits of which Her Majesty's Warrant instituting the Staff corps secured to me.

(72.)

From Major O. E. Rothney, late 45th Regiment Bengal Native Infantry, Commandant Hazara Goorkha Battalion, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, Calcutta (No. 257); dated Abbottabad, Hazara, 14th October 1861.

WITH reference to letter No. 296, dated 25th July 1861, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, published in General Order by the Governor-General, dated 10th ultimo, I have the honour respectfully to request that the following may be submitted for the consideration of Government:—

2. On the 22d ultimo, I submitted my application for admission to the Bengal Staff corps, being induced to the step by a consideration of certain advantages which were held out in the Royal Warrant. In making this election, I was aware that I was relinquishing many important rights and privileges which are guaranteed to the local service, as well as the hope of accelerated promotion, which my position in my former regiment warranted me to expect from the forthcoming retirements on the increased pension. I bore in mind also that I was entering a corps in which the emoluments are not only uncertain, but the principle on which they are regulated is unknown, and in which, moreover, so much affecting the ultimate prospects of officers is still left for subsequent adjustment. But to counterbalance these disadvantages and uncertainties, I looked to two prominent advantages, which, it appeared to me, the Royal Warrant clearly and unmistakably held out—namely, promotion after fixed terms of service, and, in connexion with such promotion, the retention of my

right of retiring under the Indian Regulations; and it was with this understanding that I elected for the Staff corps.

3. I beg respectfully to point out that the Royal Warrant, in paragraph 9, after laying down the scale of pension for other officers, proceeds to declare that "Officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the Regulations of the Indian service." The Right Honourable the Secretary of State's Despatch No. 27, in interpreting the Warrant, neither retracts nor limits this privilege; and in General Order by the Governor-General No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, paragraph 995, the privilege is again distinctly sanctioned.

4. It now appears, from letter No. 296, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, that it is not intended that officers of Her Majesty's Indian service joining the Staff corps should retain the privilege of retiring under the Regulations for the Indian Service, one clause of which provides that an officer after 22 years' service can retire upon the pension of his rank. The reason for thus setting aside a privilege that had been accorded in the Royal Warrant, is apparent in the 6th paragraph of letter No. 296; but with reference to that paragraph, I beg distinctly to state that I did not join the Staff corps with the view of immediate retirement on promotion, but on the contrary, with the *bona fide* view, should my health not fail me, of serving the Government for years to come.

5. Under these circumstances, I beg most respectfully to solicit that the question may be submitted for the reconsideration of Government, and that I may be permitted to enjoy the full benefits and privileges guaranteed in the Royal Warrant.

(73.)

The humble Memorial of George Remington Cookson, Major in Her Majesty's late 4th Regiment Native Infantry, Major in the Bengal Staff corps, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India; dated Meerut, 27th January 1862,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT by paragraph 9 of Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, dated 14th January 1861, it is ruled that officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pension under the Regulations of the Indian service.

That your memorialist has, by Government General Order of 10th January 1862, been promoted to Major in his former corps, and would, by the Regulations of 1796 for the Indian Service, have been entitled to retire in May next on the pension of that rank, having completed 22 years' service.

But by the interpretation given in paragraph 3 of Despatch (No. 296), dated 25th July 1861, your memorialist finds he can only claim the benefit of those regulations as to the rank held by him on the date of joining the Staff corps, 18th February 1861, which deprives him of the benefit of that regulation, and will require another year's service to entitle him to retire upon a Major's pension, though, by the context, it appears to him clear that future promotion under the rules of the Staff corps was the promotion it was intended to debar.

Your memorialist therefore humbly prays that the Regulation of 1796, entitling an officer to retire on the pension of his rank after 22 years' service, may be considered applicable to the officers of Her Majesty's Indian army who have joined the Staff corps, in the rank they may attain in their regimental cadres, which will place officers electing for both local and Staff corps service upon the same footing.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c. &c.

(74.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Captain Francis George Hodgson, Madras Staff corps

Showeth,

1. THAT with reference to a military letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India (No. 296), dated 25th July 1861, promulgated by the Government of India in General Orders, dated Fort William, 10th September 1861, wherein it is decided that officers of the Staff corps shall not be entitled "to claim the

pension according to rank, in respect of rank obtained in the Staff corps," your memorialist has the honour respectfully to solicit a reconsideration of this question, in as far as it affects your memorialist's future prospects and position, on the following grounds:—

2. That in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant of 16th January 1861, in para 9, after providing a scale of pensions for officers who may hereafter join the Staff corps, it is explicitly stated, that "officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pension under the regulations of the Indian service."

3. That in the "Old Furlough and Retiring Regulations" of the Indian service, para 9, it is stated, "every officer who has completed 22 years' service in India, is allowed to retire with the pay of the rank to which he has attained."

4. That in the "New Furlough and Retiring Regulations" of the Indian service, it is stated in para 32, "officers to be entitled to retire on the full pay of their regimental rank under the Regulations of 1796 (commonly known as the 'Old Furlough Regulations' above quoted), must have served 22 years in India, out of which leave of absence for two years in the aggregate, and not more, will be allowed to count as service for the retiring pension."

5. That these are the rules and regulations under which officers of the Indian service have been permitted to retire and claim their pension for the past 66 years, and are the only "Regulations of the Indian service" referred to in the paragraph of Her Majesty's Royal Warrant above quoted.

6. That it was again announced to the army, by the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, in the General Order of 10th April 1861, para. 95, that "officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces, joining the Staff corps, will be entitled to pension under the Regulations of the Indian service." And the order then proceeds to lay down a scale of pensions for officers of the British army hereafter entering the Staff corps, thereby, as it seems to your memorialist, in accordance with Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, clearly establishing that officers of Her Majesty's Indian service then joining the Staff corps were not to be placed in the same category as officers of Her Majesty's British forces hereafter entering the Staff corps, as to the rules regarding claim to pension.

7. That the rank given to officers in the Staff corps by Her Majesty's Royal Warrant is substantive, and not brevet rank, and should therefore, your memorialist respectfully submits, under every interpretation of the "Retiring rules of the Indian service," carry with it the right to retire on the pension of that rank after 22 years' actual service in India.

8. That your memorialist entered the Staff corps as Captain, and his right to retire on the pension of his rank after 22 years' actual service in India, should he elect to do so under the regulations of the Indian service, is annulled by the present decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, before quoted. This decision is now for the first time made known to the Indian army. Your memorialist begs most respectfully to submit, that this decision sweeps away a most vital and essential part of the "Retiring regulations" of the Indian service, which regulations have been in existence now for the past 66 years, and which, after the assurances given in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, and the orders of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, published to the army, your memorialist never could have contemplated would now have been set aside.

9. Your memorialist ventures to hope that it cannot be the intention of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India to place an officer joining the Staff corps in a worse and more disadvantageous position, as to pension, than he would have been in had he remained with his regiment.

10. The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India has decided that officers should not be permitted to enter the Staff corps for the mere purpose of immediately retiring, in the rank to which they might be promoted in the Staff corps. But your memorialist ventures to hope that this rule, just in itself, may not be made to operate with undue rigour against your memorialist, who may wish to claim his right to retire from the service in years to come.

11. On all the foregoing grounds, therefore, your memorialist most respectfully requests a reconsideration of this matter, and that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India may be pleased to restore to your memorialist the right to retire after 22 years'

App, G.

actual service in India, on the pension of whatever rank your memorialist may eventually attain to, in accordance with the "Pension Regulations" of the Indian service guaranteed by Her Majesty's Royal Warrant, by the Orders of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, and by the repeated assurances of Her Majesty's British Government, and the decree of the High Court of Parliament, that all rights and privileges of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces should be scrupulously preserved intact.

And, as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) F. G. HODGSON,
Captain Madras Staff corps, late 39th Regiment,
Trichinopoly, Madras Native Infantry.
25th January 1862.

(75.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieut. Edward Cave, of the 7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

1. Your memorialist has the honour to submit for your consideration the following representation, and trusts that in so doing he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful but earnest appeal.

2. Your memorialist having entered the service of the late Honourable East India Company in the year 1849, with well understood rights and privileges as to rank and promotion, which rights and privileges were guaranteed to him by Mr. Henley's clause of the Amalgamation Act, feels that a wrong has been inflicted on him by the names of the officers of his regiment who have lately elected to join the Staff corps being retained on the roll of his regiment, although transferred to a new corps.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto to allow every promotion of officers which might occur in regiments up to the rank of Major (inclusive) to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks. When the late European regiments were raised, the officers appointed to them were struck off the strength of their old regiments, and thus gave promotion to their juniors.

4. Your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely by the names of the officers who have gone into the Staff corps being retained on the roll of his regiment, and also by the certain future slowness caused by the reduction in the number of Lieutenant-Colonels, and the consequent decrease of line steps.

5. Your memorialist is third Lieutenant; and three Captains and two Lieutenants, his seniors, being in the Staff corps, his promotion to Captain, to which he feels himself entitled, from the date on which the officers joined the Staff corps, is withheld from him, and a feeling of bitter disappointment is the result.

6. Your memorialist will point out one out of many cases which will show how injurious the present system may be to him; should his regiment be called into active service, four only of his seniors would be present with his corps, in consequence of the remaining seniors being in the Staff corps, and three casualties out of the four officers must take place (a most unlikely contingency) before he could gain his promotion: formerly, when a regiment entered on foreign service, or entered on a campaign, the Staff officers were obliged to leave their appointments for a time, and join their regiments; and thus all shared in the common danger, and participated in all promotion that might take place.

7. Your memorialist has seen it stated in Parliament that the (so called) amalgamation scheme, though it would not accelerate promotion, yet would not retard it.

Your memorialist cannot help considering this statement both erroneous and fatal to the cause of the Indian army, as it has satisfied those who otherwise would have interested themselves in seeing that our just rights and privileges were not infringed.

9. Your memorialist has shown the serious check to promotion caused by the names of the officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of their regiments; and he now points out how this is still further increased by the very small chance existing of Staff officers retiring as quickly as formerly, in consequence of the rapid promotion they now get in their new corps, their increased emoluments, their remaining stationary,

and not having to join their old regiments in case of war; whereas formerly there were but few tenable appointments after attaining the rank of Major, and the Staff officers on rejoining their regiments on promotion after many years' absence, finding themselves unsuited to their new position, generally retired.

10. Your memorialist would most respectfully point out the invidious distinction that has been made between the Indian army and Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India, by the rule that amongst the latter, officers going into the Staff corps are struck off the strength of their regiments, thus giving promotion to their juniors; and this irregularity of operation in the two services he respectfully considers will cause envy and ill-will on the part of the less favoured.

11. Your memorialist, therefore, upon the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation that the officers of his regiment who have gone into the Staff corps may be struck off the return of the 7th Regiment from the date of their appointments to their new corps, so that your memorialist may obtain the position of Captain in his regiment, to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) E. CAVE, Lieutenant,
7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

Kamptee,
November 1861.

(76.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant William Wilson Mercer, 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.

1. Your memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration, the following representations:—

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful but earnest representation of the wrong which he considers is inflicted on him by the retention of the names of Major M'Callum and Saunders in the list of Captains of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, after their appointment and promotion in the Staff corps, and of the name of Captain Campbell being retained in the list of Captains of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, after his appointment to the Staff corps; and also of the names of Captains Swanson and Harrison being retained in the list of Lieutenants of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, after their promotion and appointment to the Staff corps.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has been the practice hitherto to allow every promotion of officers which might occur in the regiment to the rank of Major (inclusive), to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has now, moreover, been ruled that in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India, who shall join the Indian Staff corps, those officers are to be seconded, and their steps are to go in their respective regiments.

5. Mr. Henley's Clause Act, &c., all our rights and privileges are guaranteed. Your memorialist, keeping such guarantee in view, and doubting how any change might possibly affect him, determined to retain for the present his position, with the rights and privileges so guaranteed, and elected to remain in the local service; but what has followed, your memorialist considers that his position instead of being the same as before, is considerably altered for the worse. Five officers senior to him, have been to all intents and purposes removed from the regiment; such removal under the rules of the service should cause vacancies and give steps to every junior officer in the regiment, whereas the names of the officers so removed, are retained in the cadre of the regiment, preventing the regular steps and promotions taking place. The retention of such names in the cadre of the regiment, your memorialist respectfully submits, is no legal bar to the regular promotion which should take place on the removal from any cause of an officer from his regiment if a vacancy be not caused thereby. It is prejudicial to promotion and to the interest of his junior officers for the following reasons:—

1st. An officer so removed, ceases to share the risks to life and health inseparable from the field service, because he is not required as before to rejoin his regiment whenever it proceeds on field service.

2d. An officer who has been on the Staff the best part of his service would generally lose his appointment on promotion to a regimental majority, and must either join his corps, or proceed on furlough, or retire; in many instances such officers have preferred the furlough, following by retirement to rejoining their regiments.

6. Your memorialist submits that it cannot be justly urged that the formation of the Indian Staff corps involves a new arrangement from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefits contingent thereon, nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed.

7. Your memorialist submits also that, the India Army being strictly a seniority service, each vacancy even carrying with it *by right* an accompanying step, any rule by which only one Major shall be promoted for every two vacancies among the Lieutenant-Colonels will greatly impede your memorialist's promotion, be most injurious to his prospects, and will interfere, he ventures to believe, with the rights and privileges secured to him by Act of Parliament.

8. It is because your memorialist's brother soldiers of the regimental branches of Her Majesty's British Army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

9. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of amalgamation has been purposely constituted as to retain for him all the rights and privileges, which he acquired as an officer of the Indian Army when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

10. Your memorialist, therefore, upon the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation that Major M'Callum, Saunders, Captains Campbell, Swanston, and Harrison, may be struck off the returns of the 7th Regiment Madras Native Infantry from the date of their appointments to their new corps, that your memorialist may thereby at least obtain the promotion in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) W. W. MERCER, Lieutenant,
7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

Kamptee, 21st October, 1861.

(77.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart.,
Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Captain T. C. Ansley, of the 9th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Respectfully sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist is a Captain in the 9th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry; that he joined the late East India Company's service in the year 1839, the service being then and ever since he has been in it a purely seniority service.

2. That whenever a new regiment has been raised and an officer removed on that account, your memorialist has always been granted the benefit of the promotion according to the rules and usages of the service.

3. That in the month of February 1861, his seniors, Captains Dobbs and Shakespear, were removed, never to rejoin the 9th Regiment, into the new Staff corps, but your memorialist has not received the benefit of the promotion consequent on their removal, as has hitherto on every former occasion been granted, when a permanent removal of any officer from the regimental roll has taken place.

4. That your memorialist most respectfully, and, he trusts, with no improper motives, begs to lay what he conceives to be a grievance before his superiors for their kind consideration, feeling that a just expectation of promotion, grounded on the usages of the service from time immemorial, is set aside by the retention of the names of Major Dobbs and Captain Shakespear on the regimental roll of officers of the 9th Regiment, when they will never rejoin it, and are for ever separated from all its interests.

5. Your memorialist would also respectfully bring to notice that whenever a regiment has been ordered on service in the field, it has always been the practice for all officers on the Staff to join their regiments, thus giving equal duty in the field and chance of casualty to each regimental officer; but under present regulations,

your memorialist would endure the risk of service in the field, whereas other officers, whose names are simply retained in the regimental roll, endure no risk whatever; your memorialist would therefore submit that he is not now in the same position he was in before the late Order on amalgamation and formation of the Staff corps was issued, but that one officer enjoys immunity from duty in the field and risk, whereas the other is subjected to it.

6. Your memorialist begs also to bring to notice that, by a late General Order, officers who have been removed to the Staff corps are exempted from payments to the mess and band funds of their regiments, on the rolls of which their names are still borne, thereby entailing an additional burden of support on your memorialist, though receiving inferior pay.

7. Your memorialist would further respectfully represent that, by the present Staff corps rules, he is subject to be commanded and has been superseded by his juniors in the army, not from any fault of his own, and which has hitherto been inflicted on officers by the sentence of a court-martial, but simply from the fact of their having enjoyed for many years a position on the Staff, on which account they have been promoted over his head.

8. In conclusion, your memorialist having been led to believe by the late Act of Parliament, that not only all advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotion, and otherwise, but even his expectations, are guaranteed to him, is bitterly disappointed to find that, after 22 years of uninterrupted performance of regimental duty, in a less favoured position as regards health and emoluments than his brother officers on the Staff, his promotion is indefinitely stopped, he is superseded, and additional burdens are thrown on him, he therefore begs most respectfully to request that his case may be taken into consideration.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) THOMAS COMYN ANSLEY, Captain,
9th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Jaulnah, 6th November, 1861.

(78.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart.,
Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Captain Augustus Frederick Williams,
of the 9th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry,

Respectfully sheweth,

8. THAT your memorialist entered the service of the Honourable East India Company in the year 1846; that he has risen to his present rank of Captain in accordance with the principles established for the promotion of officers belonging to the service of the late East India Company, viz., by regimental seniority, and that it is with feelings of bitter disappointment that your memorialist now finds that, although his advantages as to pay, pension, allowances, privileges, promotion, and otherwise, were secured to him by an Act of Parliament, the system of promotion, which has hitherto been most faithfully adhered to, is now no longer in force.

6. Your memorialist would most respectfully observe, that it has ever been the invariable rule in the service of the late East India Company, on the permanent removal of an officer from the regiment, either by transfer to another corps or otherwise, to give a step to the officers below him in his former corps, but that under the recent Act for the amalgamation of Her Majesty's British and Indian forces, two officers, Captains Dobbs and Shakespear, have been promoted to the rank of Major, and removed from the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, to the Staff corps. These two officers cease to pay to either regimental mess or band funds, are not liable to incur the risks of field service when the regiment may be so employed, and cease to have any connexion with the regiment in the slightest degree, yet the names of the two officers in question are ordered to be retained in italics in cadres of the corps to "regulate," as is stated in the Amalgamation Act, the promotion of their juniors.

3. Your memorialist would here most respectfully observe that a double grievance is imposed upon him by the retention of these officers' names, as above stated, for not only is his promotion indefinitely stopped, but he finds that the promotion of certain officers, junior to him in the regiment, is in no way regulated by the retention of these officers' names, and that they may, by joining the Staff corps (which some have already done), supersede, and at some future time be placed in command over your memorialist. In fact, that in the

P

APP. G.

same regiment two different systems of promotion exist, by which your memorialist is liable to supercession by his juniors, to which he was formerly at no time liable, except by sanction of court-martial.

4. Your memorialist would also beg most respectfully to bring to notice, that, should an officer serving in one of Her Majesty's British regiments in India be allowed to join the Staff corps, his position in his regiment becomes vacant, and promotions are made in his room. This difference of operation in the two services cannot but be acutely felt by all officers in Her Majesty's Indian army.

5. Your memorialist would, therefore, most respectfully and earnestly trust, that on the grounds he has mentioned, the names of Majors Dobbs and Shakespear, who no longer belong to the 9th Regiment, may be removed from the rolls of the same, that your memorialist may thereby obtain the position in the regiment to which he believes himself fairly entitled, a position he would have attained had those officers been promoted and removed, as they now are, prior to the recent Amalgamation Act.

Your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) A. F. WILLIAMS, Captain,
9th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

Jaulnah, 19th November 1861.

(79.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State
for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant James Best Taylor,
9th Regiment, Native Infantry,

Showeth,

1. YOUR memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration, the following representations—

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety, by his respectful but earnest representation of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him (not from any fault of his own) by the retention on the roll of officers of the 9th Regiment of the names of Major Dobbs, Captains Shakespear, Sanders, and Lieutenant Johnson, after they have ceased for ever to be connected with the regiment and its interests save in name and appointed to the Staff corps.

3. Your memorialist would also respectfully submit, that he feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto, to allow every promotion of officers up to the rank of Major (inclusive) which might occur either by casualty, or removal of officers to other corps, to give a step to their juniors in their respective grades.

4. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons, on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated that, "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the Right Honourable gentleman, also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution, strictly and scrupulously of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army; and this was reiterated in a Despatch No. 27, graph 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council, but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, from such high authority, your memorialist is a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors, who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, and he has learned with much concern in answer to a query forwarded by an officer of my own regiment to army head-quarters, that the juniors of my own regiment who have elected for the Staff corps, will most probably supersede him on obtaining the vacant rank of Major, will be available for the command of his own regiment. Your memorialist now sees the senior Captain of his regiment (but he retention of the names of officers who have joined Staff corps, on the roll of officers of his regiment) superseded by (17) seventeen officers who have joined Staff corps, who were junior to him in the service, who at any day may assume the command over

Your memorialist submits that it cannot be justly said that the formation of the Staff corps involves any arrangement, from which he as an officer of the Honourable East India Company's service has no right to derive the benefits; but on the contrary, he is that it is diametrically opposed to the hitherto

regulations of the service, and to those "rights and privileges" which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previous to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

6. Your memorialist would also observe that, had Major Dobbs, Captains Shakespear, Sanders, and Lieutenant Johnson been removed into any other new corps, before the Amalgamation Act, his position would at this moment have been that of senior Lieutenant of his regiment; but according to the new rules by which the names of Major Dobbs, Captains Shakespear, Sanders, and Lieutenant Johnson, have been retained on the roll of officers of the 9th regiment, not as in any way belonging to the regiment, but solely to "regulate" as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local" the promotion of your memorialist is stopped indefinitely, leaving a feeling of utter disappointment as the result.

7. It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rule than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental positions; but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted. By the old regulations, officers on Staff employ were remanded to their regiments on promotion, either to the rank of Captain or Major, excepting when they belonged to head-quarters offices or were in certain political situations, which admitted of their being retained in them, but even from these they were ordered to join their corps on service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and shared alike with their brother officers the dangers and accidents of war. But now he will see the officers of his regiment, who have elected for the Staff corps, comfortably located in well-paid appointments, and retarding (as they do not now run the same risks of war as formerly) his promotion, it may be for years. They have also ceased to pay mess and band subscriptions. But how different is the effect on officers of the British army who may elect for the India Staff corps; for by G.O.G.G., 10th April 1861, para. 83, "Officers of the British army when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiments to which they belonged."

8. It is because your memorialist has been led to believe, that the Act of amalgamation has been purposely so constituted as to retain for him all those "rights and privileges" which he acquired as an officer of the Indian army on joining it, that he feels that he is justified in making this, his most respectful, appeal.

9. Your memorialist, therefore, for the reason which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation, and confidently trusts that the names of Major Dobbs, Captains Shakespear and Sanders, and Lieutenant Johnson, may be removed from the regimental roll of officers of the 9th Regiment, Native Infantry, from the date of their appointment to the Staff corps, thereby enabling your memorialist to obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fully entitled, and also that steps may be taken to prevent his supercession at a future date.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) J. B. TAYLOR,
Lieutenant, 9th Regiment, Native Infantry.
Jaulnah, 16th December 1861.

(80.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for
India in Council.

Memorial of Lieutenant and Brevet Captain Edward
Dunbar, of the 12th Regiment of Her Majesty's Madras
Native Infantry.

Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you regarding what he conceives to be a grievance, in having been superseded by junior officers of the Madras Army generally, and in his own regiment particularly.

2. By various General Orders of the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, lately promulgated under the new Amalgamation Order, long lists of names of officers who have been appointed to the Staff corps, many of those officers have obtained, on removal to the Staff corps, a rank they did not hold in their regiments, and they have superseded their seniors. I have been superseded by two junior Lieutenants of my own regiment,

who stood immediately below me, by their being promoted over my head to Captains in the Staff corps; and those two officers, if they serve for a few years more in the Staff corps, will become Majors, and long before I have any chance of reaching that rank; and they may possibly, in after years, become my commanding officers.

3. These officers being your memorialist's juniors in the list of Lieutenants, as they stand in the 12th Regiment Native Infantry for promotion, as such, cannot, as your memorialist respectfully submits, supersede him in a seniority service, as the Indian Army is, or in conformity with para. 23* of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor General in Council, dated Fort William, 10th April 1861. Such supercession appears to your memorialist to invalidate part of the Parliamentary guarantee of 1858 itself, confirmed in 1860.

4. For these officers, your memorialist's juniors, by being appointed to the Madras Staff corps, have obtained the substantive rank of Captain respectively, while your memorialist, their senior in the list, still remains Lieutenant and Brevet Captain.

5. And your memorialist begs further to state, that although these officers, your memorialist's juniors, have been advanced to substantive rank above him, yet he has derived no advantage or advancement himself from officers, his seniors, having been promoted and transferred to the Staff corps; for it has been ordered that the names of officers removed to the Staff corps shall remain in the Army List in italics, in their previous position, thus presenting a grievous barrier to promotion, both present and prospective.

Your memorialist, who is of 16½ years' standing, and second from the top of the list of Lieutenants in his regiment, respectfully submits this to be a great grievance, and not in accordance to precedent and the most ancient and surely-vested rights of the service, positively guaranteed by Acts of Parliament in 1858 and 1860, and also totally opposed to para. 23 of General Order of the Governor General in Council of the 10th April 1861.

6. Considering that the supercession of your memorialist by the promotions in the Staff corps is a violation of his vested rights, as strictly guaranteed by Acts of Parliament and General Orders on the subject, your memorialist, in bringing these grievances of supercession and non-promotion to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration and adjustment of the same.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) E DUNBAR,
Lieutenant and Brevet Captain,
Her Majesty's 12th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Masulipatam, 24th December 1861.

(81.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant William Mellish Parratt, of the 12th Regiment of Her Majesty's Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist conceives himself aggrieved by having been superseded by junior officers of the Madras Army generally, and in his own regiment in particular.

2. That by the possibility of officers junior to your memorialist in his own regiment becoming, by virtue of their superior rank (not obtained by gallantry in the field), your memorialist's commanding officers, which your memorialist most respectfully submits is not in conformity with a seniority service, in which he has been paying for his promotion, or with para. 23 of the General Amalgamation Orders by his Excellency the Governor General of India in Council, dated Fort William, 10th April 1861, such supersedure appearing to your memorialist to invalidate part of the Parliamentary Guarantee of 1858, itself confirmed in 1860.

3. That the names of the officers appointed to the Staff corps being retained on the cadres of regiments, present a grievous barrier to promotion, both present and prospective.

* In the execution of the measures to bring about the proposed amalgamation, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that the pledge that due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces shall be scrupulously adhered to.

4. That your memorialist's vested rights, as guaranteed by Act of Parliament and General Orders before mentioned, have been infringed by the promotion of two juniors over his head in his own regiment.

5. That your memorialist has served in the Madras Army for 13 years and 10 months; that he will not be promoted to the brevet rank of Captain till he has served another year and two months. He, therefore, most respectfully implores your Excellency's protection, and a favourable consideration of his case, and prays that as his juniors in the army are promoted to superior rank on appointment to the Staff corps after 12 years' service, that he may be allowed a similar indulgence, and a commission granted him antedated to 25th February 1860, when your memorialist completed 12 years' service.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) W. M. PARRATT,
Lieutenant, 12th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Masulipatam, 1st January 1862.

(82.)

To the Right Honourable Sir C Wood, Bart., Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant Wigram Arthur Cheke, of the 13th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry

Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you with reference to the following grievance:—

2. Several officers senior to your memorialist in his regiment have been removed by order of Government to the Staff corps; these officers so posted not only cease to belong to their old regiment, but cease to subscribe to the mess, band, &c; in point of fact, they no more belong to their regiment than officers who have retired from it on their pension. Yet your memorialist has derived no advantage whatever in promotion from those senior officers having been transferred from his corps, for their names still remain "by order" in their regiments in the Army List in italics, thus presenting great grievance, and a bar to promotion both present and prospective. Your memorialist respectfully submits that this is not in accordance with precedent or so-called "vested rights" of the service, positively guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, and in direct opposition to para. 23 of the General Order of his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

3. Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration, and solicits that he may be allowed the benefit, as heretofore, of all vacancies created in his corps by the removal of senior officers from it

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) WIGRAM ARTHUR CHEKE,
Lieutenant, 13th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Madras,
26th November 1861.

(83.)

To the Right Honourable Sir C. Wood, Bart., Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant Frederick Thomas Miller, of the 16th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you with reference to the following grievance:—

Since the promulgation of the order for the formation of the Staff corps, six officers, senior to your memorialist in his regiment, have been removed to this newly-constituted body, ceasing to subscribe to the mess and band, and all other institutions in the regiment, and virtually ceasing (as your memorialist can but see it) to belong to their old regiment in any way whatever—the advancement and promotion which would accrue to your memorialist, in accordance with the usage of the service of the late East India Company being withheld, by the retention, in italics, of the officers' names so removed to the Staff Corps in their old regimental rolls in the Army List.

Your memorialist most respectfully submits his case for consideration, conceiving that unless promotion is given in his regiment for each vacancy, according to its date, created by the removal of the above-named six officers to the Staff corps, the advantages as to "privileges, promotion, and otherwise," secured by Act of

APP. G.

Parliament, 21 & 22 Vict., to the military forces of the East India Company, are disallowed, and the Act itself rendered null and void. Your memorialist also concedes the present plan of retaining the names of the officers removed to the Staff corps (to his great detriment, both as regards his present and future prospects) in the rolls of their old regiments, to be contrary to the intention conveyed to him as an officer of Her Majesty's Indian forces, in paragraph 23 of the General Orders by His Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

Your memorialist, in bringing this his grievance to your notice, most respectfully entreats your protection and consideration, and solicits that, as heretofore, so in the present case, he may be allowed the benefit of all vacancies created in his corps by the removal of senior officers therefrom; and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, for ever pray.

(Signed) F. T. MILLER,
Lieutenant, 16th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Hurryhur,
19th December 1861.

(84.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of John Charles Hay, Lieutenant in the 16th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry, Showeth,

1. THAT in 1852 your memorialist entered the Madras Army as a seniority service, in which his only chances of promotion were successively by casualties among his brother officers, senior to him in your petitioner's regiment, from whatever cause arising, whether from death, retirement, or removal.

2. That the usage and practice of the Madras Army always has been, that officers removed to other regiments should give vacancies in their former regiments, as has always been shown on every occasion of the addition of new native or European regiments to the strength of that army; that this is a fundamental rule* in the organization of the Staff Corps, which is held in abeyance† to the obstruction of your memorialist's promotion

3. That the officers removed to the Staff Corps are transferred to a distinct corps, in which alone they obtain their promotion, is proved by the Governor-General's Order in Council,‡ exempting such officers from payment of mess and band subscriptions to the regiments "to which they formerly belonged."

4. That Captain Thomas Craufurd Longcroft and five other officers,§ senior to your memorialist in the 16th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry, have been transferred to the Staff corps, but no promotion has been made in their room; and thus, though holding the rank of Majors and Captains in the Staff corps, they are as Captains and Lieutenants obstructing promotion in a regiment which they never will rejoin in garrison or in the field, and in contravention of usage and practice, and of your memorialist's rights and privileges, as guaranteed by an Act of Parliament.

5. Your memorialist, therefore, prays that the names of Captain Longcroft and the other officers transferred to the Staff Corps, be removed from the list of the 16th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry; and your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) J. CHARLES HAY,
Lieutenant, 16th Madras
Native Infantry.

Hurryhur,
11th January 1862.

(85.)

To the Right Honourable Sir C. Wood, Bart., Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant Llewelyn Owen, of the 16th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

YOUR petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you with reference to the following grievance:—
Up to the present date six officers, senior to your

* Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, and G. O. G. G., No. 332, of 10th April 1861.

† Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, para. 14, and G. O. G. G. of 10th April 1861, paras. 53, 59.

‡ Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, paras. 6 and 14, and G. O. G. G., No. 313, dated Fort St. George, 13th September 1861.

memorialist in his regiment, have been removed by order of Government to the Staff corps; these officers, so posted to the Staff corps, not only cease to belong to their old regiment, but, as a sequence, cease to subscribe to the mess, band, or other institutions in the corps; in point of fact, they no more belong to the regiment than officers who have retired therefrom upon a pension; yet your memorialist has derived no advancement nor promotion from those senior officers having been transferred from his corps, for their names still remain by order in their old regiment in the Army List, in italics, thus presenting a great grievance, and a bar to promotion, both present and prospective.

Your memorialist respectfully submits that this is not in accordance with precedent, nor the so-called vested rights of the service, positively guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, and in direct opposition to para. 23 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration, and solicits that he may be allowed the benefit as heretofore, of all vacancies created in his corps by the removal of senior officers therefrom; and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, for ever pray.

(Signed) LLEWELYN OWEN,
Lieutenant, 16th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Hurryhur,
13th December 1861.

(86.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of William Hornidge, Lieutenant and Brevet Captain in the 24th Regiment Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth;

1. THAT on the 27th August 1861, Captain and Brevet Major R. T. Snow, the senior Captain of your memorialist's regiment, was removed in General Orders in the Madras Staff corps, but that his name is still borne on the Roll of the 24th Regiment Madras Native Infantry; and your memorialist, being the senior Lieutenant of his regiment, has not been advanced to the superior grade.

2. That para. 83 of the Amalgamation Order, dated 10th April 1861, directs, that an officer of the British army, when posted to the Staff Corps, shall be removed from his former regiment; and no reason is assigned for making a distinction in this respect between the two branches of the amalgamated service.

3. That under the Government of the late East India Company, your memorialist would, on the removal, from whatever cause, of an officer senior to him in the regiment, have had the benefit of a step of promotion.

4. That the Act of Parliament passed in the year 1858 to transfer the Government of India to the Crown, contains a clause guaranteeing to the officers of the Indian army the same privileges in the matter of promotion as they enjoyed under the Government of the late East India Company, and as they would have continued to enjoy had the aforesaid Act never been passed.

5. That therefore to transfer Captain and Brevet Major R. T. Snow to the Madras Staff corps, and at the same time to retain his name in the 24th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, thereby barring the advancement of your memorialist, is (he would most respectfully observe) an infringement of the aforesaid Act of Parliament.

6. That your memorialist therefore prays that the Madras Government may be authorized to promote your memorialist to the rank of regimental captain from the 28th August 1861.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) W. HORNIDGE,
Lieutenant (Brevet Captain) 24th Regiment,
Vizianagram,
Madras Native Infantry.
5th October 1861.

(87.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Lieutenant Quintin Shaw Awdry Jamieson, of the 22d Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

1. Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you with reference to the following grievance:—

2. Up to the present date, four officers senior to your memorialist in his regiment have been removed by order of Government to the Staff corps. These officers so posted to the Staff corps, not only cease to belong to their old regiment, but, as a sequence, cease to subscribe to the mess and other institutions in the corps; in point of fact, they no more belong to the regiment than officers who have retired therefrom upon a pension; yet your memorialist has derived no advancement or promotion from these senior officers having been removed from his corps, for their names remain by order in their old regiment in the Army List, in italics, thus presenting a great grievance and bar to promotion both present and prospective.

3. Your memorialist respectfully submits that this is not in accordance with precedent, nor the so-called vested rights of the service positively guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, and in direct opposition to para. 23, of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

4. Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully implores your favourable consideration of his case, and solicits that he may be allowed the benefit, as heretofore, of all vacancies in his corps by the removal of senior officers therefrom.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, for ever pray.

(Signed) Q. S. A. JAMIESON,
Lieutenant, 22d Regiment,
Madras, 5th December 1861. Madras Native Infantry.

(88)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Lieutenant Nathaniel Alexander, of the 22d Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

1. Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you with reference to the following grievance:—

2. Up to the present date, four officers senior to your memorialist in his regiment have been removed by order of Government to the Staff corps. These officers, so posted to the Staff corps, not only cease to belong to their old regiment, but, as a sequence, cease to subscribe to the mess and other institutions in the corps; in point of fact, they no more belong to the regiment than officers who have retired therefrom upon a pension; yet your memorialist has derived no advancement or promotion from these senior officers having been transferred from his corps, for their names still remain by order in their old regiment in the Army List, in italics, thus presenting a great grievance and a bar to promotion, both present and prospective.

3. Your memorialist respectfully submits that this is not in accordance with precedent nor the so-called vested rights of the service, positively guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, and in direct opposition to para. 23 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

4. Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration, and solicits that he may be allowed the benefit, as heretofore, of all vacancies in his corps by the removal of senior officers therefrom.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) NATHANIEL ALEXANDER,
Lieutenant, 22d Regiment
Madras, 25th November 1861. Madras Native Infantry.

(89.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant and Brevet Captain Vincent John Shortland, of the 24th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist stands third in the list of

Lieutenants of the 24th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry, and that although two Captains of his regiment, his seniors, have been transferred by the Government to the Madras Staff corps, no consequent promotion has taken place in the regiment thereon, though the Act of Parliament passed in 1858 guaranteed to the officers of the late Indian Army all their rights and privileges, and which, had the Act been carried out, would have secured your memorialist's advancement by two steps.

2. Your memorialist humbly begs to point out that the Madras Staff corps is a newly-raised regiment, and perfectly disconnected with the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, and that after a service of upwards of 19 years as a subaltern, your memorialist trusts that the promotions consequent on the transfer of the two captains from your memorialist's regiment may be made, which would secure your memorialist's advancement, according to the rules on which he entered the service, and in accordance with the guarantee of the Act of Parliament.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) VINCENT SHORTLAND,
Brevet Captain, 24th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Vizianagram, 10th October 1861.

(90.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Edwin Gardner Ingram, Lieutenant in the 24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

Showeth,

THAT Lieutenant Edward Lewis Hankin, your memorialist's regimental junior, has been promoted to the rank of Captain, to the grievous supercession of your memorialist, and in contravention of his rights and privileges as an officer of the late Indian army, which have been guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament. That Captain Raymond Torin Snow and three other officers,† senior to the memorialist in the 24th Regiment Native Infantry, have been transferred to the Staff corps, but no promotion has been made in their room, their names being retained in the list, to the obstruction of all promotion; that the usage and practice of the Madras Army has been that officers permanently removed to other regiments should create vacancies in their former regiments, and these five officers have been so transferred to a distinctly separate regiment; that all connexion with the 24th Regiment, Native Infantry, has entirely ceased, and that never again will they be called on to share with the remaining officers of that regiment the danger or chances of camp or garrison; and that, consequently, the retention of their names on the list of the 24th Regiment is in direct contravention of the rights and privileges of your memorialist, established by usage and practice and guaranteed by Act of Parliament; that having no service on the Staff to count towards promotion, your memorialist is unable to enter the Staff corps on equal terms with Lieutenant Hankin, his regimental junior; but your memorialist prays that the names of Captain Snow and the three officers; who, though transferred to the Staff corps, still obstruct his promotion, be removed from the list of the 24th Regiment, Native Infantry.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) E. G. INGRAM,
Lieutenant, 24th Regiment,
Native Infantry.

Vizianagram, 4th November 1861.

(91.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Tudor Lavie, Lieutenant in the 24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the Madras army as a seniority service, in which his only chances of

APP. G.

promotion were successively by casualties among the officers senior to him in his regiment, from whatever cause arising, whether from death, retirement, or removal.

2. That the usage and practice of the Madras Army always has been that officers removed to other regiments should give vacancies in their former regiments, as has been shown on every occasion of the addition of new Native or European regiments to the strength of that army; that this also is a fundamental rule* in the organization of the Staff corps, which is temporarily held in abeyance† to the obstruction of your memorialist's promotion.

3. That officers removed to the Staff corps are transferred to distinct corps, in which alone they obtain their promotion, is proved by the Governor-General's Order in Council,‡ exempting such officers from payment of mess and band subscriptions to the regiments, to which "they belonged."

4. That Captain Raymond Torin Snow and five other officers,§ senior to your memorialist in the 24th Regiment Native Infantry, have

been transferred to the Staff corps, but no promotion has been made in their room; and thus, though holding the rank of Major and Captains in the Staff corps, they are, as Captain and Lieutenants, obstructing promotion in a regiment which they will never again join in garrison or in the field, and in contravention of usage and practice, and of your memorialist's rights and privileges as guaranteed by Act of Parliament.

5. Your memorialist, therefore, prays that the names of Captain Snow and of the other officers|| transferred to the Staff corps, be removed from the list of the 24th Regiment Native Infantry.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) TUDOR LAVIE, Lieutenant,
24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Vizianagram, 27th October 1861.

(92.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Charles John Rose, Ensign in the 24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist's commission as an Ensign dates from the 14th June 1856, that he entered the army as a seniority service, and that he now stands first Ensign in his regiment, having attained that position by the ordinary casualties that regulate promotion by seniority; and that his rights and privileges as heretofore existing have been strictly¶ and scrupulously guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament.

That six officers, as 24th Regiment, Native Infantry.
enumerated in the margin, have been removed to the Madras Staff corps, the two first with the superior rank of Major, and the three next with that of Captain, and they never again will share with their former brother officers of the 24th Regiment Native Infantry the dangers and vicissitudes of field or garrison; that, though these officers have been removed to a distinctly separate regiment, in which alone they will receive their promotion according to a newly organized system, their names have, contrary to former usage and practice, and in opposition to our guaranteed rights and privileges, been retained on the regimental list of the 24th Regiment Native Infantry, to the prejudice and obstruction of all promotion.

Your memorialist therefore solicits that the names of the officers above mentioned be removed from the list of the 24th Regiment Native Infantry.

* Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, para. 21, and G. O. G. G., No. 332, of 10th April 1861, para. 33.

† Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, para. 14, and G. O. G. G., No. 332, of 10th April 1861, paras. 58, 59.

‡ Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, paras. 6 and 14, and G. O. G. G. No. 312, dated Fort St. George, 13th September 1861.

§ Vide Sir C. Wood's reply to Mr. Henley in Parliament, 26 July 1860.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) CHARLES JOHN ROSE, Ensign,
24th Regiment Native Infantry.
Vizianagram, 28th November 1861.

(93.)

To the Right Honourable Sir C. Wood, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Captain Blackett Revell, Her Majesty's 31st Light Infantry, Madras Army,

Showeth,

THAT, on the 17th February 1861, the Roll of Major and Captains in Her Majesty's 31st Light Infantry, Madras Army, stood as follows:—

Major:—William Henry Budd.
Captains:—Stephen Charles Briggs.
Blackett Revell.
Henry Dyett Abbott.

Your memorialist's regimental seniors, Major Budd and Captain Briggs, were promoted to the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel and regimental Major respectively, and removed to a new corps, the Madras Staff corps, on the 18th February 1861, on which date also your memorialist's regimental junior, Captain Abbott, was promoted to a regimental majority, and removed to the same corps.

Your memorialist begs most respectfully to refer Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India to section 27*, paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, General Regulations of the Madras Army, and to request that he, Captain Blackett Revell, may be promoted to a regimental majority from the 18th February 1861, the date on which his seniors, Major Budd and Captain Briggs were promoted and removed to a new corps. Your memorialist cannot believe that it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to promote his regimental seniors and juniors, and leave him *in statu quo*.

Your memorialist has signified to the Adjutant-General, Madras Army, by letter dated 12th November 1861, his willingness to accept the offer of an annuity of 120*l.* per annum made to Captains of 25 years' service, if granted the pension of a Major, the rank your memorialist now claims. Your petitioner having served upwards of 22 years is entitled to the pension of his rank. Your petitioner requested that, if his claim was objected to, his case might be referred to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India; and that in the meantime he might be permitted to serve until the 14th March 1862, when, having completed 24 years' service for pension, he would be entitled, by the Regulations of 1854, to the pension of a Major.

Your petitioner prays that he may be granted the promotion he claims respectfully as a right, and the annuity, which he would gratefully receive as a favour.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

(Signed) B. REVELL, Captain,
Her Majesty's 31st Light Infantry,
Madras Army.

Aucacole, 3d December 1861.

(94.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant Arthur Mears, of the 36th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

THAT up to the present date, four officers senior to your memorialist in his regiment, have been removed by order of Government to the Staff corps; these officers so posted to the Staff corps not only cease to belong to their old regiments, but, as a sequence, cease to subscribe to the mess, band, or other institutions in the corps; in point of fact, they no more belong to the regiment than officers who have retired therefrom upon a pension; yet your memorialist has derived no advancement nor promotion from these senior officers having been transferred from his corps, for their names

* 1. All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the Service.

2. All promotions are to bear date from the day on which the vacancies occur.

3. Promotions or removals, on augmentations, are to be made on the principle of removing to new corps the senior officers of each rank who may, by such removal, be promoted to a superior rank, or be advanced to a higher grade in the same rank.

still remain "by order" in their old regiment in the Army List, in italics, thus presenting a great grievance, and a bar to promotion, both present and prospective.

Your memorialist respectfully submits that this is not in accordance with precedent, nor the so-called "vested rights" of the service, positively guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, and in direct opposition to para. 23 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

Your memorialist, in bringing this grievance to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration, and solicits that he may be allowed the benefit, as heretofore, of all vacancies created in his corps by the removal of senior officers therefrom.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.
(Signed) A. MEARS, Lieutenant,
38th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.
Madras, 9th December 1861.

(95.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart.,
Secretary of State for India,

The Memorial of Captain James Robert Fulton, of the
46th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you regarding what he conceives to be a grievance, namely, in having his prospective promotion barred by three of his senior officers being transferred to the Madras Staff corps, without their names being removed from the list of the 46th regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

2. By General Orders of the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated 10th September 1861, 13th August 1861, and 8th October 1861, respectively, Captains Alexander John Greenlaw, Thomas Greenaway, and Alexander Kennedy Clarke Kennedy, were appointed to the Madras Staff corps, and have been promoted to substantive Majors in that corps, yet these officers still remain in your memorialist's regiment in italics, as Captains, thus presenting a grievous barrier to his future promotion. Your memorialist (who is 21 years' service, and only fifth Captain in his regiment,) respectfully submits this to be a very great grievance, and not in accordance with precedent, and the so-called vested rights and privileges of the service, positively guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament, and totally opposed to para. 23 of General Order of the Governor in Council of 10th April 1861.

3. Your memorialist in bringing this grievance to your notice most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration, and adjustment of the same, by removing the names of Captains Alexander John Greenlaw, Thomas Greenaway, and Alexander Kennedy Clarke Kennedy, from your memorialist's regiment.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) J. R. FULTON, Captain,
46th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Vizianagram, 2d December 1861.

(96.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of
State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Robert Belford Cummins,
Lieutenant in the 46th Regiment of Madras Native
Infantry,

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist entered the Madras army as a seniority service, in which his only chances of promotion were successively by casualties among those officers senior to him in his regiment, from whatever cause arising, whether from death, retirement, or removal.

2. That the usage and practice of the Madras army always has been that officers removed to other regiments should give vacancies in their former regiments, as has been shown on every occasion of the addition of new native or European regiments to the strength of that army; that this also is a *fundamental rule in the organization of the Staff corps, which is temporarily

held in abeyance* to the obstruction of your memorialist's promotion.

3. That officers removed to the Staff corps are transferred to a distinct corps, in which alone they obtain their promotion,† is proved by the Governor-General's Order in Council exempting such officers from payment of mess and band subscriptions "to the regiments to which they belonged."

‡ Captain A. J. Greenlaw.
" T. Greenway.
" A. K. C. Kennedy.
Captain and Brevet Major
W. Murray
Lieutenant and Brevet Captain
J. W. Stubbs
Lieutenant and Brevet Captain
A. C. M'Neill.
Lieutenant H. Fraser.
" H. T. Duncan.
" C. W. Street.
" E. Houghton.

4. That Captain Alexander John Greenlaw, and nine other officers, senior to your memorialist in the 46th regiment of Madras Native Infantry, have been transferred to the Staff corps, but no promotion has been made in their room, and thus, though holding the ranks of Major and Captain in the Staff corps, they are as Captains and Lieutenants obstructing promotion in a regiment which they will never again join, either in garrison or in the field, and in direct opposition to usage and practice, and to your memorialist's rights and privileges, which are guaranteed by Act of Parliament.

5. Your memorialist therefore prays that the names of Captain Alexander John Greenlaw and nine other officers transferred to the Madras Staff corps be removed from the list of officers of the 46th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) ROBERT BELFORD CUMMINS,
Lieutenant, 46th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Vizianagram, 7th November 1861.

(97.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of
State for India.

The respectful Memorial of Captain John Wellwood
Rutherford, of Her Majesty's 47th Regiment of
Madras Native Infantry,

Humbly showeth,

THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1841, the date of his first commission being the 11th of August in that year; that he has consequently served (not excluding furlough) for upwards of 20 years; that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon regimental promotion by seniority, and the following is the first clause of section 27 of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras army,—Head, "Promotion of Officers." "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated that "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution, strictly and scrupulously, of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army;" and this was reiterated in a Despatch, No. 27, para. 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, and he has heard it has been declared by authority that the juniors of his regiment who have elected for Staff may possibly hereafter supersede him in attaining the important rank of Major, and be available for the command of his regiment in supercession of your memorialist.

3. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure is diametrically opposed to the Regulations of the Service, and to those "rights and claims" which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previously to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every

* Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, para. 14, and G. O. G., No. 332, of 10th April 1861, paras. 58 and 59.

† Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, paras. 6 and 14, and G. O. G., No. 313, dated Fort St. George, 13th September 1861.

* Despatch of Secretary of State, No. 27, of 18th January 1861, para. 21, and G. O. G., No. 332, of 10th April 1861, para. 58.

APP. G.

assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

4. Your memorialist would also observe that although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps being removed, but the latter, having been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary progress of promotion, for they who are now, in most instances, virtually civilians, unexposed to the vicissitudes and dangers of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the regiment to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local." It may be urged that the promotion of "local" officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental position; but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted. The former Staff were retained as "effective" in the complements of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the requirements of the Staff Regulations, but to the latter grade it was a general rule that they should return to regimental duty, excepting only when they belonged to head-quarters offices, or were in certain political situations which admitted of Majors being retained in them; but even from these they were liable to be called upon to join their corps on service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers towards regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps; now, alas! it is true they are retained on the rolls of their regiments nominally only, as far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers, comfortable located for the remainder of their career in well-paid unexposed appointments retained on the list to regulate their promotion. How different will be the effect on officers of the British service who may elect for the Indian Staff corps, for, by a Despatch No. 27, para. 21, 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General, officers of the British Army transferred to the Staff corps will be removed from the strength of the regiments to which they belonged; the same is repeated in General Order of Governor-General, 10th April 1861, para. 83.

Your memorialist therefore confidently trusts that, on reconsideration, such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (many of them virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate military promotions.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) J. W. RUTHERFORD, Captain,
47th Regiment, Madras Native
Infantry.

Secunderabad,
1st November 1861.

(98.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of Lieutenant S. F. M. Grant, of Her Majesty's 47th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1851, his first commission bearing date the 20th January 1851, that he has served for a period of nearly eleven years; that when your memorialist entered the service, its fundamental principles were based upon the system of regimental promotion by seniority, the following being the first clause of Section XXVII. (head, "Promotion of Officers") of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras Army: "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment, stated, in the debate on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, in the House of Commons, that he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, viz., "that they had the firm resolution, strictly and scrupulously of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army," and this was reiterated in Despatch, No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, para. 3, to the Governor-General of India in

Council; but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps in consequence of the latter obtaining their substantive rank as Captain, after serving a period of 12, and as Major of 20 years; while by a Despatch addressed to the Governor-General in Council, bearing date the 23d August 1815, the brevet rank of Captain is granted to subalterns, of the Indian army, but not till they have served for a period of 15 years from the date of appointment; thus subalterns will be placed in an anomalous position by the names of officers of their regiments who have joined the Staff corps being retained on the "cadre" as regimental Lieutenants, whilst they have obtained their substantive rank of Captain in the Staff corps. Your memorialist humbly submits the above proposition, as he lately learned with great surprise that "brevet promotion to subalterns who were unfortunate in substantive promotion is a boon, and that an officer promoted in the Staff corps can return to his regiment;" these two points more particularly affect your memorialist, as from three of his juniors (who entered the service years after him) having joined the Staff corps, he is liable to supercession by his regimentally junior officers, though in the language of Lord Derby, when Prime Minister, "not only their pay, promotion, and pension were guaranteed to Indian officers, but likewise their expectations."

3. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure would be diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service, and his "rights and claims," which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service prior to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authorities.

4. Your memorialist would also observe, that although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary course of promotion; for they, who are now in most instances virtually civilians, unexposed to the dangers and vicissitudes of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the "cadres," to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of officers who remain "local." Your memorialist humbly requests attention to this point the more earnestly, that he has been unable to obtain any authentic information on this subject. He would also point to the fact of the names of officers who elect for "general service" being retained on the list of the "cadres" of their former corps, thereby permitting these officers, who may be called upon to serve in the most salubrious climates, to retard the promotion of their former brother officers, who from having elected to remain on their original terms of service, or, as it is styled "local," continue exposed to the malaria and epidemics so prevalent in tropical countries.

5. It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the new Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental lists; but your memorialist respectfully submits that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted; the former Staff were retained as "effective" in the list of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the enactment of the Staff Regulations; and it was a rule that they should return to regimental duty on promotions to the latter grade, excepting when they were employed in head-quarter offices or political situations; but even from those they were liable to be recalled to join their regiments when on active service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers when called upon in regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps. To quote the words of Colonel Durand: "The hard-earned savings of many officers have been invested in purchasing out senior officers, with the reasonable expectation of profiting in their turn when they retired. To many the obliteration of such vested rights must prove ruinous, and, where not ruinous, it will deprive many officers and their families of a provision which they would have enjoyed but for the change now introduced by Government without the due notice promised to the Indian armies." (With reference to the above subject, your memorialist begs to observe that, since he has been in the service, a sum of no less than 92,500 rupees has been paid by the Captains and sub-

altern officers of his regiment in the shape of bonuses to those retiring) Now it is true that officers in the Staff corps are retained on the strength of their original regiments, nominally only, so far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well-paid and unexposed appointments retained on the regimental list to impede, or, as it is called, to regulate, their promotion; and hereafter, when they may wish to retire from the service, should their "cadre" name not have been removed from the rank of Major, whatever rank they may have obtained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for a pecuniary inducement to retire, with the alternative of remaining in their comfortable appointments, till their names are removed from the list of Majors, being themselves liberated from all appeals on behalf of others above them in the regiment?

6. Your memorialist begs to submit that the same conditions do not exist in the Line regiments of Her Majesty's army, from which, should any officer join the Staff corps, his name is at once removed, and gives a substantive vacancy; and he begs to draw attention to the anomaly of officers entering the same corps (*i.e.*, the Staff corps) on precisely the same conditions, but in the one case all former connexion being completely severed, while in the other they are retained, or, to again quote Colonel Durand: "The former (*i.e.*, officers of the Line) when they obtain commissions in the Staff corps, are not to bar promotion in the regiments they leave, whereas Indian officers given commissions in the Staff corps are to remain in the roll of their regiments," thus retarding the promotion of their juniors until they would have been promoted in turn by seniority to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Line.

7. Your memorialist, therefore, confidently trusts that on reconsideration such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regular promotions.

Your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) S. GRANT, Lieutenant,
H.M. 47th Regiment,
Madras Native Infantry.

Secunderabad,
25th November 1861.

(99.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of Lieutenant Joseph Beauchamp Leggett, of Her Majesty's 47th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1856, his first commission bearing date the 16th August 1856; that he has served for a period of five years and three months; that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon the system of regimental promotion by seniority, the following being the first clause of Section XXVII. (head "Promotion of Officers") of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras army: "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment, stated, in the debate on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, in the House of Commons, that he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, viz., "that they had the firm resolution strictly and scrupulously of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army;" and this was reiterated in Despatch No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, paragraph 3, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but, notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, in consequence of the latter obtaining their substantive rank as Captain, after serving for a period of 12, and as Major of 20 years, while, by a Despatch addressed to the Governor-General in Council, bearing date the 23d August 1815, the brevet rank of Captain is granted to

subalterns of the Indian army, but not till they have served, for a period of 15 years from date of appointment; thus subalterns will be placed in an anomalous position by the names of officers of their regiments who have joined the Staff corps being retained on the "cadre" as regimental Lieutenants, whilst they have obtained their substantive rank of Captain in the Staff corps. Your memorialist humbly submits the above proposition, as he has lately learnt that brevet promotion to subalterns who are unfortunate in substantive promotion is a boon, and also that officers promoted in the Staff corps can return to their regiments; these two points more particularly affect your memorialist, as from one of his juniors, whose service is within a few months of his own, and about to join the Staff corps, he is liable to supercession by his regimentally junior officer, though, in the language of Lord Derby, when Prime Minister, "not only their pay, promotion, and pension were guaranteed to Indian officers, but likewise their expectations."

3. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure would be diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service, and his "rights and claims," which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service prior to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authorities

4. Your memorialist would also observe, that, although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary course of promotion; for they, who are now in most instances virtually civilians, unexposed to the dangers and vicissitudes of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the cadres, to regulate as it is denominated the promotion of officers who remain "local." He would also point to the fact of the names of officers who elect for "general service" being retained on the list of the cadres of their former corps, thereby permitting these officers who may be called upon to serve in the most salubrious climates, to retard the promotion of their former brother officers, who from having elected to remain on their original terms of service, or, as it is styled, "locals," continue exposed to the malaria and epidemics so prevalent in tropical countries; this, in his humble opinion, being directly opposed to the spirit of the numerous Parliamentary guarantees, though the wording of the various paragraphs may appear to a superficial observer to respect them.

5. It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the new Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental lists, but your memorialist respectfully submits that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted. The former Staff were retained as "effective" in the lists of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major according to the enactment of the Staff Regulations; and it was a rule that they should return to regimental duty on promotion to the latter grade, excepting when they were employed in head-quarter offices or political situations; but even from those they were liable to be recalled to join their regiments when on active service. They were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers, when called upon, in regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps. To quote the words of Colonel Durand, the hard-earned savings of many officers have been invested in purchasing out senior officers, with the reasonable expectation of profiting, in their turn, when they retired. To many the obliteration of such vested rights must prove ruinous, and where not ruinous it will deprive many officers and their families of a provision which they would have enjoyed but for the change now introduced by Government, without the due notice promised to the Indian armies." Now, it is true that officers in the Staff corps are retained on the strength of their original regiments nominally only so far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well-paid and unexposed appointments, retained in the regimental list to impede, or, as it is called, to regulate their promotion; and hereafter, when they may wish to retire from the service, should their cadre name not have been removed from the rank of Major, whatever rank they may have attained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for a

APP. G.

pecuniary inducement to retire, with the alternative of remaining in their comfortable appointments till their names are removed from the list of Majors, being themselves liberated from all appeals on behalf of others above them in the regiment?

6. Your memorialist begs to submit that the same conditions do not exist in the Line regiments of Her Majesty's Army, from which, should any officer join the Staff corps, his name is at once removed, and gives a substantive vacancy, and he begs to draw attention to the anomaly of officers entering the same corps (*i. e.* the Staff corps) on precisely the same conditions, but in the one case all former connexion being completely severed, while in the other they are retained, or, to again quote Colonel Durand, "the former (*i. e.* officers of the "Line), when they obtain commissions in the Staff "corps, are not to bar promotion in the regiments "they leave, whereas Indian officers given commissions "in the Staff corps, are to remain in the roll of their "regiments," thus retarding the promotion of their juniors until they would have been promoted in turn by seniority to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Line.

7. Your memorialist therefore confidentially trusts that on reconsideration such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate promotions.

Your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) JOSEPH BEAUCHAMP LEGGETT,
Lieutenant, 47th Regiment, Madras
Native Infantry.

Secunderabad, 29th November 1861.

(100.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary
of State for India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of Lieutenant Robert Stewart,
of Her Majesty's 49th Regiment of Madras Native
Infantry,

Humbly sheweth,

1 THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1856, his first commission bearing date the 20th November 1856, that he has served for a period of nearly five years, that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon the system of regimental promotion by seniority, the following being the first clause of Section XXVII. (head, "Promotion of Officers") of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras Army: "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2 On the 26th July 1860 Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment, stated in the debate on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies in the House of Commons, "that he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, *viz.*, that they had the firm resolution strictly and scrupulously of maintaining faith "with the officers of the Indian Army." And this was reiterated in Despatch, No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, paragraph 3, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors, who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, in consequence of the latter obtaining their substantive rank as Captain after serving for a period of 12, and as Major of 20 years, while by a Despatch addressed to the Governor-General in Council, bearing date the 23d August 1815, the brevet rank of Captain is granted to subalterns of the Indian army, but not till they have served for a period of 15 years from date of appointment; thus subalterns will be placed in an anomalous position by the names of officers of their regiments who have joined the Staff corps being retained on the cadre as regimental Lieutenants whilst they have obtained their substantive rank of Captain in the Staff corps. Your memorialist humbly submits the above proposition, as he lately learned, with great consternation, in answer to a question on the above subject, forwarded by his commanding officer to army head-quarters, that "brevet promotion to subalterns who are unfortunate in substantive promotion is a boon," and moreover, in answer to another question regarding whether an officer promoted in the Staff corps can return to his regiment, that this

also may occur. These two points more particularly affect your memorialist, as from one of his juniors, whose service is within a few months of his own, having joined the Staff corps, he is liable to supercession by his regimentally junior officer, though, in the language of Lord Derby when Prime Minister, "not only their "pay, promotion, and pension were guaranteed to "Indian officers, but likewise their expectations."

3. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure would be diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service, and his "rights and claims," which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service prior to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authorities.

4. Your memorialist would also observe, that although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary course of promotion; for they, who are now, in most instances, virtually civilians, unexposed to the dangers and vicissitudes of military life, are retained nominally on the roll of the cadres, to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of officers who remain "local." Your memorialist humbly requests attention to this point, the more earnestly that he has been unable to obtain any authentic information on this point, as a query on the subject submitted amongst others by his commanding officer for transmission to army head-quarters was directed to be expunged. He would also point to the fact of the names of officers who elect for "general service" being retained on the list of the cadres of their former corps, thereby permitting these officers, who may be called upon to serve in the most salubrious climates, to retard the promotion of their former brother officers, who, from having elected to remain on their original terms of service, or, as it is styled, "locals," continue exposed to the malaria and epidemics so prevalent in tropical countries; this, in his humble opinion, being directly opposed to the spirit of the numerous Parliamentary guarantees, though the wording of the various paragraphs may appear to a superficial observer to respect them.

5. It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the new Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental lists; but your memorialist respectfully submits that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted: the former Staff were retained as "effective" in the list of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the enactment of the Staff regulations, and it was a rule that they should return to regimental duty on promotion to the latter grade, excepting when they were employed in head-quarter offices or political situations, but even from those they were liable to be recalled to join their regiments when on active service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers, when called upon, in regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps. To quote the words of Colonel Durand, "the hard-earned "savings of many officers have been invested in "purchasing out senior officers, with the reasonable "expectation of profiting in their turn when they "retired; to many the obliteration of such vested "rights must prove ruinous, and, where not ruinous, "it will deprive many officers and their families of a "provision which they would have enjoyed but for "the change now introduced by Government, without "the due notice promised to the Indian armies." With reference to the above subject, your memorialist begs to observe that, within the last six years, a sum of no less than 83,174 rupees has been paid by the Captains and subaltern officers of his regiment, in the shape of bonuses to those retiring. Now, it is true that officers in the Staff corps are retained on the strength of their original regiments nominally only so far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well-paid and unexposed appointments, retained on the regimental list to impede, or, as it is called, to regulate, their promotion; and, hereafter, when they may wish to retire from the service, should their cadre names not have been removed from the rank of Major, whatever rank they may have attained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for a pecuniary inducement to

retire, with the alternative of remaining in their comfortable appointments till their names are removed from the list of Majors, being themselves liberated from all appeals on behalf of others above them in the regiment?

6. Your memorialist begs to submit that the same conditions do not exist in the Line regiments of Her Majesty's army, from which, should any officer join the Staff corps his name is at once removed, and gives a substantive vacancy, and he begs to draw attention to the anomaly of officers entering the same corps (*i.e.* the Staff corps) on precisely the same conditions; but in the one case all former connexion being completely severed, while in the other they are retained; or, to again quote Colonel Durand, "the former (*i.e.* officers of the Line) when they obtain commissions in the Staff corps are not to bar promotion in the regiments they leave, whereas Indian officers given commissions in the Staff corps are to remain in the roll of their regiments," thus retarding the promotion of their juniors until they would have been promoted in turn by seniority to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Line.

7. Your memorialist, therefore, confidently trusts that, on reconsideration, such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate promotions.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) ROBERT STEWART, Lieutenant,
49th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Secunderabad, 24th October 1861.

(101.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of Captain Arthur Noel Hill Lynch, of Her Majesty's 19th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,
Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1840, the date of his first commission being 16th September in that year; that he has consequently served, not excluding furlough, for a period of upwards of 21 years; that when your memorialist entered the service, its fundamental principles were based upon *regimental promotion by seniority*, and the following is the first clause of Section XXVII. of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras army, heading, "Promotion of Officers:—" "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th of July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated that "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to affirm, what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution strictly and scrupulously maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army," and this was reiterated in a Despatch, No. 27, para. 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps; and he has learned with the greatest consternation, in answer to a query forwarded to army head-quarters, that the juniors of his own regiment who have elected for the Staff (and will most probably hereafter supersede him in attaining the important rank of major), will be available for the command of his regiment in supercession of your memorialist.

3. Your memorialist begs to annex* a copy of the

question to which he has alluded, and of the answer which has been received from the head-quarters of the Madras army. It will be observed that in answer to that part of the question, whether an officer of the Staff corps obtaining accelerated promotion over his former regimental seniors, can be remanded to the corps from which he has been removed, to their prejudice, it is stated that "the position assumed is not a new one," but it is one that now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to command "of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service." Your memorialist, however, humbly submits that the cases are not analogous; the mortifying grievance of which he complains is, that the juniors of his regiment are promoted by a hitherto unheard-of action foreign to that of regimental promotion; to which, however, your memorialist is still restrained, and may then, as he is informed, be re-introduced into the regiment to the prejudice of your memorialist's prospects.

4. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure is diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service, and to those "rights and claims" which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previously to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

5. Your memorialist would also observe that although officers who elect to remain in the local service, not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiment who elect for the Staff corps being removed, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary progress of promotion; for they who are now in most instances virtually civilians, unexposed to the vicissitudes and dangers of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the regiment to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local." It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental positions; but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted. The former Staff were retained as "effective" in the complement of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the requirements of the Staff regulations; but to the latter grade it was a general rule that they should return to regimental duty, excepting only when they belonged to head-quarter offices or in certain political situations which admitted of Majors being retained in them, but even from these they were liable to be called upon to join their corps on service, they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers towards regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps. Now, alas! it is true, they are retained on the roll of their regiments nominally only as far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers, comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well-paid unexposed appointments, retained on the list to regulate promotion, and hereafter when these officers may wish to retire from the service, should their "cadre" names not have been removed from the rank of Major in their original regiments, whatever rank they may have attained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for pecuniary assistance, or the alternative of remaining on the Staff till their names are removed from the list of majors and their regiments? On the contrary, how different will be the effect on officers of the British service, who may elect for the Indian Staff corps, for by General Order of the Governor-General, 10th April 1861, paragraph 13, "Officers of the British army when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiments to which they belonged;" the same is also repeated in a Despatch, No. 27, paragraph 21, 18th of January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General.

6. Your memorialist, therefore, confidently trusts that, on reconsideration, such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (many of them virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate military promotions.

Q 2

* First Question.

Answer.

Paragraphs 23, 62, 70, and 101, of G O G G, No. 323, dated 10th April 1861.

Can an officer who has qualified for and obtained promotion in the Staff Corps be temporarily appointed to command his former or any other corps in which there may be officers who were originally his regimental seniors?

On whatever duty an officer of the Staff corps may be placed, the rank to which he may have attained in that corps will undoubtedly carry with it the same position and advantage as now obtains in the army. The position assumed in the question is not a new one, but is one which now obtains when one officer who has risen in one regiment attains the command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service.

APP. G. For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) A N H LYNCH,
Captain, 19th Regiment, Madras
Native Infantry
Geo NORT,
Colonel, Commanding 19th Regiment
Native Infantry.

Secunderabad, 21st October 1861.

(102)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council

The respectful Memorial of Captain Arthur Evan Bowen of Her Majesty's 19th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Humbly sheweth,

1 THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras Army in 1845, the date of his first commission being 19th March in that year; that he has consequently served for a period of upwards of 16 years, that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon regimental promotion by seniority, and the following is the first clause of section 27 of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras Army, head, "Promotion of Officers." "All Officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments, up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2 On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons, on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated that "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution, strictly and scrupulously, of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army," and this was reiterated in a Despatch, No 27, paragraph 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council, but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors, who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, and he has learned with the greatest consternation, in answer to a query forwarded by an officer to army head-quarters, that the juniors of his own regiment, who have elected for the Staff (and will most probably hereafter supersede him in attaining the important rank of Major) will be available for the command of his regiment in succession of your memorialist.

3. Your memorialist begs to annex* a copy of the question to which he has alluded, and of the answer which has been received from the head-quarters of the Madras Army. It will be observed that, in answer to that part of the question whether an officer of the Staff corps obtaining accelerated promotion over his former regimental seniors, can be remanded to the corps from which he has been removed to their prejudice, it is stated that "the position assumed is not a new one," but it is one that now obtains, when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to command "of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service." Your memorialist, however, humbly submits that the cases are not analogous, the mortifying grievance of which he complains, that the juniors of his regiment are promoted by a hitherto unheard-of action, foreign to that of regimental promotion, to which, however, your memorialist is still restrained, and may then, as he is informed, be re-introduced into the regiment to the prejudice of your memorialist's prospects.

4 Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure is diametrically opposed to the regulations of

the service, and to those "rights and claims" which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previously to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

5 Your memorialist would also observe, that although officers who elect to remain in the local service, not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiment, who elect for the Staff corps, being removed, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary progress of promotion, for they who are now in most instances virtually civilians, unexposed to the vicissitudes and dangers of a military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the regiment, to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local." It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental positions, but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted, the former Staff were retained as "effective" in the complement of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them, on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the requirements of the Staff regulations, but to the latter grade it was a general rule, that they should return to regimental duty, excepting only when they belonged to head-quarter offices, or were in certain political situations which admitted of Majors being retained in them, but even from these they were liable to be called upon to join their corps on service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers towards regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps. Now, alas! it is true, they are retained on the roll of their regiments, nominally only, as far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well-paid, unexposed appointments, retained on the list to regulate their promotion, and hereafter when these officers may wish to retire from the service, should their "cadre" names not have been removed from the rank of Major in their original regiments, whatever rank they may have attained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for pecuniary assistance or the alternative of remaining on the Staff till their names are removed from the list of Majors and their regiments? On the contrary, how different will be the effect on officers of the British service who may elect for the Indian Staff corps, for by the General Order of the Governor-General, 10th April 1861, paragraph 83, "Officers of the British Army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiments to which they belonged;" the same is also repeated, in a Despatch, No. 27, paragraph 21, 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General.

6 Your memorialist, therefore, confidently trusts that, on reconsideration, such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (many of them virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate military promotions.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) A F BOWEN, Captain,
19th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Secunderabad, 21st November 1861.

(103)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council

The humble Memorial of Molyneux Capel Spottiswoode, Captain in the 24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

1 THAT your memorialist entered the army of the late Honourable East India Company as a seniority service, and that his rights and privileges have been guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament.

2 That Captain Henry Hoscason, your memorialist's regimental junior, together with very many others junior to your memorialist, has been promoted to a majority, and thus, after more than 27 years' con-

* Question
Paragraphs 23, 62, 76, and 101 of G O G G, No, 332, dated 10th April 1861.

Can an officer who has qualified for and obtained promotion in the Staff corps be temporarily appointed to command his former or any other corps in which there may be officers who were originally his regimental seniors?

Answer
On whatever duty an officer of the Staff corps may be placed, the rank to which he may have attained in that corps will undoubtedly carry with it the same position and advantage as now obtains in the army, the position assumed in the question is not a new one, but is one which now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to the command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service.

tinuous and faithful service has your memorialist been superseded by a large number of officers, from no merit of theirs, and from no fault of his

3 That Captain Raymond Torin Snow, senior Captain of your memorialist's regiment, has been transferred to the Staff corps, but his name retained on the regimental list, thus obstructing promotion, contrary to former practice and usage, and so infringing the guaranteed rights and privileges of your memorialist. That on the formation of the 51st and 52d regiments of Native Infantry, and of the 2d and 3d regiments of European Infantry, in the Madras army, officers transferred to those regiments created substantive vacancies in their former regiments, that similarly, officers now transferred to the Staff corps, have *bonâ fide* joined another regiment, and ceased to have any connexion with their former regiments, as is shown by the General Order of the Governor-General in Council, exempting officers so transferred from payment of mess or band subscriptions to the regiments "to which they belonged"

4 That a fundamental rule in the organization of the Staff corps is, that officers transferred to it shall cause substantive vacancies in their former regiments; that this fundamental rule has been specially and exceptionally set aside to the detriment and injury of your memorialist, and to the obstruction, of his promotion as guaranteed to him on entering the army

5. That grievous as is to a military officer supercession by his juniors, your memorialist accepts the organization of the Staff corps as a measure in which his individual rights and privileges must be sacrificed to the public good, but the same reasoning cannot apply to the retention of the names of officers of the Staff corps on the list of their former regiments, by which exceptional measure no individual derives advantage, and the prospects of your memorialist are seriously injured

6 Your memorialist therefore prays that the name of Captain Raymond Torin Snow, now a Major in the Staff corps, be removed from the list of officers of the 24th regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray

(Signed) M C SPOTTISWOODE, Captain
24th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.
Vizianagram, 9th October 1861

(104)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council

The humble Memorial of Captain C J Bradley, of the 24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry

Showeth,

1. THAT your memorialist, after a service of 22 years, stands in his regiment junior Captain, that although two* senior to him (Captains) have been virtually removed from the regiment and transferred to the Staff corps, no promotion, according to the rules of the service hitherto obtaining, has accrued to your memorialist, this being (your memorialist would respectfully urge) an infringement of the rights and privileges guaranteed to the officers of the late Indian army by Act of Parliament

2 Your memorialist would further bring to your notice the fact of Lieutenants of much junior standing to him in the service, and in the same regiment, are by the rules of the Staff corps entitled to the rank of Major within a period of a few years, thereby entailing direct supercession to your memorialist, and that further, the probabilities are that the said Lieutenants will obtain the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, whilst your memorialist remains in his present rank, the system of promotion by seniority, a right guaranteed as above said, will thereby be entirely done away with.

Your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) CHS J. BRADLEY, Captain,
24th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

Vizianagram, 29th October 1861

(105)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council

The Memorial of Captain Arthur James Shuldham, of the 26th regiment of Madras Native Infantry

1 Your memorialist humbly showeth that he has served in the Indian army for the space of 20 years and five months, during which period it has been the invariable custom that when an officer has been appointed

to any other regular corps of the service, his name has been removed from the cadre of his regiment, thereby giving a step to his juniors, that this custom has been departed from under the recent Warrants for the Staff corps, to which Captains Shakespear and Stevenson, your memorialist's seniors in the grade of Captain, have been removed, and that your memorialist's interests have sustained an injury, which he had not contemplated, by their names remaining in the cadre of the regiment to keep back his, your memorialist's, promotion

2 That your memorialist's position in the service has been injured, moreover, by his having been superseded in rank by several officers his juniors in the service, who have entered the Staff corps, and that he will be superseded next year by an officer of his own regiment, 15 months junior to him, and who has rendered no particular service to the State which would justify such a supercession, that your memorialist has passed for the Staff in Hindustan, that he served during the Burmese and latter part of the Crimean campaigns, in the latter as aide-de-camp to the late General Neill, that he has served in various Staff appointments, but that, from the unfortunate fact of his not having been permanently on the Staff for the last three years, although he has acted in three different appointments, he has not been permitted to enter the Staff corps

3. Your memorialist in showing, as above, how grievously his interests have suffered by the changes which have taken place under the amalgamation of the two armies, would earnestly and respectfully beg that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, will adopt such measures as he may deem expedient with a view to placing your memorialist in such a position as his previous services and expectations may have fairly led him to contemplate

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) A J SHULDHAM Captain,
26th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.
Kamptee, 20th October 1861.

(106)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council

Memorial of Major George Thomas Haly, of the 41st Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

1 Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you regarding what he conceives to be a grievance in having been superseded by junior officers of the Madras army particularly and the Indian army generally

2 By various General Orders of the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, lately promulgated under the new Amalgamation Order, several officers of the Madras army, being Majors and his juniors, have been promoted over your memorialist's head to be Lieutenant-Colonels in the Madras Staff corps

3. These officers, being your memorialist's juniors in the list of Majors, as they stand in the Infantry for promotion, as such cannot, as your memorialist respectfully submits, supersede him, either in accordance with the rules and customs that prevailed in the late Honourable East India Company's service, or in conformity with paragraph 23 of the General Order by his Excellency the Governor General in Council, dated Fort William, 10th April 1861. Such supercession appears to your memorialist to invalidate part of the Parliamentary guarantee of 1858, itself confirmed in 1860.

4. For these officers, your memorialist's juniors, by being appointed to the Madras Staff corps, have obtained the substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonels respectively, while your memorialist, their senior in the list, still remains a Major.

5 And your memorialist begs further to state that, although these officers, your memorialist's juniors, have been advanced to substantive rank above him, yet he has derived no advantage or advancement himself from officers his seniors having been promoted and transferred to the Staff corps from the list of Majors, for it has been ordered that the names of officers removed to the Staff corps shall remain in the Army List in italics in their previous position, thus presenting a grievous barrier to promotion, both present and prospective. Your memorialist, who is of 35 years' standing and 19th Major in the list, respectfully submits this to be a great grievance, and not in accordance with precedent and the most ancient and surely vested rights of the service, positively guaranteed by Act of Parliament in 1858 and 1860, and

Q 3

No 312,
dated Fort
St George,
13 Sept
1861

Par 21. De-
spatch of
Secretary of
State, No 27,
of 18 Jan
1861

G O, G G,
No 332, of
10 April
1861, par 83

Despatch of
Secretary of
State, No 27,
of 18 Jan
1861, par. 14,
and

G O, G G,
No 332, of
10 April
1861, par. 58.

Major
Snow
Major Hos-
ason.

Captain
Browne,
Captain
Clephane,
Lieut
Hankin,
Lieut
Osborne

APP. G.

APP. G.

also totally opposed to paragraph 23 of General Order of the Governor-General in Council on the 10th April 1861.

6. Considering that the supercession of your memorialist, by the late promotions into the Staff corps, is a violation of his vested rights, as strictly guaranteed by Acts of Parliament, General Orders, &c., &c., on the subject, your memorialist has the honour, most decidedly yet respectfully, to protest against the injustice done him by the promotions above alluded to. And, finally, your memorialist has been himself for many years employed on the Staff in various important military, political, and civil appointments, in the performance of which duties it has always been acknowledged that he has done good service to the State, and he has more than once had the honour to receive the special commendation of Government. It therefore now falls very severely upon him, that, because he does not at the present moment happen to be employed on the Staff, he should be precluded as he is, from the advantages now guaranteed to the more lucky present incumbents, and likewise superseded by his juniors.

Your memorialist, in bringing these grievances of supercessions and non-promotion to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration and adjustment of the same.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.
(Signed) GEO. T. HALY, Major,
41st Regiment M. Native Infantry.
Arcot, 10th December 1861.

(107.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

The respectful Memorial of Captain William Roche Broome, of Her Majesty's 49th Regiment Madras Native Infantry.

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1840, the date of his first commission being 30th September in that year; that he has consequently served, not excluding furlough, for a period of upwards of 21 years; that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon regimental promotion by seniority, and the following is the first clause of Section XXVII. of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras army:—Head, "Promotion of Officers:—" All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments, up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons, on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated that "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman, and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution strictly and scrupulously of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army;" and this was reiterated in a Despatch No. 27, paragraph 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors, who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps. And he has learned with the greatest consternation, in answer to a query forwarded by his commanding officer, to army head-quarters, that the juniors of his own regiment, who have elected for the Staff (and will most probably hereafter supersede him in attaining the important rank of Major), will be available for the command of his regiment in supercession of your memorialist.

3 Your memorialist begs to annex* a copy of the question to which he has alluded, and of the answer which has been received, from the head-quarters of the Madras army. It will be observed, that in answer to that part

of the question whether an officer of the Staff corps obtaining accelerated promotion over his former regimental seniors can be remanded to the corps from which he has been removed to their prejudice, it is stated that "the position assumed is not a new one, but is one that now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service." Your memorialist, however, humbly submits that the cases are not analogous, the mortifying grievance of which he complains is that the juniors of his regiment are promoted by a hitherto unheard of action, foreign to that of regimental promotion, to which, however, your memorialist is still restrained, and may then, as he is informed, be reintroduced into the regiment, to the prejudice of your memorialist's prospects.

4. Your memorialist humbly conceives that such a measure is diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service, and to those "rights and claims" which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previously to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

5. Your memorialist would also observe, that although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps being removed, but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary progress of promotion, for they, who are now in most instances virtually civilians, unexposed to the vicissitudes and dangers of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the regiment, to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local." It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental positions; but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted; the former Staff were retained as "effective" in the complement of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion, either to Captain or Major, according to the requirements of the Staff regulations; but to the latter grade it was a general rule that they should return to regimental duty, excepting only when they belonged to head-quarter offices, or were in certain political situations which admitted of Majors being retained on them; but even from these they were liable to be called upon to join their corps on service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers towards regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps; now, alas! it is true they are retained on the roll of their regiments nominally only as far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well paid unexposed appointments retained on the list to regulate their promotion, and hereafter, when these officers may wish to retire from the service, should their cadre names not have been removed from the rank of Major in their original regiments, whatever rank they may have attained to in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them from appealing to their former brother officers for pecuniary assistance, or the alternative of remaining on the Staff till their names are removed from the list of Majors and their regiments?

On the contrary, how different will be the effect on officers of the British service who may elect for the Indian Staff corps, for by General Order of the Governor-General, 10th April 1861, paragraph 83, "Officers of the British army when permanently transferred to the Staff corps will be removed from the strength of the Regiments to which they belonged." The same is also repeated in a Despatch, No. 27, paragraph 21, 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General.

6. Your memorialist therefore confidently trusts that on reconsideration such steps will be adopted, as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (many of them virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate military promotions.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) WILLIAM ROCHE BROOME, Captain,
49th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry,
Secunderabad, 11th October 1861.

* Question.

Paragraphs 23, 96, 70, and 101 of G. O. G. G., No. 332, dated 10th April 1861.

Can an officer who has qualified for and obtained promotion in the Staff corps be temporarily appointed to command his former or any other corps in which there may be officers who were originally his regimental seniors?

Answer.

On whatever duty an officer of the Staff corps may be placed, the rank to which he may have attained in that corps will undoubtedly carry with it the same position and advantages now obtained in the army; the position assumed in the question is not a new one, but is one which now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to the command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service.

(108)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of Captain Francis Pictet, of Her Majesty's 49th Regiment of Madras Native Infantry.

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist was appointed to the Madras army in 1847, the date of his first commission being 11th December in that year; that he has consequently served, not excluding furlough, for a period of nearly 14 years; that when your memorialist entered the service its fundamental principles were based upon regimental promotion by seniority, and the following is the first clause of section XXVII. of the General Regulations for the guidance of the Madras army, Head "Promotion of Officers:" "All officers shall be promoted by seniority in their respective regiments up to the rank of Major, and afterwards by seniority in their respective branches of the service."

2. On the 26th July 1860, Sir Charles Wood, in reply to Mr. Henley's amendment in the debate in the House of Commons on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies, stated, that "he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the right honourable gentleman; and also to re-affirm what the Government had never attempted to deny, namely, that they had the firm resolution, strictly and scrupulously, of maintaining faith with the officers of the Indian army;" and this was reiterated in a Despatch, No. 27, paragraph 3, 18th January 1861, to the Governor-General of India in Council; but, notwithstanding these assurances on the subject of the amalgamation of the armies from such high authority, your memorialist is now a daily witness of officers being superseded by their regimental juniors, who elect to be appointed to the Staff corps, and he has learned, with the greatest consternation, in answer to a query forwarded by his commanding officer to army head-quarters, that the juniors of his own regiment who have elected for the Staff (and will most probably hereafter supersede him in attaining the important rank of Major), will be available for the command of his regiment in supercession of your memorialist.

3. Your memorialist begs to annex* a copy of the question to which he has alluded, and of the answer which has been received from the head-quarters of the Madras army. It will be observed that, in answer to that part of the question whether an officer of the Staff corps obtaining accelerated promotion over his former regimental seniors can be remanded to the corps from which he has been removed to their prejudice, it is stated "the position assumed is not a new one, but is one that now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service." Your memorialist, however, humbly submits that the cases are not analogous, the mortifying grievance of which he complains is, that the juniors of his regiment may be promoted by a hitherto unheard-of action, foreign to that of regimental promotion, to which, however, your memorialist is still restrained, and may then, as he is informed, be reintroduced into the regiment to the prejudice of your memorialist's prospects.

4. Your memorialist, humbly conceives that such a measure is diametrically opposed to the regulations of the service and to those "rights and claims," which have been guaranteed to all officers who entered the service previously to the assumption of the Government of India by Her most Gracious Majesty, and to every assurance which has emanated from the highest authority.

5. Your memorialist would also observe that, although officers who elect to remain in the local service not only do not obtain any advantage by the seniors of their regiments who elect for the Staff corps being removed,

* Question.

Paragraphs 23, 62, 70, and 101 of G O G. No. 332, dated 10th April 1861.

Can an officer who has qualified for and obtained promotion in the Staff corps, be temporarily appointed to command his former or any other corps in which there may be officers who were originally his regimental seniors?

Answer.

On whatever duty an officer of the Staff corps may be placed, the rank to which he may have attained in that corps will undoubtedly carry with it the same position and advantage as now obtains in the army, the position assumed in the question is not a new one, but is one which now obtains when an officer who has risen in one regiment attains to the command of a regiment in which are officers who have been his seniors in the service.

but the latter have been constituted a retarding element to the ordinary progress of promotion, for they who are now, in most instances, virtually civilians, unexposed to the vicissitudes and dangers of military life, are retained nominally on the rolls of the regiment to regulate, as it is denominated, the promotion of the officers who remain "local." It may be urged that the promotion of local officers will not be more impeded by the Staff rules than hitherto, as Staff officers were always retained in their regimental positions; but your memorialist respectfully suggests that there is no analogy between the Staff as formerly and as now constituted; the former Staff were retained as "effective" in the complement of their regiments, and were liable to be remanded to them on promotion either to Captain or Major, according to the requirements of the Staff regulations; but to the latter grade it was a general rule that they should return to regimental duty, excepting only when they belonged to head-quarter offices, or were in certain political situations which admitted of Majors being retained in them; but even from these they were liable to be called upon to join their corps on service; they were then part and parcel of their regiments, and usually assisted their brother officers towards regimental subscriptions and purchase of steps; now, alas! it is true they are retained on the roll of the regiments nominally only as far as they are concerned, but most substantially as respects their juniors, who will now see officers comfortably located for the remainder of their career in well paid unexposed appointments, retained on the list to regulate their promotion; and hereafter when these officers may wish to retire from the service, should their "cadre" names not have been removed from the rank of Major in their original regiments, whatever rank they may have attained in the Staff corps, what is to prevent them appealing to their former brother officers for pecuniary assistance, or the alternative of remaining on the Staff till their names are removed from the list of Majors and their regiments? On the contrary, how different will be the effect on officers of the British service who may elect for the Indian Staff corps; for by General Order of the Governor-General, 10th April 1861, paragraph 83, "Officers of the British army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiments to which they belonged." The same is also repeated in a Despatch, No. 27, paragraph 21, 18th January 1861, from the Secretary of State for India to the Governor-General.

6 Your memorialist, therefore, confidently trusts that on reconsideration such steps will be adopted as will protect him from the ruinous consequences of such an unexpected regulation as retaining officers (many of them virtually civilians) on the list of regiments to regulate military promotions.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) FRANCIS PICTET, Captain,
49th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Secunderabad, 14th October 1861.

(109.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Captain A. D. McDougall, 3d Madras European Regiment.

Your memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration the following representation.

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful, but earnest representation, of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him by the retention of the names of Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris and Moore, in the list of Captains of the 3d Madras European Regiment, after appointment to the 108th regiment and Staff corps.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto, to allow every promotion of officers which might occur in regiments (up to the rank of Major included), to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has, however, been ruled that in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India, who shall join the Staff corps, those officers are to be seconded, and their steps are to go in their respective regiments, and the irregularity of operation in the two services in the instances he describes, makes an invidious distinction.

APP. G.

5. Your memorialist cannot but remember, had Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris and Moore, been removed into any other new corps before the Amalgamation Act, his position would at this moment have been that of senior Captain of his regiment; but according to the new rules by which Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris and Moore are retained on the roll of the 3d Madras European Regiment—not with any view of their ever returning to the corps as heretofore, whenever the regiment may be employed on active service; not in order that their subscriptions to the regimental funds may still be retained; not as in any way belonging to the regiment, but solely to regulate, as the General Order terms it, the promotion of the juniors,—your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely, leaving a feeling of bitter disappointment as the result.

6. Your memorialist submits that it cannot be justly urged that the formation of the 108th Regiment, and the Indian Staff corps, involves a new arrangement from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefits contingent thereon; nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed, with its subordinate arrangements. It has been the well-understood rule in the service, and hitherto faithfully observed, that every removal or promotion of a regimental officer under the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel should give a step to the juniors of his rank. Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris and Moore, have been removed into other corps, and your memorialist thinks and feels that in refusing to him the steps in the regiment, which Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captain Harris, and Moore's removal into other corps makes, the conditions of his service are not observed by the Government under which he serves.

7. It is because your memorialist's brother soldiers of the regimental branches of the British army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

8. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of Amalgamation has been purposely so constituted, as to retain for him all the privileges and rights which he acquired as an officer of the Indian army when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

9. Your memorialist, therefore, on the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitations that Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris and Moore may be struck off the returns of the 3d Madras European Regiment, from the date of their appointments to the 108th Regiment and Staff corps, that your memorialist may thereby, at least, obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled.

For which your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) A. D. McDUGALL,

Captain 3d Madras European Regiment.
Jaulnah, 10th December 1861.

(110.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Captain C. F. Gilbertson, 3d Madras European Regiment.

1. Your memorialist has had the honour to submit for consideration the following representation:—

2. Your memorialist trusts he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful but earnest representation of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him by the retention of the names of Captains Dysart, Harris, and Moore, in the list of Captains of the 3d Madras European Regiment, after appointment and promotion in the Staff corps and Her Majesty's 108th Foot respectively.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto to allow every promotion or transfer of officers which might occur in regiments, up to the rank of Major included, to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has, moreover, been ruled, that in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India who shall join the Staff corps, those officers are to be seconded and these steps are to go in their respective regiments; and the irregularity of operation in the

two services in the instance he describes, makes an invidious distinction.

5. Your memorialist cannot but remember, had these officers been promoted and removed into any other new corps before the Amalgamation Act, his position would at this moment have been that of second Captain of his regiment; but according to the new rules, by which the above officers are retained on the roll of the 3d Madras European regiment—not with any view of their ever returning to the corps as heretofore whenever the regiment may be employed on active service; not in order that their subscriptions to the regimental funds may still be retained; not as in any way belonging to the regiment, but solely to regulate, as the General Order terms it, the promotion of their juniors—your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely, leaving a feeling of bitter disappointment as the result.

6. Your memorialist submits that it cannot be justly urged that the formation of the Indian Staff corps involves a new arrangement, from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefit contingent thereon; nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed with its subordinate arrangements; it has been the well understood rule in the service, and hitherto faithfully observed, that every removal or promotion of a regimental officer under the rank of a Lieutenant-Colonel should give a step to the junior of his rank. Now, the officers before named, viz., Captains Dysart, Harris, and Moore, have been removed into a new corps; and your memorialist thinks and feels that in refusing to him the steps in the regiment which these officers' removal to another corps make, the conditions of his service are not observed by the Government under which he serves.

7. It is because your memorialist began his career in the Indian army, believing that, however slow might be the progress of advancement in the service to him as a regimental officer, the time would eventually come, if his life was spared, when the long struggle through the junior ranks would receive its late reward; that your memorialist feels the disappointment of seeing his seniors removed without benefit to him. This falls with peculiar severity now that that career has extended over 18 years.

8. It is because your memorialist's brother soldiers of the regimental branches of the British army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

9. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of Amalgamation has been purposely so constituted as to retain for him all the privileges and rights which he acquired as an officer of the Indian army when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

10. Your memorialist, therefore, upon the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation that Captains Dysart, Harris, and Moore may be struck off the returns of the 3d Madras European Regiment from the date of their appointment to their new corps, that your memorialist may thereby at least obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled.

And your petitioner has the honour to subscribe himself,

Yours, &c.

(Signed) C. F. GILBERTSON, Captain,
3d Madras European Regiment.

(111.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Captain R. S. Burge, 3d Madras European Regiment.

1. Your memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration the following representation:—

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay himself open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful, but earnest representation of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him by the retention of the names of Captain and Brevet Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnley, and Dashwood, in the list of Captains of the 3d Madras European Regiment, after appointment to the 108th Regiment and Staff corps.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system; because it has ever been the practice hitherto to allow every promotion of officers which might occur in regiments, up to the rank of Major included, to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has, moreover, been ruled that in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India, who shall join the Staff corps, those officers are to be seconded, and their steps are to go in their respective regiments; and the irregularity of operation in the two services, in the instance he describes, makes an invidious distinction.

5. Your memorialist cannot but remember, had Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood been removed into any other new corps before the Amalgamation Act, his position would, at this moment, have been that of fifth Captain of his regiment; but according to the new rules, by which Captains Dysart, Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, are retained on the roll of the 3d Madras European Regiment; not with any view of their ever returning to the corps, as heretofore, whenever the regiment may be employed on active service; not in order that their subscriptions to the regimental funds may still be retained; not as in any way belonging to the regiment,—but solely to regulate, as the General Order terms it, the promotion of the juniors, your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely, leaving a feeling of bitter disappointment as the result.

6. Your memorialist submits that it cannot be fairly urged that the formation of the 108th Regiment and the Indian Staff corps involves a new arrangement, from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefits contingent thereon, nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed, with its subordinate arrangements. It has been the well-understood rule in the service, and hitherto faithfully observed, that every removal or promotion of a regimental officer under the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, should give a step to the juniors of his rank. Captains Dysart, Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood have been removed into new corps; and your memorialist thinks and feels that, in refusing to him the steps in the regiment which Captains Dysart, Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood's removal into other corps make, the conditions of his service are not observed by the Government under which he serves.

7. It is because your memorialist's brother soldiers of the regimental branches of the British Army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

8. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of Amalgamation has been purposely so constituted as to retain for him all the privileges and rights which he acquired as an officer of the Indian army, when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

9. Your memorialist therefore, upon the grounds which he has now stated, submits his earnest solicitation that Captains Dysart, Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood may be struck off the returns of the 3d Madras European Regiment, from the date of their appointments to the 108th Regiment and Staff corps, that your memorialist may thereby at least obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself to be fairly entitled.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) ROBERT SUTTON BURGE, Captain,
3d Madras European Regiment.
Jaulnah, 21st November 1861.

(112.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for
India in Council.

The Memorial of Lieutenant C. J. T. Whitlock,
3d Madras European Regiment.

1. Your memorialist has the honour to submit most respectfully for consideration the following representation:—

2. Your memorialist trusts that he will not lay him-
7186.

self open to any charge of impropriety by his very respectful but earnest representation of the wrong which he feels is inflicted on him by the retention of the names of Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood on the list of Captains, and the names of Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Wetherall, Bedingfield, Sheffield, and Worster, on the list of Lieutenants of his regiments, after their appointment to the Staff corps, and Her Majesty's 108th Regiment.

3. Your memorialist feels injured by this new system, because it has ever been the practice hitherto to allow all promotion of officers which might occur in regiments (up to the rank of Major inclusive), to give a step to their juniors in their respective ranks.

4. It has been moreover ruled in cases of officers of Her Majesty's British regiments serving in India who shall join the Staff corps, that those officers are to be seconded, and their steps are to go in their respective regiments, and the irregularity of operation in the two services in the instance he describes makes an invidious distinction.

5. Your memorialist cannot but remember that had Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, and Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Weatherall, Bedingfield, Sheffield, and Worcester have been removed into any other new corps prior to the Amalgamation Act, his position would at this moment have been that of 13th Captain of his regiment, but according to the new rules by which Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, and Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Weatherall, Bedingfield, Sheffield, and Worcester are retained on the roll of the 3d Madras European Regiment,—not with any view of their ever returning to the corps, as heretofore, whenever the regiment may be employed on active service; not in order that their subscriptions to the regimental funds may be retained; not as in any way belonging to the regiment, but solely to regulate, as the General Order terms it, the promotion of the juniors—your memorialist's promotion in the army is stopped indefinitely, thereby leaving a feeling of bitter disappointment as the result.

6. Your memorialist begs to submit, with all due respect, that it cannot be justly urged that the formation of Her Majesty's 108th Regiment and the Indian Staff corps involves a new arrangement, from which he, as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service, has no right to derive the benefits contingent thereon, nor is it a fair mode of argument to say that he is in no worse position than that in which he would have been had the Amalgamation Act not existed, with its subordinate arrangements. It has been a well understood rule in the service, and, hitherto, most faithfully adhered to, that any removal or promotion of a regimental officer under the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, should give a step to the juniors of his rank. Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, and Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Wetherall, Bedingfield, Sheffield, and Worcester have been removed into new corps, and your memorialist thinks and feels that in refusing to him the steps in the regiment which Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Williams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, and Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Wetherall, Bedingfield, Sheffield, and Worcester have been removed into other corps have caused, the conditions of his service are not observed by the Government under which he serves.

7. It is because your memorialist's brother officers of the regimental branch of the British army in India are to be promoted under the operation of the new system that he feels acutely the wrong under which it makes him suffer.

8. And it is because your memorialist has been led to believe that the Act of Amalgamation has been purposely so constructed as to retain for him all the privileges and rights which he acquired as an officer of the late Honourable East India Company's service when he joined it, that he feels that he is entitled to make this his most respectful appeal.

9. Your memorialist, therefore, upon the grounds which he has above stated, submits most respectfully his very earnest solicitation that Captain and Brevet-Major Dysart, Captains Harris, Moore, Farewell, Wil-

R

APP. G.

hams, Pereira, Rawnsley, and Dashwood, and Lieutenants Bradford, Creery, Peet, Hunt, Carmichael, Wetherall, Beddingfield, Sheffield, and Worster may be struck off the returns of the 3rd Madras European Regiment from the date of their appointments to Her Majesty's 108th Regiment and Staff corps, in order that your memorialist may thereby at least obtain the position in his regiment to which he believes himself fairly entitled.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

Yours, &c.

(Signed) C. J. T. WHITLOCK,

Lieutenant, 3d Madras European Regiment,
Her Majesty's 108th Regiment.

Jaulnah, 9th December 1861.

(113.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Captain Edward Henry Blomfield, of the 7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

YOUR memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration the following representation:—

1. Your memorialist having entered the service in the year 1840, with well-understood rights and privileges as to rank and promotion, which rights and privileges were guaranteed by Mr. Henley's clause of the Amalgamation Act, feels that a wrong has been inflicted on him by his supercession by a junior in his own regiment, Captain Saunders, who has been promoted to a substantive majority, and may thus hereafter command the regiment to which your memorialist belongs, or with which he may be doing duty.

2. Further, your memorialist would represent that not only is he now superseded by his junior in the regiment, Captain Saunders, but that three other regimental juniors, Captain Campbell, Lieutenants, Swanton and Harrison, lately appointed to the Staff corps, will become Majors in five and six years hence, and thus probably supersede your memorialist, as he cannot hope to gain his majority within that time, in consequence of the certain future slowness of promotion caused by the reduction in the number of Lieutenant-Colonels, and consequent decrease of line steps, and also by the stoppage of all purchased retirements among the seniors, caused by Staff officers remaining in their old regiments, but gaining their promotion in the Staff corps.

3. Under the rules of the Company's service, your memorialist could never have been superseded in regimental or line promotion by his regimental junior, except by sentence of court-martial as a punishment for misconduct. The advantages as to privileges and promotion of these rules were granted by Act of Parliament, and further confirmed by clause 23 of the Amalgamation Warrant. Your memorialist therefore feels justified in making this representation, and requesting that he may be relieved from his present supercession by Captain Saunders, and future supercession by other juniors of his own regiment.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) E. H. BLOMFIELD,

Captain, 7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Kamptee, 3d October 1861.

(114.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Captain William Blount, of the 7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.

YOUR memorialist has the honour to submit for consideration the following representation:—

Your memorialist having entered the service of the late Honourable East India Company in the year 1844, with well understood rights and privileges as to rank and promotion, which rights and privileges were guaranteed him by Mr. Henley's clause of the Amalgamation Act, feels that a wrong has been inflicted on him by the names of the officers of his regiment who have lately elected to join the Staff corps being retained on the roll of his regiment, although transferred to a new corps, a custom never hitherto practised, thereby checking promotion by means of purchase, a system recognised and approved of by the late Honourable East India Company, and your memorialist having expended certain sums in the purchase of steps, can thus never

hope to obtain anything in his turn on his retirement from the service; a pecuniary loss is thereby inflicted on him.

Further, your memorialist would represent that three of his regimental juniors, Captain Campbell and Lieutenants Swanton and Harrison, lately transferred to the Staff corps, will become substantive Majors in five or six years from this time, and thus supersede your memorialist, as he cannot hope to obtain his majority within that time, in consequence of the certain future slowness of promotion, caused by the reduction in the number of Lieutenant-Colonels and consequent decrease of line steps, and also by the stoppage of all regimental purchase as before mentioned.

Under the rules of the late Honourable East India Company's service, your memorialist could never have been superseded in regimental or line promotion by his regimental juniors, except by sentence of court-martial, as a punishment for misconduct. The advantages as to privileges and promotion of these rules were guaranteed by Act of Parliament, and further confirmed by clause 23 of the Amalgamation Warrant.

Your memorialist would also beg to represent that an unfair advantage has been given to officers joining the new Staff corps by their now being placed by their promotion in a position to subscribe in a higher grade to the Military Fund in this Presidency, and thereby derive advantages in the shape of increased passage money and equipment allowance, and superior pensions for their widows and children in the event of their decease, an advantage denied to your memorialist until he attains a regimental majority.

Your memorialist, therefore, feels justified in making this representation, and requests that he may be relieved from the dread of future supercession by the juniors of his own regiment; that the check given to his promotion and pecuniary loss sustained by him may be taken into consideration, and that he may be enabled to avail himself of the like advantages as the Staff officers lately of the same rank as himself in the regiment, and his juniors, who will be able to attain such long before he can possibly hope to do so.

And your memorialist has the honour to subscribe himself,

(Signed) Wm. BLOUNT, Captain,

7th Regiment, Madras Native Infantry.
Kamptee, 14th October 1861.

(115.)

o the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Burdett Richard Powell, a Lieutenant-Colonel in Her Majesty's 26th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry,

1. Most humbly sheweth that your memorialist on the amalgamation of the Indian with Her Majesty's general army was, by Act of Parliament, guaranteed all his rights and privileges.

2. That your memorialist respectfully submits that such Act has not been strictly observed.

3. That by the constitution of the Staff corps or regiment, your memorialist, who held the regimental rank of Major at the time, has been superseded in the substantive and regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel by officers who were regimentally his juniors on the list of field officers for promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel, regimentally, at the date of amalgamation, to the detriment of your memorialist, and in breach of the Rules and Regulations of the Indian army.

4. That by the Secretary of State for India, Despatch No. 270, published in the Calcutta Government Gazette, No. 869, of the 12th September 1862, each of these officers, his juniors on the list of regimental field officers at the date of amalgamation, becomes entitled to off-reckonings, or Colonels' allowances, prior to your memorialist, in direct contravention of his rights and privileges, which secures the off-reckonings, or Colonels' allowances, to field officers by regimental succession only.

5. That under the Rules and Regulations of the Indian army in force prior to the date of amalgamation, it was not possible for a senior field officer, by regimental succession, to be superseded in substantive rank by his junior, or for his junior ever to obtain the off-reckonings, or Colonels' allowances, before him.

6. That in accordance with the rules contained in the aforesaid Despatch, No. 270, an officer on the Staff corps becomes entitled to the off-reckonings, or Colonels' allowances, after 38 years' service, while your memorialist, and many other officers in the local army, whose

promotion has been similarly slow, will not become entitled to the off-reckonings until after 44 years' service.

7. That your memorialist's already slow promotion (he having served upwards of 32 years for the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel) is still further and indefinitely retarded by the unprecedented retention over your memorialist of officers who have retired from the service, whose names are to be retained on the general list. Your memorialist here refers to the recent orders for retirement of 300 officers of the Indian army.

8. That the objects which induced your memorialist to contribute to the retirement of six of his regimental seniors have been frustrated, and his professional prospects destroyed by the supersession occasioned by the constitution of the Staff corps.

9. That your memorialist has served upwards of 11 years on the Staff, but was precluded entering the Staff corps in consequence of not having been employed on the Staff within three years of the date of amalgamation, although in command of a native regiment of the regular army at the time, which does not constitute Staff employ, whereas the command of an irregular regiment does.

10. Your memorialist therefore prays that to prevent his being superseded in substantive rank by officers regimentally junior to him on the list of field officers at the date of the amalgamation, his regimental substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel may be ante-dated to the 18th February 1861.

11. And that the right and privilege of every field officer by regimental succession, borne on the effective strength of the army to succeed to the off-reckonings, or Colonels' allowances, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the service in force at the date of amalgamation, and which have been guaranteed by Act of Parliament, may be continued.

And your memorialist will, as it duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) B. R. POWELL,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
Camp Kolapore, Her Majesty's 26th Regiment,
9th February 1863. Bombay Native Infantry.

(116.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India.

The humble Petition of James Mackillop Taylor, Lieutenant-Colonel, Her Majesty's 2d Regiment, Bombay Light Cavalry,

Humbly sheweth,

1. YOUR petitioner entered the service of the Honourable Company as Cornet of Cavalry in the Bombay army on the 3d August 1836, and rising through each successive grade by seniority, he attained the regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on the 6th February 1861.

2. That the army of the Honourable Company was ever a purely seniority service, by which all vacancies through transfer and retirements of regimental officers invariably gave promotion and rise to their juniors.

3. That on the question of the amalgamation of the Royal and Indian armies being referred to the House of Commons, it was declared on the 2d August 1858 by an enactment, that with regard to officers of the local Indian services, "they shall be entitled to the like pay, pension, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the Company."

4. That such declaration has been repeatedly published to the Indian army both by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, as also by the Indian Government, more especially in a General Order of the 10th April 1861.

5. That in the above General Order all officers of the Indian army were called on to elect as to whether they wished to transfer their services by volunteering for Her Majesty's general British army in any particular regiment, or with the above guarantee to remain in the local Indian service. Amongst other modifications promulgated in this General Order, it was ruled by the Secretary of State for India in his Despatch to the Indian Government, being replies to questions by Indian officers submitted by the Indian Government to the Right Honourable Secretary, that "regimental Lieutenant-Colonels transferring themselves, and being accepted in any of the new Line regiments of Cavalry or Infantry, thereby disconnect themselves from the Indian service, and will forego all claim to

"future full Colonel's allowance in the Indian line, but will become eligible to a regiment under the regulations of the British army."

APP. G.

6. That your petitioner, on the provisions of the above guarantee, elected to remain in Her Majesty's local Indian Bombay Cavalry, but that Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis, your petitioner's immediate senior officer, and the 1st Lieutenant-Colonel of the Bombay Cavalry, volunteered for Her Majesty's 21st Hussars, one of the new regiments of the British Line Cavalry, and has been transferred as regimental Lieutenant-Colonel to the 21st Hussars.

7. That Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis, by such voluntary transfer to Her Majesty's Dragoons, has therefore forfeited his position in and claim to future promotion to full Colonel in the Bombay army, and Colonel's allowance in the Bombay Cavalry, to which he does not now belong.

8. That your petitioner respectfully submits to your honourable and favourable consideration that his rights and claims, acknowledged previous to amalgamation, may not be disturbed, for your petitioner finds that the name of Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis, though totally separated from, and no longer belonging to, the Bombay Cavalry, is still kept over your petitioner in "italics," and is so to remain for life, thereby debarring your petitioner from that present promotion and rank, and future emolument, which must by such transfer have necessarily ensued to your petitioner, had the Company's service still existed.

9. That your petitioner hereby prays the name of Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis, of Her Majesty's 21st Hussars, may be entirely removed from the lists of field officers of the Bombay Cavalry; and that your petitioner may, in accordance with all former usage in the Indian army, obtain the promotion to, and position of senior Lieutenant-Colonel of the Bombay Cavalry, now vacated by the transfer of Lieutenant-Colonel Curtis to a regimental lieutenant-colonelcy in the 21st British Hussars.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray,
(Signed) J. M. TAYLOR, Lieutenant-Colonel,
2d Regiment Bombay Light Cavalry.
Neemuch, 22d September 1862.

(117.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Charles Thompson, a Captain in Her Majesty's 2d Bombay European Regiment, Light Infantry,

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist has served upwards of 20 years as a commissioned officer in the Bombay army, and that during that time he has paid various large sums of money for the purchase of regimental steps, under the sanction of the Honourable the East India Company (*vide* letter from the Honourable Court to the Supreme Government of India, dated 29th November 1837, published in General Order, 22d May 1838,) looking forward to the privilege of recovering the same by subscriptions from his juniors (under the rule of the said Company secured to him) when the time for his own retirement should arrive; but under existing circumstances he has been deprived of this benefit, and the money all sunk; that this, being one of his privileges, has been confirmed by Act of Parliament, and is therefore guaranteed by the statute law of England.

2. That your memorialist finds himself, without any fault on his part, deprived of his regiment and sent to a native corps, with his promotion stopped, not only by the retention of the names of pensioned officers still on the effective list above him; but those of Majors Barr and Gordon, and Captains Hervey, Tyacke, Aitchison, and Bruce kept on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment; they having to all intents and purposes quitted that regiment, and been posted to and promoted in other corps, viz., Major Barr to Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff corps, Major Gordon to the same; Captain Tyacke to Major in Her Majesty's 106th Regiment, Light Infantry; and Captains Hervey, Aitchison, and Bruce to Majors in the Staff corps; in both of which respectively they stand as substantive Lieutenant-Colonel and Majors.

3. That your memorialist, during his service, has seen four new regiments added to the Bombay army, and in each and every case the names of the officers posted to them have been removed, and the promotion made in their places in the old regiments; and your memorialist respectfully submits that this has been the custom and usage of the Bombay army from time im-

APP. G.

memorial, and that this usage and right has been guaranteed by Act of Parliament, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. ss. 56 and 58. That the Bombay Staff corps is a new regiment has been, your memorialist would respectfully state, determined by a declaration to that effect made by the Honourable Secretary of State for India.

4. That from your memorialist's long service, he has paid, as a married subscriber, large donations and subscriptions to the military fund; and that by the names of the above-mentioned officers being retained as Majors and Captains on the cadre of his regiment (with which they have now no concern, they being, one a Lieutenant-Colonel, and the remainder Majors in other corps), he is thereby cut off from all hope of that promotion which would secure to his widow, in the event of his death, the pension of a Major instead of that of a Captain.

5. That your memorialist therefore humbly prays that the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India will inquire into the circumstances under which your memorialist's prospects have been most seriously injured, contrary to the provisions made by law, and will grant him the relief which his case calls for, by removing the names of all retired officers from the effective list of the Bombay army, and also from the cadre of your memorialist's regiments the names of those already enumerated, whereby alone he would be placed on an equality with officers of his own standing in the service who have entered the Staff corps, or been promoted into the new Line regiments.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) C. THOMPSON, Captain,
Her Majesty's 2d Bombay European Regiment,
Light Infantry.

Camp, Neemuch, 17th October 1862.

(118.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Henry Ebenezer Jacob, a Captain in Her Majesty's 18th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry,

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist, understanding from the general tenor of the official documents on the subject, and more especially from the views expressed in the following extract from General Order by his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, No. 332, para. 23, of 10th April 1861:—

“ In the execution of these measures it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that the pledge that due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian army shall be scrupulously adhered to; ” that it is the wish of Government that the measures recently introduced for the amalgamation of the Indian with Her Majesty's general forces should not injuriously affect the interests of any individual officer, begs respectfully to submit for consideration the following circumstances connected with his own case, as he conceives that the change of system will operate very ruinously on his professional position and prospects.

2. That your memorialist, having been informed in letter No. 4358, of 19th June 1861, from the Adjutant-General of the Army, that he is not eligible to enter the Staff corps on the same terms as other officers who are now, or who within the last three years have been, holding permanent Staff appointments, is compelled, not from choice, but by necessity, to remain with his regiment, but this enforced position is, in several respects, far inferior to the one he has hitherto occupied. In the first place, he is subjected to supercession by many of his junior officers, whose claims he cannot admit to be in any way superior to his own. This in itself is galling to the feelings of your memorialist as a military man; and in addition to this supercession, which he considers to be undeserved on his part, his prospects of regimental rise and command are very much weakened by the change of system, and also, under the altered condition of the service, he will not benefit as he would otherwise have done from the sums he has laid out in the purchase of regimental steps.

3. To elucidate what has been brought forward as regards supercession, your memorialist would beg to point to four junior officers of his regiment who have been permitted to enter the Staff corps, and who must, according to all calculation, be promoted to the rank of Major before him. Of these officers, Captains Ash-

burner and Ross are his juniors by four years, and, except that they now hold Staff appointments, whilst your memorialist has been with his regiment since his return from furlough, their previous Staff service differs in no material respect from his own. Lieutenants (now Captains in the Staff corps) Johnstone and Elphinstone are his juniors by seven years. Captain Burton, also junior to him, is now holding an appointment out of India, and your memorialist is not aware whether or no he will be permitted to enter the Staff corps; but the other four officers named are already in it, and must, he fears, supersede him. It is even possible that he may be superseded by Lieutenants Grants and Wilson of his own regiment, who are his juniors by 16 years, as both those officers now hold Staff appointments, and will probably be permitted to enter the Staff corps. Were these examples not sufficient, your memorialist could mention the names of very many junior officers of other regiments who will supersede him, from having gained admittance to the Staff corps. This supercession is not a nominal evil but a real hardship, as, at some future period, the officers alluded to might be sent to command his regiment over his head, and, indeed, until he is promoted to the rank of Major by regimental rise, they, on becoming field officers on the Staff, would probably be considered to have a prior right to the command. Under any circumstances, either in quarters or in the field, your memorialist is at any time liable to be placed under the command of officers who, until the recent changes were introduced, were his juniors in the service, and whose claims to Staff employment, so far as the former rules and requirements of the service are considered, are not superior to his.

4. Your memorialist also would respectfully represent that he cannot attribute this supercession, which renders his position in the service, he must say, a degraded one, to any fault, omission, or failure of duty on his own part. He has passed the prescribed interpreter's examination in Hindostanee; though not at present holding a Staff appointment, he has, at various periods of his service, been employed on the Staff. The annexed list of the appointments he has held will show that he has had considerable and varied experience as a Staff officer; in fact, he has actually served with credit on the Staff for a longer period than many of his junior officers, who will now, on account of their Staff services, be put over his head.

6. That the rules laid down for the admittance of officers to the Staff corps bear hardly in the case of your memorialist, may further be inferred from the fact, that could he give up seven years of his 22 of service, and be replaced in the appointment of Adjutant of his regiment which he held in 1854, he would be eligible for the Staff corps, and would then, as regards promotion, be in a much better position than he is now. It also appears to your memorialist that, having officiated in the appointment of Assistant Adjutant-General, Southern Division of the Army, on a full vacancy, from 19th May to 31st July 1860, he should be permitted to elect for the Staff corps on the same terms as other Staff officers. On this point he would wish to be favoured with instructions.

6. The Staff Corps Warrant certainly provides that officers who are not at present eligible, may at some future period gain admittance to the corps on being found fully qualified, and on passing such periods of probation as may be determined on; but no positive information on the subject, as regards details, has as yet been published to the army. The probability of your memorialist gaining admittance is thus remote and uncertain, whilst he is daily being subjected to supercession; and he is now placed on a different footing (involving loss of position and rank) to some of his more fortunate brother officers, whose claims and qualifications he has shown to be in no material respect superior to his. Indeed, the only difference between them and him is that they happen, through the chances of the service, to be now holding similar appointments to those he formerly held. Your memorialist is also under the impression, that were he now to enter the Staff corps on probation, his previous Staff service would not count.

7. Whilst thus debarred from entering the Staff corps on the same terms as others, and subjected to the forfeiture of the rights and privileges appertaining to the former system, your memorialist finds that his regimental position and prospects are not nearly so good as they formerly were. Not only is it probable, as above shown, that officers now his juniors may, at some future period, supersede him in the command,

but his promotion to the rank of Major is likely to be much retarded by the change of system. Of the four officers who stand immediately above him in the regiment, your memorialist is aware that three had intended to retire from the service at an early period could they have secured from their juniors the sums usually paid, with the sanction of Government, to officers on retiring; of the intentions of the fourth officer your memorialist has no certain information, but he has heard that he also had some thoughts of retiring on the same terms at an early period. But these officers will probably not now be able to fulfil their intentions, as the new system will not admit of their being purchased out by their juniors, who could not look for any return for money now invested in that way. Thus your memorialist sees no immediate prospect of regimental promotion, and he also loses the money he himself has invested in the purchase of regimental steps, in all about 7,000 rupees; moreover, should he himself wish to retire at any time, he cannot hope to be purchased out in his turn. It must be admitted, that this is a serious injury to his prospects when it is considered that several Captains of his regiment, who have retired since he joined, have received from their juniors sums varying from 15,000 to 20,000 rupees. No Major has been purchased out, but in other regiments the sums hitherto paid to Majors have usually ranged from 30,000 rupees to 40,000 rupees.

8. Under these circumstances, your memorialist respectfully submits this brief representation of his case to the favourable notice of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, in the confident hope that, in accordance with the pledge given that the rights and claims of all officers will be scrupulously adhered to, measures will be adopted to place him in as good a position as that he has hitherto, by the kind consideration of a liberal Government, been enjoying.

And, as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) H. E. JACOB, Captain,
Her Majesty's 18th Regiment, Bombay
Native Infantry.

Belgaum, 17th September 1861.

Statement of Permanent and Acting Staff Appointments held by Captain H. E. Jacob, 18th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry.

Permanent Appointments.

Assistant Baggage-Master and Commandant 3d Division Scinde Camel Baggage Corps, from 13th June 1847 to 1st April 1848.

Aide-de-camp to General Sir S. B. Auchmuty, G.C.B., then Major-General commanding Poona division of the army, from 7th February 1851 to 3d April 1852.

Adjutant of his regiment, from 28th April 1852 to 30th March 1854.

Acting Appointments.

Adjutant of a wing of his regiment, from 26th September 1842 to 16th January 1843.

Brigade Major, Rajcote, from 17th September 1854 to 17th November 1854.

Assistant Adjutant-General, Southern division of the army, from 19th May 1860 to 31st July 1860.

Brigade-Major, Belgaum, from 17th September 1860 to 26th November 1860.

(119.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of James Casamajor Farquharson, a Captain in Her Majesty's 2d Regiment, Bombay Light Cavalry:

Most humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist acknowledges with gratitude, that on the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Royal army with the Indian army, a seniority service, that his rights and privileges had been guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament.

Your memorialist, however, respectfully submits that such Act has not been rigidly attended to in Her Majesty's Indian army.

That on the amalgamation of the services, officers had the option of joining the Staff corps, volunteering for general service or Her Majesty's Hussars, or remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff corps and Hussar officers' names who are senior to your memorialist in the cadre of the regiment is a serious injury to him, by preventing his regimental rise, while his juniors in the Staff corps must supersede him.

That consequent on the Staff corps and Hussar officers' names being retained on the cadres of regiments, all your memorialist's contributions to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as no officers will contribute under existing circumstances, and consequently promotion is stopped.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded, and that he may not be superseded by the retention in the cadres of the regiment of the names of those officers who have joined the Staff corps and Hussars.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) JAMES C FARQUHARSON, Captain
Camp Poona, Her Majesty's 3d Regiment, Bombay
13th February 1863. Light Cavalry.

(120.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Charles Alfred Moore, a Lieutenant in Her Majesty's 2d Regiment, Bombay Light Cavalry:

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist acknowledges with gratitude, on the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Royal army with the Indian army, a seniority service, that his rights and privileges had been guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament (Act 21 & 22 Vict. 106. s. 58), and are, therefore, now guaranteed by the statute law of the realm.

Your memorialist, however, respectfully submits, such Act has not been rigidly attended to in Her Majesty's Indian army.

That on the amalgamation of the services, officers had the option of joining the Staff corps, volunteering for general service, or for Her Majesty's Hussars, or remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff corps and Hussar officers' names who are senior to your memorialist in the cadre of his regiment, is a serious injury to him, by preventing his regimental rise.

That in accordance with the sanction of the Honourable Court of Directors of the late East India Company, conveyed to the Bombay army in their letter to the Supreme Government of India, under date 29th November 1837, your petitioner has from time to time invested sums in the purchase of steps by regimental subscription; and this privilege, secured to him by the rules and customs of the Honourable East India Company, had never been questioned or cancelled.

That consequent on the Staff corps and Hussar officers' names being retained in the cadre of regiments, all your memorialist's contributions to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as no officers will contribute under existing circumstances, and consequently promotion is stopped.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded, and that those officers' names who have selected the Staff corps and general service may be entirely removed from the list of Bombay Cavalry officers.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) CHARLES ALFRED MOORE,
Lieutenant and Adjutant
Her Majesty's 2d Bombay Light Cavalry.
Camp Neemuch, 20th October 1862.

(121.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of George Forbes Hogg, a Lieutenant in the Bombay Staff corps, Quartermaster and Interpreter Her Majesty's 29th (or 2d Belooch Regiment) Native Infantry.

Showeth,

THAT your memorialist was much mortified at the issue of an order by the Government of Bombay, based on your Despatch of the 11th of August 1861, cancelling his promotion to Captain in the Staff corps.

APP. G.

That your memorialist joined the army on the 3d of March 1848, was promoted to Lieutenant on the 25th December 1854, was appointed to the 2d Belooch Regiment on the 8th November 1856, elected to the Staff corps on its formation, and was gazetted to a Captaincy in the corps on the 2d August, with rank from the 18th February.

That your memorialist obtained leave of absence on sick certificate to Europe for 15 months in 1859-60. That in Her Majesty's Royal Warrant directing the formation of a Staff corps, it is laid down that "officers after 12 years' service, of which four must have been in the Staff corps, to become Captains;" and officers now in Staff employment in India, joining the Staff corps on its formation, shall count their previous Staff service towards promotion to the following extent: one step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it according to the above rules.

That your memorialist having served 12 years, four of which were on the Staff, was admitted to the Staff corps, and promoted to Captain.

That by the cancelling of his promotion your memorialist loses one year's rank, and is superseded by numerous officers in the Staff corps, some of whom, having suffered from ill-health, have, like him, been obliged to leave India for a time, but who, by reason of their longer service on the Staff, are not affected by the recent Order.

That not only in the Staff corps will your memorialist be superseded by officers junior to him, but also in the regiment (1st European Regiment Bombay Fusiliers) to which he formerly had the honour to belong, and likewise in the General List.

That your memorialist most respectfully solicits the same indulgence as was granted by you in Despatch No. 389, dated 8th October 1861, para. 5, to certain Artillery officers in the Bengal and Madras Presidencies who were erroneously promoted—viz., that instead of their promotion being cancelled, they should be borne as supernumeraries.

That your memorialist would respectfully submit that your Despatch, dated 11th August, states that "officers who may now join the Staff corps," &c., whereas your memorialist had at that time been appointed to, and promoted in, the corps. Your memorialist ventures to hope that you will take a favourable view of his case, and restore to him the rank of a Captain from the date of the formation of the Staff corps.

(Signed) G. F. HOGE, Lieutenant,
Bombay Staff Corps.

(122.)

Oriental Club, Hanover Square,
19th May 1862

SIR,
I DEEM it right, as a matter of respect to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council, to transmit to him copy of a petition which I have addressed to the Honourable the House of Commons.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. G. GAITSKELL,
Lieut.-Col. Bengal Retired List

To the Military Secretary,
India Office.

To the Honourable the Commons of England.

The humble Petition of Lieutenant-Colonel James
Gandy Gaitskell, of the Bengal Retired List,

Showeth,

THAT your petitioner on the 28th November 1860 applied to the India Office to know if, in case he retired from the service, he could defer doing so till near the expiration of his five years' absence from India, in expectation of some inducement being held out to Field Officers to retire who had served their time.

That, receiving no reply, and the departure of the steamer drawing nigh, your petitioner inquired at the Military Secretary's office, India Office, and was informed that his application was under consideration, and a reply would be given him if he attended there on Friday, the 14th December, when he was told no decision had been arrived at.

That on the 20th December 1860 (the very day the steamer left Southampton, which could have conveyed him to Calcutta before his five years' absence expired), your petitioner received a letter, No. 5448, dated the

19th instant, from the India Office, stating "that no alteration of the retiring rules of Her Majesty's Indian army has been determined upon," and that his application must be sent in so as to permit of his return to India in case it was refused.

That this delay in replying to your petitioner's letter of the 28th November 1860 compelled him at once to send in his application to retire, and deprived him of the option of returning to India, and thus securing the grant of an additional 50l. a year, published on the 4th February 1861; also the benefit of the increased annuities offered the following August; the former of which being issued before the expiration of his five years' absence, extending it to your petitioner, could infringe no section of the Act of the 33 Geo. 3. cap. 52. bearing on this matter.

That the Amalgamation Act has also caused your petitioner great pecuniary loss, most of the officers of the 26th Bengal Native Infantry having refused, in consequence, their contributions to him, in return for his many years' subscription to the Regimental Retiring Fund, sanctioned by the letter of the Court of Directors of the 29th November 1837, No. 7, in which they state "that when they see cause for any interference with such funds they will give timely notice;" and your petitioner is convinced your Honourable House will uphold the rights of the Indian officers, secured to them by the clauses 55, 56, and 58 of the Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106. and re-enacted by the Right Honourable Mr. Henley's saving clause in the Bill of 1860, as well as by the present Premier's promise when introducing the Indian Bill, and likewise by the Right Honourable the Earl of Derby, when Premier, who stated in the House of Lords on the 15th July 1858, "The Bill leaves undisturbed the existing rights of the Indian army, and it would manifestly be a gross injustice to deprive the members of that army of the *privileges* and *expectations* which were held out to them;" and the petitioner is sure your Honourable House will consider that "the obliteration of such vested rights must prove ruinous, and will deprive officers and their families of a provision which they would have enjoyed but for the exchange now introduced by Government without the due notice promised to the Indian armies by the Court of Directors," as stated so truly and forcibly in Colonel Durand's Minute, late Member of the Indian Council.

Your petitioner therefore earnestly prays that your Honourable House will take into your favourable consideration the extraordinary delay which occurred at the India Office in replying to his letter of the 28th November 1860 (which, he it remarked, was not the case with any subsequent replies), and the injury inflicted on him thereby, also the further injuries inflicted by the Amalgamation Act, as fully detailed in his correspondence with the India Office, marginally cited, and that your Honourable House will consider your petitioner is, on these accounts, fully entitled to the same indulgence granted to other officers of his standing, viz., to participate in the sale of increased annuities sanctioned last August, or to such other reparation as to your Honourable House shall seem just and expedient.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

(Signed) J. G. GAITSKELL,
Lieutenant-Colonel Bengal Retired List,
Late Major 26th Bengal Native Infantry.
Oriental Club, Hanover Square, 19th May 1862.

MEMORANDUM.

On the 28th November 1860, Major Gaitskell asked whether he must then retire, or might remain until the 10th February 1861 (when he would have been five years absent from India, and by Act of Parliament out of the service), and then retire from the service. On the 19th December he was informed that he must at once retire. By this decision he complains that he lost the additional allowance granted to officers who retired after the 5th February 1861, and which he could have claimed had he remained until the 10th February.

He also complains that in consequence of the amalgamation, his brother officers have declined to give him the usual sum on retirement.

(123.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart.,
Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Lieutenant-Colonel James
McGrigor, Her Majesty's 15th Regiment Bombay
Native Infantry,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your petitioner passed the Artillery course at Addiscombe on the 12th December 1834, and there being very few Artillery vacancies, came out to Bombay in the Infantry on the 5th July 1835, since which period he has served continuously in the country, with the exception of 17 months' leave on sick certificate, from October 1855 to March 1857.

That in consequence of the promotions on the amalgamation having taken place in the Artillery and Engineers before those in the Infantry, the Artillery promotions dating from 18th February 1861, while those in the Infantry are dated 1st January 1862, your petitioner has been superseded by about 14 Artillery and Engineer officers in the Bombay army alone, some of whom are more than seven years his junior, and have never passed through Addiscombe.

That your petitioner is superseded in the general list of the three presidencies by about 60 Artillery and Engineer officers, who by this supercession retard his promotion in every higher grade in the service, and when employed in the same force supersede him in commands that would otherwise fall to his share.

Your petitioner would, therefore, pray that all promotion consequent on the amalgamation should bear the same date, in order that he may be restored to his former position in the service.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) J. McGRIGOR, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Her Majesty's 15th Regiment
Bombay Native Infantry.

Aden, 10th March 1863.

(124.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of George Leslie Thomson, a Captain in
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment Bombay Native In-
fantry,

Most humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, on the amalgamation of the European officers and men of the Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces, was by Act of Parliament guaranteed his rights and privileges.

That your memorialist, however, most respectfully submits that such Act has not been observed.

That on the amalgamation of the services officers had the choice, on certain conditions, of volunteering for general service, of joining the Staff corps, or of remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff corps' officers senior to your memorialist now on the cadre of his regiment prevent his regimental rise, while his juniors in the Staff corps must supersede him.

That consequent on the officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, all his contributions (which have been considerable) to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as under existing circumstances no officer will contribute, and consequently promotion is rendered less speedy than it was before.

Your memorialist has been nearly nineteen (19) years in the Indian army, and in about four years more will be superseded by four officers his juniors in his own regiment, besides many others of his juniors in the service who were fortunate enough to get into the Staff corps, and this supercession is caused by no fault of your memorialist, and is contrary to what he was led to expect when he entered the Indian army.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded in any way, and that he may not be superseded by the retention of the officers of the Staff corps in the cadre of his regiment.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) GEO. LESLIE THOMSON, Captain,
Her Majesty's 26th Regiment
Bombay Native Infantry.

Camp Poona,
25th September 1862.

(125.)

Memorial from Captain Ewen Grant to the Secretary of
State for India,

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, being a cadet of 1839, has served nearly 24 years, and is now second Captain in the 3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry.

That in 1839 your memorialist was posted as Ensign to the 1st Bombay Grenadier Regiment, and served with it in the Bombay column of the army of the Indus, and was present at the battle of Nufoosk, on the 21st August 1840, on which occasion great loss of life was sustained by the British troops, and your memorialist thereby obtained his promotion to Lieutenant.

That your memorialist in this action was severely injured, and in the subsequent operations his health suffered so much that it has never since been completely re-established.

That your memorialist on his return to Scind found that he had been transferred from the lieutenantcy thus gained in action in the 1st Bombay Grenadier Regiment, to the 3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry as Ensign, in consequence of some departmental alteration of rank at the head quarters of the army. Your memorialist was thus deprived of the substantive rank (regimental) obtained in action, and his future promotion in the service was most disastrously affected thereby; for, had your memorialist been allowed to retain the position he had won in the 1st Bombay Grenadier Regiment in the field, he would have got his company in July 1849, and now promoted to the rank of Major instead of second Captain in the 3d Regiment, dating from 1st April 1854, according to the rules of promotion by regimental seniority in force in this army.

That such deprivation of rank once substantially gained by casualties caused in action is contrary to all rule and military custom, and was an unprecedented injury to your memorialist, and from which he has suffered throughout his career.

That in 1845 your memorialist was appointed second in command of the Scind camel corps, under the late Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Napier, K C B.

That in 1847 your memorialist was specially selected by Sir Charles Napier to serve as Adjutant of the Belooch battalion then being raised.

That in 1848-49 your memorialist served with the army of the Punjab, and was present at the siege and capture of Mooltan, battle of Gujerat, and pursuit and surrender of the Sikh army.—(Medal and two clasps.)

That in 1855, when on leave in England, your memorialist volunteered for service in the Crimea, and served under Sir R. H. Vivian in the Turkish Contingent, and as Provost Marshal to the force, with the local rank of Major (medal and 4th class order of the Medjidie for these services). The General was pleased to record his opinion in favor of your memorialist obtaining promotion, as shown in the letter marked c, but this promotion was never granted to him, although given to other officers who joined the Contingent at the same time as your memorialist (Instance.—Captain and Brevet-Major Rung, late Her Majesty's 87th Royal Irish Fusiliers.)

That in 1856 your memorialist returned to India, and was selected by Lieutenant-General Sir James Outram, G.C.B., to serve in Persia, in command of two squadrons of Scind Horse, was present at the bombardment and capture of Mohumra, and pursuit of the Persian army—(medal and clasps). For this service your memorialist, though led to expect promotion by brevet, was passed over, while officers junior to him were so rewarded.

That your memorialist on his return from Persia, and while in command of his regiment, was called on to proceed on special duty to Australia, to purchase horses, then most urgently required by the Government, and on his return and completion of this duty your memorialist received the thanks of Government.

That in 1858 your memorialist was again appointed on special duty to establish the Transport Train during the mutinies in Central India, and was subsequently appointed Director of the entire line.

That in 1860 your memorialist's regiment being ordered to China, he proceeded with it, and in April of the same year was appointed Deputy Quartermaster-General in Southern China, and served till the final evacuation of Canton by the British troops, when the Staff being reduced, His Excellency Sir J Michel, K.C.B., was pleased to commend these services very strongly to His Royal Highness the General Command-in-Chief for brevet promotion.

APP. G.

That on his return from China your memorialist was deputed by Sir H. Robinson, Governor of Victoria, to raise men in India for police service in China, which your memorialist carried out with success, and to the satisfaction of the Colonial Government.

That on the completion of the above duty, His Excellency Sir Bartle Frere, Governor of Bombay, was pleased to appoint your memorialist as Military Secretary to His Excellency in which office he has now the honour to be serving.

That your memorialist desires to bring most prominently to notice that, though during this long period of service he has always been actively employed in offices of considerable responsibility, danger, and trust, both in the field and in camp, for which his services have invariably been commended by all his immediate superiors, and recommended by them for brevet promotion, he still remains a Captain in the 3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry; and that from the changes in the services recently introduced, he is daily being superseded by officers very much junior to himself; upwards of 60 officers, his juniors, having been already promoted over him to the rank of Field Officer in the Bombay army alone.

That your memorialist has repeatedly applied for admission to the Staff corps, but his application has been refused, on the ground that his long Staff service in important situation was during the last two years previous to the formation of the Staff corps, in offices which did not belong to the permanent Staff of the army.

Had your memorialist been admitted, he would have obtained the substantive rank of Major from February 1861, and on completing 26 years' service in June 1865, been again promoted to the superior grade of Lieutenant-Colonel; but having been debarred from entering the corps, in all likelihood on the latter date he will still hold his present position in the 3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, with but slight hope of obtaining his regimental majority before 1872, by which date all Staff corps officers of the season 1851 will have been promoted to the rank of Major in the army.

Your memorialist, therefore, earnestly petitions that the Secretary of State will give the above facts his best consideration, with especial reference to your memorialist's services in Scind, the Crimea, Persia, and China, and recommend your memorialist to Her most gracious Majesty for promotion; and that you will further take such other steps as may prevent your memorialist being superseded by officers formerly his juniors in the army, and who, under the constitution of the army which existed when your memorialist entered it, could not have superseded him.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) EWEN GRANT, Captain,
3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry,
Military Secretary to His Excellency
the Governor of Bombay.

Bombay, 10th March 1863.

(a.)

19th April 1847.

I HAVE recommended you to be Adjutant of the Belooch Regiment at Hyderabad, to reward you for your zeal and good service. It will be in orders.

(Signed) C. NAPLIER.

(b.)

Kutch, 31st May 1856.

I CANNOT leave without giving myself the pleasure of writing to acknowledge how much I am indebted to you for the great service you have been to myself and the force generally, by the manner in which you have conducted the duty of your appointment as Provost Marshal. I am very well aware of the great difficulties you had to encounter, with very inadequate assistance; and that the order which has been maintained in the town has been the result of your vigilance, strong determination, and prudence.

Nothing would give me greater pleasure than being again associated with you on duty. Meanwhile, asking you to excuse my volunteering these expressions,

I remain, &c.

(Signed) R. CREEVE, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Deputy Adjutant-General Turkish Contingent.

(c.)

Copy of a Letter from Lieutenant-General Sir R. H. Vivian to Mr. Edward Ellice, M.P.

12th March 1858.

I WILL defer my reply a day or two, by which time I hope to see my late Military Secretary, who will be able to get me some documents to which I should desire to refer, ere I answer Major Grant's reference. I entertain the highest opinion of him; and would have rejoiced at the opportunity of serving him, for he was an excellent officer; but my impression is, that I could not have brought him on my recommendation list for promotion without opening the door to so many others, as would, had I recommended them all, have induced Lord Panmure to have thrown over my promotion list altogether. You shall hear further on the subject.

(d.)

Copy of Letter from Lieutenant-General Sir R. H. Vivian to Mr. Edward Ellice, M.P.

13th March 1858.

I HAVE referred to my correspondence with the War Department on the subject of the promotion of a certain number of my officers, and I find matters to be much as I stated in my note of the 11th.

I was restricted by Lord Panmure in my recommendation to a very limited number; and had I attempted to swell the list, I should have failed in obtaining promotion for any. I selected, as nearly as I could, a fair proportion from the seniors in the Contingent belonging to the various arms, Artillery, Cavalry, Infantry, and Staff, and confined that selection to those who first joined me, and held the commands of regiments, or positions equivalent to such commands. I would very gladly have extended my list, and, had I been permitted to do so, most certainly Ewen Grant's name would have been entered, as well as that of Major Young, both most efficient officers; but they joined me late, at Kutch only; and though they were quite as deserving of promotion as those recommended, still, as their periods of service with me were of shorter duration than those of the others, and as I was, as already stated, limited to the selection of a few, I gave those who had been longest with me the benefit of their seniority in my service.

(e.)

SIR, Horse Guards, 29th April 1862.
I AM directed by His Royal Highness the General G. O. 28th April Commanding-in-Chief to transmit for your information the enclosed copy of a letter from the India Office, relative to the recommendation of Major-General Sir John Michel in your favour, and in that of Captain C. F. Grant, 3d Bombay Native Infantry, for services in China, transmitted to the Government of Bombay.

(Signed) W. F. FORSTER.

(f.)

India Office, 26th April 1862.

I HAVE received and laid before the Secretary of State for India in Council your letter dated 9th instant, and am directed to inform you, in reply, that the correspondence enclosed therewith regarding the services in China of Captain C. F. Grant and Captain E. Grant, both of the 3d Bombay Native Infantry, will be transmitted to the Government of Bombay.

The enclosures to Sir John Michel's letter are herewith returned in accordance with your request.

(Signed) T. T. PEARS, Major-General,
Military Secretary.

(True copies.)

EWEN GRANT, Captain
3d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry,
Military Secretary to
His Excellency the Governor of Bombay.

(126.)

The Memorial of Captain Christian Disandt Grant, of the 11th Regiment of Her Majesty's Madras Native Infantry, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

YOUR petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you, and submits that the amalgamation of the late the Honourable East India Company's with Her Majesty's army, and the formation of the Staff corps, has caused your memorialist to suffer what he conceives

to be most grievous wrong and injury, in the following manner :—

2. Your memorialist, who belongs to the Indian Local Service, has been superseded by Captains Ardagh and Girdlestone, who, from being Captains in your memorialist's regiment, junior to your memorialist, have been made Majors in the Madras Staff corps, though the names of Majors Ardagh and Girdlestone are still retained in the regimental list of the 11th Madras Native Infantry as Captains junior to your memorialist; yet in virtue of their army rank they are competent to command the regiment in which your memorialist is their senior Captain.

3. Independent of these two direct supercessions by officers of his own regiment, your memorialist has been superseded by hundreds of Captains who were his juniors in the service, but who are now Field Officers by promotion into the Staff corps; and your memorialist is liable at any time to be placed in a position in which he must serve under these officers, formerly his juniors; and, finally, your memorialist is actually inferior to them in respect to such important matters as prize money, choice of quarters, general precedence, and the attainments of command.

4. Captain Benson, of your memorialist's regiment, has been removed and promoted to Major in the Staff corps; yet notwithstanding such removal and promotion, his name is still retained in your memorialist's regiment as a Captain senior to your memorialist, thus at present depriving him of a step in the list of Captains, and subsequently impeding your memorialist's promotion to the rank of Major in all probability for a period of eight years.

5. By the two preceding paras. it is shown that your memorialist has suffered by supercession by his juniors being promoted into the Staff corps, these juniors enjoying all the advantages over your memorialist that a senior can have over a junior; and that when a senior to your memorialist has been removed and promoted into the Staff corps, that then your memorialist has not been permitted to derive the slightest benefit from such promotion. Your memorialist most respectfully submits that the infliction of such grievances is opposed to every rule and regulation of the late Honourable East India Company's and also of Her Majesty's service, and that a similar removal from any of Her Majesty's British regiments into the Indian Staff corps will be followed by the promotion of officers junior to such removal.

6. The sums of money contributed by your memorialist from time to time towards the purchasing out of his regiment his seniors, which custom was formally sanctioned and approved of by the late Government, must now be considered as money thrown away, as there is no hope that your memorialist may by these means reach the grade of field officer regimentally, which was his object in contributing to the purchases aforesaid; and moreover, the monetary value of your memorialist's position in his regiment is greatly deteriorated by removal into the Staff corps of no less than seven officers junior to your memorialist, whose names are still retained on your memorialist's regiment, but whose promotion and prospects are now in no way affected by your memorialist's position in the regiment as their senior, and who, therefore, will not contribute towards the purchasing out of your memorialist when he may wish to retire from the service.

7. The above instances your memorialist most respectfully submits to be a great grievance, and not in accordance with precedent and the vested rights and privileges of the service positively guaranteed by Act of Parliament in 1858 and 1860, and also totally opposed to para. 23 of General Order of the Governor-General in Council, dated 10th April 1861.

8. Your memorialist, in bringing these grievances of supercession, non-promotion, and pecuniary loss to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration and adjustment of the same.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) C. D. GRANT, Captain,
Her Majesty's 11th Regiment
Madras Native Infantry.

Wellington, 9th March 1863.

(127.)

Memorial of Captain and Brevet-Major Edward Long Grant, of the late 1st Madras Fusiliers, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

Your petitioner begs most respectfully to memorialize you regarding what he conceives to be grievances 7186.

in the following instances, the result of the amalgamation of the late Honourable East India Company's Military Service with Her Majesty's army and formation of the Staff corps.

2. By various General Orders of the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, lately promulgated under the new amalgamation order, several officers of the Indian army, being Majors and his juniors, have been promoted over your memorialist's head to be Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff corps. For instance, in General Orders by the Governor in Council, No. 54, dated 17th February 1863, no less than 15 Majors supersede your memorialist in one day by promotion to Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff corps. One of these officers, viz., Major, now Lieutenant-Colonel, J. H. M. Babington, being upwards of two years junior to your memorialist as a Major, and doing duty under him, has superseded and since done duty above your memorialist by virtue of the said promotion.

3. Your memorialist having obtained his brevet majority for special services at the defence of Lucknow, having received medals for service in Pegu and in Bengal, in the suppression of the mutiny, and having been severely wounded on both services, now finds himself superseded, through no fault of his own, by officers, some of whom have never seen a day's service in the field, and placed in an inferior position to them in respect to such important matters as prize money, choice of quarters, general precedence, and the attainment of commands.

4. By the formation of the new line regiments, Major Thomas Rakes, of your memorialist's regiment, viz., the late 1st Madras Fusiliers, volunteered as a Major into Her Majesty's 102d regiment, he was removed from your memorialist's regiment and promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel in the 102d regiment, but notwithstanding this removal and promotion, his name is still retained in the cadre of your memorialist's regiment as a Major, thus impeding your memorialist's promotion, who had elected for local service.

5. The sums of money contributed by your memorialist from time to time towards the purchasing out of his regiment his seniors, which custom was formally sanctioned and approved of by the late Government, must now be considered money thrown away, as there is no hope that your memorialist may by these means reach the grade of field officer regimentally, which was his object in contributing to the purchases aforesaid; and moreover, the monetary value of your memorialist's position in the 1st Madras Fusiliers is rendered worthless by the virtual destruction of that regiment.

6. The above instances your memorialist most respectfully submits to be great grievances, and not in accordance with precedent and the vested rights and privileges of the service positively guaranteed by Act of Parliament in 1858 and 1860, and also totally opposed to para. 23 of General Orders by the Governor-General in Council of the 10th April 1861.

7: Your memorialist, in bringing these grievances of supercession, non-promotion, and pecuniary loss to your notice, most respectfully implores your protection and favourable consideration and adjustment of the same.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) E. L. GRANT,
Captain and Brevet-Major late
1st Madras Fusiliers.

Wellington, 16th March 1863.

(128.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

The Memorial of Edward Thompson, a Captain in Her Majesty's 8th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry, Showeth,

THAT your memorialist entered the service of the Honourable East India Company on the 2d day of May 1840, and has been therefore nearly 23 years in the Indian service.

2d. That the conditions under which officers of the Indian military forces of Her Majesty were permitted to enter the Staff corps were not such as to invite all generally to avail themselves of the terms of the Royal Warrant, inasmuch as regimental service, the hardest and worst remunerated, though not the least honourable and essential employment, as well as officiating tenure of Staff appointments, were held of no account.

3d. That your memorialist has performed zealous and honourable service as a regimental officer; has acted as Quartermaster and Paymaster of his corps for about

S

APP. G.

three and a half years; was Adjutant for nearly a year and a half, and officiated in important and responsible political duties for a year and a half previous to the publication of the Royal Warrant, but was excluded by the conditions notified in the interpretation of the said Warrant from the option of joining the Staff corps, and consequently had no alternative but to cling to his position in the Indian military forces of Her Majesty, under the solemn guarantee conveyed in clause 56 of Act of Parliament, c. 106.

4th. That your memorialist, being thus helplessly retained in the old Indian service, and hopelessly debarred from participation in the attractions and advantages of the new Staff corps, found his prospects of promotion, so essentially dear to every soldier, completely ruined, notwithstanding the just mentioned solemn guarantee.

1. He is directly superseded by Major J. W. Young-husband, of the Bombay Staff corps, an officer borne as Captain immediately below him in the regimental list; and he will in like manner, on their attaining 20 years' service, be superseded by Captains Alban and Beville, of the Bombay Staff corps, who are borne as junior Captains in the regimental list; such supercession being at variance with the guaranteed "advantages as regards promotion."

2. He is superseded by every Captain of junior rank in the Army List, who is of 20 years' service and has been transferred to the Staff corps, which supercession will increase as other officers transferred thereto complete a term of 20 years; the same being at variance with the guaranteed "advantages as regards promotion."

3. He is denied the benefit of steps that should result from retirements of Field Officers, whose removal from the Effective to the Pension List was as certain to create vacancies to be filled up agreeably to the guaranteed "advantages as regards promotion" as if established by the statute law of England.

4. He is denied the benefit of steps accruing from the transfer of officers to the Staff corps and to Her Majesty's British regiments, both services constituted distinct and separate from the Indian military forces of Her Majesty; the same being at variance with the guaranteed "advantages as regards promotion," under which guarantee such transfers should give effective steps.

5. Your memorialist cannot believe it was ever the intention of a kind and humane Government that professional ruin should fall on individuals of the Indian service, simply from the fact of their having been placed in the invidious position of men who had no opportunity given them of sharing in advantages offered to one section of the army only; and it is with this conviction that he confidently submits his case for the merciful consideration of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

6. Your memorialist, therefore, earnestly solicits, to save him from the hopeless prospect of wholesale supercession, and direct stagnation in promotion, as opposed to the spirit and letter, of the Parliamentary guarantee,—

1. That the brevet rank of Major may be conferred on him from the period on which he completed 20 years' service, in order that he may be thus rescued from supercession at present by his immediate regimental junior Captain Young-husband, who holds the substantive rank of Major in the Staff corps, and eventually by numberless other Captains in the army, who are now junior to him.
2. That he be permitted the substantive and actual promotion accruing from retirement on pension of all Field Officers whose names have been transferred from the effective to the pension list.
3. That he be permitted the substantive and actual promotion resulting from the transfer of officers senior to himself to the Staff corps, a new and distinct service, or to Her Majesty's British regiments.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) EDW. THOMPSON, Captain,
Her Majesty's 8th Regiment Bombay
Native Infantry.

Duttea, 19th March 1863.

(129.)

To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Petition of William Alexander Deey, a Captain in Her Majesty's 41st Regiment of Madras Native Infantry,

Showeth,

I. THAT your petitioner entered in the service of the Honourable East India Company on the 20th day of January 1845, and has served in Her Majesty's 41st Regiment Madras Native Infantry for upwards of 18 years.

II. That the system of promotion in the army has hitherto been regulated by seniority, so arranged that all officers were promoted regimentally up to the rank of Major, and then in a separate list of Field Officers.

III. That by this system your petitioner was protected from the possibility of supercession by any junior of his own corps, and could only be superseded by them in army rank by their obtaining promotion by distinguished service.

IV. That according to the seniority system and its privileges as to promotion, all officers retiring from the service by pension or otherwise, and all officers transferred to a regiment, vacated their places in the lists of their late regiments, and in that of the Field Officers too, their places being filled up by their juniors in regular succession.

V. That on the transfer of the army of the Honourable East India Company to the service of the Crown, your petitioner was solemnly guaranteed the above-mentioned privileges regarding promotion, namely,—

1. Security from supercession in substantive rank by regimental juniors.
2. Succession to steps vacated by senior officers retiring on their pensions.
3. Succession to steps vacated by officers transferred to Her Majesty's British forces.
4. Succession to steps vacated by officers transferred to newly raised regiments of the army, by an Act of Parliament 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106, sections 56 and 58, which has been again confirmed with greater particularity in an Act of Parliament entitled the "Local European Act."

VI. That the guarantee so given has been clearly explained in the Report of the Committee, of which Lord Hotham was President, as follows—(on the mode of regulating the promotion of officers of the local army):—"The right of all the officers to the like advantages, as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the Company, has been deliberately and comprehensively guaranteed and cannot be denied." We consider, "that under this pledge the promotion of the officers of the three armies, after the Staff corps has been formed, must of necessity be allowed to proceed on the same principle as before. Nor can the volunteering of individuals here and there into the Line cause any difference; the cadres must be preserved through the entire army, and promotion must go forward regularly and in the established order."

VII. That contrary to the established order the following changes in the principles on which promotion has hitherto been allowed to proceed have been introduced into the army, to the great detriment of your petitioner:

1. An officer of your petitioner's regiment, Captain Henry Joseph Jepson, has been transferred to Her Majesty's 102d Regiment of Foot, and has been promoted to the substantive rank of Major, thereby superseding your petitioner, though his (Captain Jepson's) rank in the 41st Regiment Madras Native Infantry is junior to your petitioner's.
2. Certain Field Officers of the army who have retired on their pensions have, although non-effective, been retained on the effective list, thus preventing regular promotion.

VIII. The withholding of the above privileges as regards promotion is simply professional ruin, which, unless mercifully relieved, tends continually to become more hopeless.

IX. That the establishment of a Staff corps, the officers of which are entitled to promotion after fixed periods (very much quicker than any your petitioner can now hope for), and are entitled to hold regimental commands and appointments as well as all Staff appointments, has rendered your petitioner's prospect of succeeding to the former much less than before.

X. That in consequence of vacancies caused in your

petitioner's regiment by the officers who have joined the Staff corps and volunteered for the Line not being filled up, the privilege of regimental purchase, conferred on this army by letter from the Honourable Court to the Supreme Government, dated 29th September 1837, which has been confirmed among other privileges by statute law, as above set forth, has been destroyed by the number of subscribers being reduced, and your petitioner consequently is deprived of and loses a sum of 2,000*l.*, or thereabouts, which was before the changes now petitioned against the value of his position as senior Captain in Her Majesty's 41st Regiment Madras Native Infantry, and to gain which position your petitioner has paid large sums of money.

XI. That your petitioner, therefore, most humbly prays that the rights and privileges guaranteed to him by the statute law of England may be confirmed and secured to him as above solicited, namely:—

1. That all pensioned and non-effective officers may be removed from the effective list of the Madras army, and promotion given according to the usual custom.
2. That your petitioner may be granted a commission as Major, giving him rank above Major Jepson of Her Majesty's 102d Regiment of Foot, and other officers by whom he has been superseded.
3. That the names of all officers transferred to the Staff corps, and the name of Captain Jepson, transferred to Her Majesty's 102d Regiment of Foot, be struck out of the cadre of your petitioner's regiment.

And your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) WM. A. DEEY, Captain,
Her Majesty's 41st Regiment of
Madras Native Infantry.

Arcot, 19th March 1863.

(130.)

From Major Beale, Her Majesty's 22d Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, to the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Army of Bombay, Poona.

SIR, Dated 30th March 1863.

I HAVE the honour to request you will do me the favour of submitting the following matter to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay army:—

By a Government General Order, dated 19th February 1863, 11 Majors of the Staff corps were promoted to Lieutenant-Colonels. I was a substantive Major before any of these officers, and, had I been allowed to join the Staff corps, would have held my position and been above the whole of them now. As a substantive Lieutenant-Colonel, I had not the option of joining the Staff corps, consequently an advantage granted to others of the same army was withheld from me by para. 26 Royal Warrant, para. 73 Amalgamation Orders.

One of the officers referred to is now on the cadre of my regiment as senior Captain. He has, indeed, gained in promotion about nine years' advantage; I should not, therefore complain, but only that he supercedes me.

I have been as long as, if not longer, in the service than eight of those 11 officers, and was for more than six years on regimental and general Staff employment, having been Quartermaster and Interpreter of my regiment from the 18th September 1841 to the 21st January 1846, when I was promoted.

I served as an Assistant Executive Engineer in the Public Works Department from the 3d October 1855 to the 7th August 1857; during the first half year of 1857 I was on field service in Persia. I have officiated from time to time in other departments.

That I should consider myself injured by being superseded as referred to, will, I think, cause no astonishment. There are many reasons, one of which is, that all those officers are now available for commands before me.

I beg most respectfully to appeal to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief for advice and assistance, to the end that I may not be superseded by such of the above officers as have actually become my superiors in each, consequent on the Staff Corps Regulations.

I have, &c
(Signed) G. BEALE, Major,
Her Majesty's 22d Regiment
Bombay Native Infantry.

Hong Kong, 30th March 1863.

(131.)

APP. G.

The humble Memorial of St. John O'Neill Muter, a Captain in Her Majesty's 2d or Grenadier Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry,

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT your memorialist entered the service of the late Honourable East India Company with the rank of Ensign, dating from the 18th of March 1841. He has, therefore, served in the Indian army upwards of 22 years.

2. That in the army of the Company the officers rose by seniority, supercessions being unknown, except for distinguished service in the field, in which case the rank was brevet; and officers so distinguished served, without reference to such rank, in their regiments until entitled by army rank to brigades.

3. That by an Act of Parliament the army of the Company was transferred to the Crown. The Act, however, guaranteed to the naval and military forces so transferred the "pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion or otherwise, as if they had continued in the service of the Company." *Vide Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106.*

4. That, consequent on the above Act, orders were issued for the organization of a Staff corps, but promotion so ruled as to cause immense supercession to officers situated as your memorialist, who remained in the local service in consequence of the parliamentary guarantee, which secured to him his privileges and like advantages, as regards promotion or otherwise, as if he had continued in the service of the Company.

5. That as it has been ruled that the rank of the officers of the Staff corps is substantive, all officers of that corps who have superseded your memorialist are entitled by their commissions to command him in all situations in which they come officially in contact, whether in command of troops or otherwise, thereby depriving him of the honours, allowances, and privileges guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament, and to which he would have become entitled by length of service and seniority had he continued in the service of the Company.

6. That your memorialist has been already superseded by the four Captains immediately below him in his regiment, one of whom was promoted to a majority in the 106th regiment of British Infantry, and three to majorities in the Staff corps. That, in like manner, he has been passed over by his juniors in every regiment in the Bombay army, thereby vitally injuring his professional prospects.

7. That the right of promotion by seniority induced the officers of the regiment to which your memorialist belongs to purchase steps (by inducing senior officers to retire) to the amount of 80,000 rupees. That the purchase system was sanctioned by the Court of Directors in Government General Orders, dated 22d of May 1838, which sanction has never been withdrawn. That your memorialist paid his share of the above sum, expecting eventually to benefit by rank and increased allowances, and to retire with the price of his commission. That the formation of the Staff corps completely destroyed the purchase system, and at the same time supercessions have destroyed the prospects of the local officers situated as your memorialist, as above shown.

8. That the great grievance complained of could be rectified by granting to the officers of Her Majesty's local service so superseded the same rank as that conferred on the officers of the Staff corps. The rank and increased allowances would remunerate for the purchase money already expended, and the prospective loss which will be sustained by the destruction of the purchase system in consequence of the formation of the Staff corps.

9. Your memorialist, therefore, prays that a Major's commission with substantive rank, antedated to prevent his juniors in the army or his regiment superseding him, may be conferred upon him, and that he may continue to rank with officers of the Staff corps during his service, thereby maintaining that position in the army guaranteed to him by Act of Parliament.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

(Signed) ST. JOHN O'NEILL MUTER, Captain,
Her Majesty's 2d Grenadier Regiment
Native Infantry.

Camp, Belgaum, 25th April 1863.

APP. G.

(132.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

Memorial of Captain G. E. Herne, Her Majesty's 103d Regiment of Foot, or Royal (Bombay) Fusiliers.

YOUR memorialist, being an officer in the 1st Bombay Fusiliers, volunteered, under the conditions specified in the Despatch noted in the margin, for the 103d Regiment, at the same time other officers of his regiment who were junior to him in rank volunteered for the Bombay Staff corps.

Your memorialist is still a Captain, and has every prospect of remaining a Captain for several years, whereas officers junior to him in his old regiment, the 1st Bombay Fusiliers, who volunteered into the Staff corps, viz, Captain Phillips and Captain Cowper, were promoted to the rank of Major, the former on the 11th June 1862, and the latter on 13th July 1862.

Your memorialist has also been superseded by Major Bolton, Her Majesty's 106th Regiment, and by Majors Maude and Wolfahrt, Her Majesty's 109th Regiment, his juniors in the service, through the mere fact of his volunteering for the 103d Regiment and for general service, there being nothing in the Despatch previously quoted to lead him to believe that, on volunteering for service in his old regiment under its new name, instead of for *general service only*, his professional prospects would be so seriously injured as they have been.

Thus your memorialist, who volunteered at the same time as the officers already mentioned, has suffered a great supercession and loss of rank and pay as compared with his more favoured juniors.

Your memorialist, therefore, respectfully trusts that his case may be taken into consideration, and prays that he may be promoted to the rank and pay of a Major from the date on which his more favoured juniors have been.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) G. E. HERNE, Captain,
Her Majesty's 103d Regiment
Royal Bombay Fusiliers.

(133.)

To the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

Memorial of Major Charles Thomas Trower, Her Majesty's 103d Regiment of Foot (Royal Bombay Fusiliers).

YOUR memorialist, being an officer in the 1st Bombay Fusiliers, in accordance with the terms of the General Order, dated 10th April 1861, volunteered for the 103d Regiment of Foot at the same time other officers of his regiment who were junior to him in rank volunteered for the Bombay Staff corps.

Your memorialist, however, only obtained the rank of Major on the 27th February 1862, being on that day promoted in his former corps by the death of Colonel Stiles.

Your memorialist, therefore, respectfully prays that his commission as Major may be antedated to the 18th February 1861, the date on which officers junior to him were promoted to the rank of Major in the Staff corps, as also in the Artillery and Engineers.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) C. T. TROWER, Major,
Her Majesty's 103d Regiment of Foot.

(134.)

The humble Petition of Edward Melville Lawford, a Captain in the 4th Regiment of Madras Light Cavalry, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India,—(Dated Saugor, Central India, the 26th April 1863.)

THAT your petitioner entered the service of the late East India Company in 1847, in the Madras Cavalry.

2. That in 1857 one, and in 1860 three, regiments of Madras Cavalry were disbanded, and that the officers of the disbanded regiments were in 1860 sent to the remaining four regiments, entering them according to

the dates of their commissions. That this inflicted serious injury on many officers.

3. That previous to amalgamation it was customary for officers of one regiment sent to do duty with another to enter as juniors of their rank; and although a regulation exists which enables the Commander-in-Chief to supersede any number of officers in one regiment by those of another, according to date of commission, this power was seldom if ever exercised till the late disbandments in the Madras army; and putting the regulation in force has inflicted the most serious wrong on all officers subject to it.

4. That your petitioner, by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's exercise of this power, was after 15 years' service superseded in his own regiment, and that he has lost all prospect of the future command of it.

5. That officers from the Staff corps are now selected to command regiments in supercession of officers who have volunteered to remain with their old regiments, and that this is a direct violation of the Parliamentary guarantee of the rights and privileges of the officers of the Indian army.

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that you will be graciously pleased to inquire into the grievances herein set forth.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(135.)

From Captain H. H. Lyster, V.C., Aide-de-Camp to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, to the Adjutant-General, dated Dayrah, 8th May 1863.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to request that you will lay before his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief the following statement regarding the effect on me of the amalgamation of the Honourable East India Company's army with that of Her Majesty's.

As an officer in the Honourable East India Company's service, I had certain rights and privileges, which were guaranteed to me by Act of Parliament on the transfer of the army to the Crown.

1. Any officer my senior leaving my regiment gave me one step towards promotion.

2. When I wished to retire from the service, I received a certain amount of money for my step, according to a graduated scale, and to obtain this I had to subscribe largely to purchase out my seniors.

3. The full proportion of Line steps do not continue.

It is needless to explain that my juniors must supersede me, my promotion being stopped in the cadre of my regiment by the non-removal of the names of my seniors who have left the regiment, while the promotion of my juniors who have left the regiment continues.

From the large number of officers who have left the regiment, the system of purchase has come to an end. I can neither purchase a step nor recover the price of my step on retirement.

I beg to be permitted to leave my case in the hands of his Excellency, feeling perfectly certain that, as far as it may be in his power, he will see justice done to an officer serving under his command.

(136.)

The humble Memorial of William Ashbourne, a Captain in Her Majesty's 3d Regiment Light Cavalry, on the Bombay Establishment, to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India,

Humbly sheweth,

1. THAT your memorialist entered the service of the Honourable East India Company on the 19th of January 1837, and has served up to the present time upwards of 26 years.

2. That on the amalgamation of the Honourable Company's service with Her Majesty's in 1861, your memorialist was called upon by the Adjutant-General of the army to elect the conditions upon which to serve Her Majesty's Government.

3. That as the rules laid down in Her Majesty's Warrant of Amalgamation appeared to your memorialist unfavourable to future hopes of regimental promotion, your memorialist elected to serve in Her Majesty's "Indian Staff corps," then about to be raised, in the hopes that the privileges promised and promotion by "time service" would in some measure compensate for the money invested by him in the purchase of promotion regimentally, and which by the amalgamation of the two services has been lost to your memorialist entirely.

4. That notwithstanding your memorialist had been desired to make his election between the "Staff corps," "General Service," or "Local Service," on his requesting to be permitted to join the "Staff corps," it was intimated to him, in the latter part of September 1861, that unless he passed the prescribed examination in Hindoostanee by the 21st day of the succeeding month (October 1861), his application to enter the Staff corps could not be permitted.

5. To pass an examination in the written and printed Hindoostanee character in less than a month was an obvious impossibility to an officer of upwards of 24 years' service, during eight of which your memorialist had been Adjutant of his regiment, which necessitates a perfect colloquial familiarity with the language of the men. Your memorialist, therefore, requested to be provisionally appointed to the Staff corps, and guaranteed to pass the prescribed examination in the Staff test of the Hindoostanee language within a year, if his request was granted.

6. But your memorialist was at the time in question, viz., 1861, Commandant of a native Silladar corps, which is held to be a Staff appointment; and as your memorialist believed "Commandants of irregular corps" then holding commands, and "officers of the Indian army now holding staff appointments of any description, will have the option of joining the Staff corps, if they do not possess the substantive rank of Colonel." *Vide* Nos. 69 and 72 of the General Orders of his Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council, dated 10th April 1861. These orders quoted, your memorialist fancied, had application to his individual case.

7. In order, however, to meet the requirements of Government in every respect, your memorialist did qualify by passing the prescribed Staff test examination in Hindoostanee, but not within the time prescribed, which, with other responsible duties to perform, was obviously an impossibility between the warning to do so and the time at which the doing so was made imperative, viz., about a month.

8. That in consequence of the closing of the Staff corps, on its formation in February 1861, against your memorialist, with its attendant privileges of counting former service for promotion, your memorialist has been grievously injured by supercession in the service by every Major in the Staff corps. The first commission of each, from first to last, dates subsequent to his entering the service; and the supercession of those named is merely the commencement of the grievance under which your memorialist is suffering.

9. Your memorialist is therefore emboldened to petition that his first application to join the Staff corps from the date of its commencement, with all its advantages, may be re-considered, and, if possible, granted him, as his chances of future regimental promotion, owing to the amalgamation, have become nearly hopeless.

Trusting that his case will meet with favourable consideration, your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) W. ASHBOURNE, Captain,
3d Regiment Light Cavalry,
Commandant 1st Regiment Light Cavalry
on the Bombay Establishment.

Camp Deesa, 27th May 1863.

(137.)

The humble Memorial of Ernest Augustus Green, a Lieutenant and Brevet Captain in Her Majesty's 11th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry.

To Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Humbly sheweth,

THAT your memorialist, being on the 6th of May 1861 a Lieutenant of nearly 14 years' standing in the service, and Adjutant of the 11th Regiment Native Infantry, and having been Adjutant for upwards of three years and a half, received the circular from the Adjutant-General of the Bombay army, calling upon him to declare whether he were desirous of being transferred to the Staff corps.

2. Your memorialist sent in his application to be admitted a member of that corps. In September 1861 your memorialist received a copy of a resolution from Government, dated 17th September 1861, intimating that "officers who had been appointed to the Staff corps without having passed, but who were otherwise qualified, should have the offer of a Special Committee to enable them to pass before the 21st of October, if their knowledge of the language be sufficient."

3. Your memorialist only received this on the 27th of

September; as it was impossible to have a Committee convened in time, your memorialist again brought his case before the Adjutant-General, and in reply received circular No. 34, dated 5th of October, from the Adjutant-General, to the effect that "the Government of India has been pleased to rule that officers on the Staff who may not have passed in the Hindoostanee language qualifying them to enter the Staff corps will be provisionally admitted to that corps, provided their applications are received by the 21st instant, and will be allowed six months from the date on which they may receive this intimation to qualify themselves for confirmation by passing in the language referred to."

4. On the 12th of October your memorialist sent in his application to be admitted to the Staff corps under the provision of the above circular, No. 34. On the 23d of October your memorialist received a letter from the Adjutant-General cancelling the above circular. Your memorialist, however, proceeded with the study of the language, and passed the preliminary examination on the 31st of March following, and the Staff test on the 23d of April, which was the earliest period a Committee could be convened.

5. Your memorialist's case having been sent to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, no further steps in the matter were permitted to be taken until the decision to the reference was received.

6. During last month your memorialist received from the Adjutant-General of the army, under endorsement No. 1290 of the 4th of March 1863, the decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, No. 399, of the 23d of October 1862, on two questions by the Bombay Government referring to an Adjutant of a regular regiment who has not passed in Hindoostanee being admitted to the Staff corps. This decision is in accordance with the terms of the Warrant, and bears on general cases, but your memorialist urges that his is a special case, and respectfully prays that it may receive reconsideration.

7. Your memorialist acted up to the orders, as far as he understood them, to qualify himself for the Staff; and, though he cannot lay blame to any other than himself, that he was under the impression that it was not necessary for him to pass in Hindoostanee, yet this impression was confirmed by the letter from the Adjutant-General giving him the option of entering the Staff corps (such letter only being sent to those who were considered qualified for that corps), and your memorialist was not aware of the necessity to pass until the end of September; had he so understood in the first instance, he could have passed in time, as is shown by passing within six months.

8. Your memorialist respectfully represents that Lieutenant Williams of the Madras army was granted admission to the Staff corps, on the understanding that he passed an examination in the native language in six months, on the grounds of his having qualified himself, by departmental examination, for his appointment of Adjutant. The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India in his military letter, No. 133, of the 31st of March 1862, thus records his decision in para. 8:—

"Taking these circumstances into consideration, as also the necessity of adopting and enforcing an uniform rule in future for all Staff officers in regard to the examination in Hindoostanee, I have determined that in cases of both kinds, that is, where an officer has qualified for a Staff employment or department, as Lieutenant Williams appears to have done, by passing the prescribed examination for that office or department; and also in the case of an officer whose proficiency in any language other than Hindoostanee has already been accepted as a qualification for general Staff; such officers, if coming under the terms of paragraph 69 of your General Orders, No. 322, of the 10th April 1861, may be appointed to the Staff corps under paragraphs 72 and 73 of that Order, provisionally, and with the understanding that they pass the examination in Hindoostanee required for general Staff within six months from the date of their appointment to that corps; failing which, they will revert to their former corps and position in the service."

9. In para. 6 of the above letter of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, it is mentioned that Lieutenant Williams had passed the examination required in Madras for an Adjutant of a Native corps; but this examination is declared of no avail, as given in replies by the Governor-General to queries from officers of the Indian army, and approved by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

APP. G.

10. Your memorialist respectfully submits for favourable consideration that he was in the same position as Lieutenant Williams; that the cases are identical. Your memorialist passed the colloquial examination in Hindostanee and the examination required departmentally by the Regulations of the Bombay army for his appointment as Adjutant, and he has passed in the six months, as allowed by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, in his Despatch No. 133, above referred to; and he prays that the same indulgence may be granted to him as has been granted to Lieutenant Williams.

11. Your memorialist has every hope that his case will meet with favourable consideration, especially as his admission to the Staff corps will be borne out by precedent.

12. The loss to your memorialist by not being admitted into the Staff corps from its first formation is serious. Should his appeal not be granted, your memorialist prays that he may be admitted as a probationer in the Staff corps from the 22d of October 1861, six months previous to his passing the examination in the Hindostanee language.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) E. A. GREEN,
Lieutenant and Brevet Captain,
Adjutant Her Majesty's 11th Regiment
Bombay Native Infantry.

Camp Deesa, 30th April 1863.

(138.)

To Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India
in Council.

The Memorial of Captain Jenkin Jones, of the Royal
Engineers, Bombay Presidency.

Your memorialist begs respectfully to bring to the notice of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council, that the name of an officer, Lieutenant Colonel Marriott, though appointed and now belonging to the Bombay Staff corps, is still retained in the Army List as an officer of Royal Engineers, and that your memorialist suffers the loss of the promotion he had every reason to expect by that officer's removal from his old corps.

Your memorialist would point out that in the constitution of his corps, ordered by Royal Warrant of 18th February 1861, the number of Lieutenant-Colonels was fixed at *ten*, while by retaining Lieutenant-Colonel Marriott's name there are now but *nine* effective Royal Engineer Lieutenant-Colonels.

He would further respectfully urge that though Her Majesty's Government were pleased to direct that the names of officers of the local Native Infantry who joined the Staff corps should still be borne on the rolls of their regiments in order to regulate the promotion of their juniors, that the case is not analogous to the present.

The late corps of Bombay Engineers is no longer local; it has become a portion of the Royal Engineers; its strength and constitution made similar; its officers eligible for general service. It therefore seems incongruous that an officer who has elected to join a local corps, the Bombay Staff corps, should still have his name enrolled as a Royal Engineer.

In the royal regiments of Infantry transferred from the late Indian army, and now available for general service, the name of no officer belonging to the Staff corps has been allowed to enter. Your memorialist would respectfully claim the same rule for his corps of Royal Engineers.

Trusting due consideration will be given to the above petition, your memorialist will, as in duty bound, always

JENKIN JONES, Captain,
Royal Engineers, Bombay.

(139.)

The humble Memorial of Charles Brenton Basden, Captain, late 61st Regiment Native Infantry, Her Majesty's Bengal Army, to the Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood, Bart., G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.—(Dated Jullundur, the 31st May 1862)

Respectfully sheweth,

THAT the Amalgamation Order and Staff Corps Regulations have had a most injurious and ruinous effect on his position and prospects.

2. Your memorialist is senior Captain of the late 61st Regiment Native Infantry, and on the 6th of July of this year will have completed nine years in the grade of Regimental Captain. Has qualified for the Staff by P. H. examination, but having held only officiating Staff appointments, was not allowed the privilege of electing for the Staff corps, and remained a local officer.

3. Lieutenant-Colonel Ryves and Major Septimus Becher, promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel and Major respectively in the cadre of the late 61st Regiment Native Infantry, on the 1st of January 1862 joined the Staff corps on its formation, obtaining each a step of rank, but giving no promotion in their former corps, the late 61st Regiment Native Infantry.

4. The five Captains junior to your memorialist joined the Staff corps.

The 3d in the cadre, Captain Stainforth, obtained his majority on the 4th of August 1861.

The 5th in the cadre, Captain Obbard, will obtain his majority on the 11th of June of this year.

The 2d, 4th, and 6th Captains in the cadre, Captains Somerville, Wintle, and Corbett, will all obtain their majorities in about three years, as they complete the prescribed period of Staff service and period passed on furlough.

5. Your memorialist entered the army of the East India Company in the full confidence that it was a seniority service, and that an officer voluntarily transferring his services to another corps ceased to have his name borne on the roll of his former regiment.

That only distinguished service to the State enabled an officer to obtain army rank above the seniors in his regiment.

That it was not possible for an officer below him on the roll of the regiment to obtain increased army rank, carrying with it an increase of pay for that rank, and until the formation of the Staff corps not a single instance exists.

6. Major Stainforth, the 3d Captain in the late 61st Regiment Native Infantry, obtained his majority in the army on the 4th of August 1861, receiving an increase of 224 rupees monthly pay on account of his army rank obtained by joining the Staff corps, superseding your memorialist in army rank, and additional allowances for that rank, not from any want of energy, disregard of duty, or any cause over which your memorialist, had control, and rendering him liable at any time to serve under Major Stainforth's command.

7. Out of the five Captains already named, Major Stainforth will obtain his lieutenant-colonelcy on the 4th of August 1867, and the remainder within short periods after him; whereas, your memorialist cannot hope to obtain his substantive majority under a further service of from five to six years.

8. Your memorialist has been superseded to a very great extent throughout the army by officers, his juniors in rank, joining the Staff corps, and every day is adding to the number.

9. The very valuable privilege of regimental bonus on retirement has been totally destroyed by the formation of the Staff corps. Your memorialist subscribed largely for regimental retirements (the last occasion was his share of 47,000 rupees given to an officer for retiring on obtaining his majority), as it established his claim to the same consideration from his juniors.

Wherefore your memorialist prays—

I. That promotion be made in place of his seniors who voluntarily and for their own advancement transferred their services to the Staff corps.

II. That your memorialist may receive promotion (with retrospective effect) to the substantive rank and pay of a Major, to prevent the most disheartening supercession, and to enable him to retain his relative position in rank and allowances with his juniors, whose names are still borne on the roll of the regiment.

III. That the Government will either hold out a similar and as valuable privilege for retirement as the bonus destroyed by the formation of the Staff corps, or award compensation in place of it, as the Act of Parliament promulgated in 1858, on the transfer of India to the Crown, which at article LVI., under the head of "Existing Establishment," says, "and be entitled "to like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and "the like advantages as regards promotion and other- "wise as if they had continued in the service of the "said Company;" and this was guaranteed in the 23d paragraph of General Order by the Governor-General, No. 332, of the 10th of April 1861; and your memorialist will ever pray.

(140.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of Francis John Wise, Lieutenant in Her Majesty's 26th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, Showeth,

THAT your memorialist entered the army as a seniority service, in which his only chances of promotion were successively by casualties among the officers senior to him in his regiment, from whatever cause arising, whether from death, retirement, or removal.

That the under-mentioned officers have been removed from your memorialist's regiment to the Bombay Staff corps, in which alone they will receive their promotion according to a newly organized system, yet their names are, contrary to former usage and practice, and in opposition to guaranteed rights and privileges, retained on the list of Her Majesty's 26th Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, to the obstruction of your memorialist's promotion:—

Major John Shaw Kemball.
 " William Barry Gray.
 " John Tisdall Annesley.
 Captain Franklin Phillips Mignon.
 " Clarence Augustus Collier.
 " Charles Francis Falcon Chamberlain.
 " Lewis Matthew Davies.
 Lieutenant Simon Fraser McGilliwray.
 " John Watson Macclesfield Anderson.

That in the event of your memorialist's regiment taking the field or being employed on any active service, the above-enumerated officers, though borne on the strength of his regiment, do not share in the vicissitudes and dangers to which he is exposed.

That consequent on the above-mentioned officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, the system of giving gratuities to senior officers to enable them to retire sanctioned, *vide* Military Despatch from the Court of Directors to the Government of India (No. 7), dated 29th November 1837, has been utterly destroyed, thus rendering promotion more tardy than heretofore, to the detriment of your memorialist's present and prospective career.

Your memorialist craves that the above-mentioned officers of the Staff corps may be removed from the list of his regiment, so that he may obtain the position to which he is fairly entitled, and protection from the ruinous consequences of a regulation inimical to advancement in his profession.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) F. J. WISE, Lieutenant,
 Her Majesty's 26th Regiment Bombay
 Native Infantry.

Camp Kolapore, 1st August 1863.

(141.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The memorial of Walter Montriou, a Captain in Her Majesty's 24th Regiment Bombay Infantry.

Most humbly showeth,

THAT your memorialist entered the Honourable East India Company's service in December 1839, and has served upwards of 23 years.

The system of promotion in the army from the date of your memorialist entering the service was laid down by Government as that of one of strict seniority, every officer was protected from supercession by a junior, unless he misconducted himself, and was superseded by a court-martial.

Under this rule every officer retired from the service on his pension; was struck off the list of the army, and promotion made in his stead.

The same rule was followed when new regiments were raised, or officers removed to the immediate service of the Crown.

In proof of the statement of your memorialist, he begs to point to the General Orders of the Bombay Army, and particularly to those of the years 1817, 1826, and 1839, 1846, as well as the Gazette, transferring Lieutenant Nasmyth of the Bombay Artillery, and Captain Burton, of the 18th Regiment, to the immediate service of the Crown.

In 1858 your memorialist, by Act of Parliament, Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, was transferred, as a servant of the Company, to that of Her Majesty, at the same

time the legislature was pleased to guarantee to your memorialist all his rights and privileges as regards promotion and otherwise as if he had continued a servant of the Honourable East India Company.

Very shortly after the change in the constitution of the army, introduced by the Act of Parliament above quoted, various alterations were introduced into the service, under the operation of which your memorialist has been a severe sufferer, and he craves permission to state a few instances by which he has suffered; they are as follows:—

That the names of officers who retired on their pensions, and transferred to the regiments of the line, have, contrary to all precedent, been retained on the effective list of the army, to the direct injury of your memorialist, who, being senior Captain in his regiment, would have been promoted on the 1st January 1862 to the rank of Major, had the rules of the service been adhered to.

That the names of officers who have been transferred to the Staff corps, and who have received promotion and increased pay, are retained in the cadre of the 24th regiment to the injury of your memorialist.

That your memorialist has been superseded by no less than 40 officers in army rank, for no fault on his part, and in violation of the rules of the service and the Act of Parliament before cited.

That, moreover, your memorialist has been superseded in his own regiment by the promotion of his regimental junior, and in November next your memorialist's position will be still more painful and degrading, by additional regimental supercession, resulting from the amalgamation.

That your memorialist has suffered injury, inasmuch as his juniors, who have been fortunate enough to be transferred to the Staff corps, have been permitted to subscribe to the Bombay Military Fund in a higher grade than your memorialist, they thus receiving advantages to their families, when they have actually contributed less to the fund than your memorialist.

That Staff corps officers being retained in the cadre of their regiments, all contributions your memorialist has made to his seniors to retire (some 1,000*l.*) is lost to your memorialist, as under existing regulations no officer will contribute, and likewise promotion is rendered much slower than formerly.

That if such supercession had resulted from any fault of your memorialist, he would not have ventured himself to your attention, but such not being the case, he trusts that the rights and privileges guaranteed by Parliament may be confirmed and secured to him as follows:—

That all pensioned and non-effective officers may be removed from the effective list of the army; that your memorialist may be granted a commission as Major from the 1st of January 1862; that the names of officers who have joined the Staff corps may be struck off the regimental cadre and promotion made in their stead.

That your memorialist may be granted a commission of even date and rank with such of his juniors who have superseded him on joining the Staff corps; for which your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) WALTER MONTRIOU, Captain,
 Her Majesty's 24th Regiment, Bombay Army.
 Dharwar, 4th September 1863.

(142.)

To the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

The Memorial of George Shedden Hawthorn, a Lieutenant in Her Majesty's 24th Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry.

Most humbly showeth,

THAT your memorialist was by Act of Parliament guaranteed his rights and privileges on the amalgamation of the European officers and men of the Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces.

That your memorialist however most respectfully submits that such Act has not been strictly observed. That on the amalgamation of the services, officers had the option, on certain conditions, of joining the Staff corps, volunteering for general service, or remaining in the local army, in which your memorialist now is.

That the retention of those Staff officers senior to your memorialist on the cadre of his regiment prevents his regimental rise, while his juniors (Staff corps officers) must supersede him. That, consequent on the

APP.

APP. G.

officers of the Staff corps being retained on the cadre of your memorialist's regiment, all his contributions to enable his seniors to retire have been lost to him, as under existing circumstances no officer will contribute, and consequently promotion is rendered less speedy than heretofore.

That your memorialist most respectfully and earnestly prays that his promotion may not be impeded, and that

he may not be superseded by the retention of the officers of the Staff corps on the cadre of his regiment.

And your memorialist will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

GEO. S. HAWTHORN, Lieutenant,
Her Majesty's 24th Regiment,
Bombay Native Infantry.
Camp, Dharwar, 5th September 1863.

APP. H.

APPENDIX H.

GENERAL ORDER by the GOVERNOR GENERAL of INDIA, No. 332, dated 10th April 1861, amalgamating the ARMY of INDIA with the Line, published in the Calcutta Government Gazette.

GENERAL ORDER by His Excellency the Governor-General of India in Council.

Fort William, Military Department,
10th April 1861.

His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General of India in Council publishes, for general information, Her Majesty's warrant, dated the 16th of January last, for the information of Staff corps in each of the Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, and the sub-joined despatches, recently received from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, announcing the Queen's gracious intentions regarding the officers and men of Her Majesty's Indian forces.

2. Her Majesty's Government have laid down the general principles of this important measure; but, considering that various questions and points of detail affecting the interests of the army might arise, which could be best considered in India, have intrusted the Governor General of India in Council, in communication with His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India, with full discretion to act as may be deemed best for the public service, and have authorized him to frame such orders as may be necessary to give full effect to the intentions of Her Majesty's Government.

3. The Governor General in Council has now the satisfaction of announcing to the European officers and men of the Indian forces the conditions prescribed and the offers made to them upon their amalgamation with Her Majesty's general forces, whereby two armies will be united which severally have rendered the most signal services to their Queen and country.

4. Her Majesty's Government have expressed an anxious desire to preserve the proud recollections of distinguished service which belong especially to the older regiments of each Presidency, and to incorporate with Her Majesty's army corps which have so greatly contributed to the acquisition and maintenance of Her Majesty's dominions in the east.

5. In order to effect these measures consistently with the determination which has been previously made known to the army, that no man shall have his present terms of service altered except with his own consent, the Governor General in Council, under the authority of Her Majesty's Government, hereby offers to all warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and men, without exception, belonging to the European Artillery, Infantry, and Sappers and Miners of the three Presidencies, to the European Cavalry in Bengal, including the Lahore Light Horse, to the German soldiers of the 3rd Bombay European Regiment, and to all men in the depôts of the Indian forces at Dum-Dum, Barrackpore, and other stations, the option of accepting general service on the ordinary conditions of soldiers enlisted for the Artillery, Infantry, and Cavalry of Her Majesty's line army, with a bounty, to all who are not of warrant rank, at the rates to be presently stated.

6. Soldiers who now volunteer will have the option of choosing whether their future pensions shall be reckoned according to the regulations of Her Majesty's army or according to those of the Indian forces. Their choice may be declared at any time within three months of the date of volunteering.

Soldiers who now volunteer will have the privilege of counting their past service toward completion of their contract service and for pension, under whichever regulations they may choose.

7. The non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the Artillery of each Presidency who, under the above conditions, may be willing to transfer their services absolutely to the Royal regiments of Artillery of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, will be formed into new troops and batteries, composed of men serving under the same conditions as those of the Royal Artillery. The soldiers who may decline to accept the offer now made will be

formed into batteries, which will remain under their original conditions, and as the numbers of the men diminish by casualties the batteries will be gradually diminished in number, and will finally disappear.

8. Non-commissioned officers and men who have been transferred from other corps to the corps of Sappers and Miners, and who may now volunteer under the conditions of Her Majesty's general service, will receive the rates of bounty stated in paragraph 20. The acceptance of bounty will not involve their removal from the sappers and miners. Those who decline to accept the offer now made may continue with that corps on their present conditions.

9. The European Cavalry will be formed into three regiments of Light Dragoons of Her Majesty's general army, to consist of the men who may now volunteer on the conditions of general service, and these men will have the option of joining any one of three regiments of Light Dragoons to be now formed. These will be designated respectively the 19th, 20th, and 21st Regiments of Light Dragoons.

10. The non-commissioned officers and men of the European Cavalry and the Lahore Light Horse, who may prefer the existing conditions of Indian service, will be placed in a regiment of Cavalry to be formed for that purpose as a local regiment, with officers selected from those who may not volunteer for line service.

11. It is desired by Her Majesty's Government to maintain, as integral regiments, the three oldest European infantry regiments of the Bengal Presidency, and all of the three regiments of the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, and to keep the men who are now in each of those corps, and who may volunteer for Her Majesty's general service, in the regiments which, when transferred to the line, will represent those to which they now respectively belong.

12. The men of the 4th and 6th Bengal European Regiments, and the men of the Bengal European Infantry of the depôt at Barrackpore, will be allowed to volunteer for any one of the three new regiments of the line in Bengal. The men of the Bengal European Light Cavalry of the depôt at Barrackpore, will be allowed to volunteer for any one of the three new regiments of the cavalry of the line. The men of the Cavalry and Infantry arm of the depôt at Barrackpore who do not volunteer will join the local regiment of their arm.

13. Her Majesty having graciously determined to mark Her estimation of the services of Her Indian armies by conferring the designation of "Royal" upon three of the European regiments, and by selecting for this honour one regiment from each Presidency, the selection of which has been left by Her Majesty to the judgment and discretion of the Government of India, the Viceroy and Governor General in Council has much gratification in announcing that the following regiments will henceforward bear the honourable designation of "Royal" Regiments:—

The 1st Bengal Fusiliers.
The 1st Madras Fusiliers.
The 1st Bombay Fusiliers.

14. The three older regiments in the several Presidencies will thus be converted into Regiments of Her Majesty's general army, and will be numbered and designated as follows:—

The 101st Regiment of Foot (Royal Bengal Fusiliers).
The 102d Regiment of Foot (Royal Madras Fusiliers).
The 103d Regiment of Foot (Royal Bombay Fusiliers).
The 104th Regiment of Foot (Bengal Fusiliers).
The 105th Regiment of Foot (Madras Light Infantry).
The 106th Regiment of Foot (Bombay Light Infantry).
The 107th Regiment of Foot (Bengal Infantry).
The 108th Regiment of Foot (Madras Infantry).
The 109th Regiment of Foot (Bombay Infantry).

Despatch 23,
para. 3.Non-com-
missioned
officers and
men.
Despatch 27,
para. 11.
Despatch 23,
paras. 1, 7,
10, 13, 22, 23,
26.
Despatch 29,
para. 10.Despatch 29,
paras. 2, 10,
12.Despatch 3
para. 14.Despatch 1
para. 19.Despatch
para. 10.Despatch
para. 10,
17, 23, 26.Despatch
para. 10.Despatch
para. 11
26, 29.

Despatch 28, paras. 17, 23, 5. 15. The corps transferred to Her Majesty's service will retain all honorary distinctions which they have won; these will be borne on appointments and colours, or in the Army List, in such manner as Her Majesty's Government may think best suited to the arm of the service to which the corps belongs.

Despatch 28, paras. 10, 12, 4, 27. 16. The non-commissioned officers and men of the infantry who may prefer the conditions of Indian service will be placed in one or more regiments of Infantry, to be formed as local regiments in each Presidency, with officers selected from those who may not volunteer for line service.

Despatch 28, para. 10, Despatch 29, para. 10. 17. In the Artillery, Cavalry (including the Lahore Light Horse), and Infantry of the Indian forces, there are many men who volunteered from regiments of the line. To these men the Governor General in Council allows the option of returning to the regiments, whether of Cavalry or Infantry, from which they volunteered, if those regiments are now in India, or of transfer to other regiments of British Cavalry or Infantry serving in India, or to the regiments to be now retained of the arm to which such men belong. The men of this class electing to be transferred to British regiments serving in India will not receive bounty, having received it on entering the Indian service. To those who accept the conditions of Her Majesty's general service, now offered, bounty will be given on the same terms as to the other men in the Indian service. The volunteers here alluded to will be further allowed the option of discharge if unwilling to remain in the service. Those who prefer the existing conditions of the Indian service will be allowed to remain with a local regiment.

18. The non-commissioned officers of artillery, of the 4th and 5th Bengal European Cavalry, and of the 4th and 6th Bengal European Infantry, who volunteer for the new regiments of the line, will carry their rank with them, and be supernumeraries in the regiments for which they volunteer, being made effective in their respective ranks as vacancies occur, in the proportion of three appointments to four vacancies.

General order of Despatch 28. 19. To the warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men employed in the several departments of the army, to the non-commissioned officers serving with native regiments, and to all other men borne on the unattached list in Bengal, and the lists of effective supernumeraries in Madras and Bombay, the Governor General in Council offers the option of accepting the conditions of Her Majesty's general service, according to the arm of the service to which they belong, with bounty to all men not of warrant rank who, under the usual conditions of service, would be entitled to bounty, or of remaining on the conditions of the Indian service if they prefer to do so.

Despatch 28, para. 10. 20. The rates of bounty to be issued will be as follows:—

	Rs.
To men who have more than 4 years to serve from the 18th February 1861	50
To men who have more than 3 and less than 4 years to serve from the same date	40
To men who have more than 2 and less than 3 years to serve from the same date	30
To men who have more than 1 and less than 2 years to serve from the same date	20
To men who have 1 year or less to serve from the same date	10

Any expense caused to a man by his transfer will be reimbursed to him. No kit, or compensation in lieu of kit, will be given.

21. The immediate issue of bounty to men volunteering is hereby authorized on their making the declaration appended to this general order before a justice of the peace or magistrate.

Despatch 28, para. 9. 22. The earliest measures will be taken in the three Presidencies, under the orders of their Excellencies the Commanders-in-Chief, to ascertain the wishes of the men, and the result will be reported to the Government of India without delay. The Commander-in-Chief in India may take the necessary measures for carrying out the final arrangements for the new constitution of the European forces of Her Majesty's Indian army, and for the disposal of the men who do not volunteer.

Commissioned officers. Despatch 27, para. 3. 23. In the execution of the measures to bring about the proposed amalgamation, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that the pledge that due regard shall be paid to the rights and claims of the officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces shall be scrupulously adhered to.

Despatch 31, paras. 2, 4. 24. Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify Her intention to give to every officer of Her Indian armies a Royal commission, under the sign manual, 7186,

conferring rank and command in Her Majesty's army in any part of the world. Nominal rolls of all the officers of the armies of the three Presidencies will be immediately transmitted by the several Governments of India to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, in order to the preparation of the new commissions.

25. In order to carry out to the full extent the plan which has been determined upon by Her Majesty's Government for the assimilation and ultimate consolidation of the Indian regiments of Artillery with the Royal Artillery, the organization of the Indian regiments will be as follows:—The Bengal Artillery will be formed into seven brigades, the Madras Artillery into four brigades, and the Bombay Artillery into three brigades, in all 14 brigades, each with the strength of officers detailed in the margin. Regimental promotions in the Artillery requisite to complete the formation of brigades on the new organization will be made without delay, with effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the despatches by the Government of India.

26. The officers of Artillery holding appointments in the Ordnance Department, including superintendents of Ordnance manufacturing establishments, will be seconded, and the promotions consequent thereupon will be made from the same date.

27. Under the Royal Artillery organization the Colonel's allowance is drawn by Colonels Commandant, and of these there will be seven only under the new organization, in place of 12 who now draw Colonel's allowance in Bengal; in Madras, four in place of seven; and in Bombay, three in place of five.

Eventually the assimilation will be carried out in this respect also. The five officers who will be supernumerary in Bengal, the three in Madras, and the two in Bombay will continue to receive Colonel's allowance; and the necessary reduction will be gradually carried out, by promoting only three officers to every four vacancies in the number of those receiving Colonel's allowance, until the supernumeraries shall have been absorbed.

28. The Colonels now to be made Colonels Commandant, and the Colonels in excess of the new establishment, who are also in receipt of the Colonel's allowance, will take regimental rank as Colonels Commandant from the date on which they respectively received the Colonel's allowance. All general officers not being on the new fixed establishment of Colonels Commandant, and not drawing Colonel's allowance, will be supernumerary or unattached, as at present.

29. Colonels of Artillery, under the new organization, who, not being Colonels Commandant, will not draw Colonel's allowance, will be permitted to draw in India the pay and allowances fixed for the rank of regimental Colonel (excepting the Colonel's allowance). On furlough they will receive the furlough pay of Colonel, viz., 25s. a day, and they will enjoy the privileges of regimental Colonels, in being permitted to reside in England, if not required in India, without forfeiting their position on the effective list.

30. Artillery officers willing to serve out of India, and who may be permitted to do so, will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery, and will draw the pay and allowances fixed by Her Majesty's regulations for that arm of the service, according to the situation and locality in which they may be serving, but their promotion will continue to go on in their original regiments.

31. The existing regiments of Artillery in the three Presidencies of India will remain distinct from each other and from the Royal Artillery so long as any officers now in them shall continue to be borne on their rolls.

32. For the batteries formed of men who may accept the conditions of Her Majesty's Royal Artillery officers will be provided from the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Artillery regiments respectively, and they will receive commissions in the Royal Artillery concurrent with those which they now respectively hold in their regiments. For the batteries which may be formed on the conditions of the Indian service officers will be provided from the same regiments.

33. No new appointments will be made to the Indian regiments of Artillery, but hereafter, on the occurrence of vacancies in any of the three Indian regiments, or in the Royal Artillery, appointments of young officers will be made to the Royal Artillery.

34. After all the subalterns in any of the Indian regiments of Artillery shall have been promoted, on the occurrence of the next vacancy in the grade of Second Captain in that corps, the senior subaltern of the Royal Artillery shall be promoted to that grade.

APP. H.

Despatch 29, para. 2, VI.

1 Colonel Commandant
2 Colonels.
4 Lieut-Colonels.
8 Captains.
9 Second Captains, including an Adjutant.
24 Lieutenants.

Despatch 27, para. 9.

Despatch 29, paras. 4, 5.

Despatch 29, para. 6.

Despatch 29, para. 7.

Despatch 29, para. 2, I.

Despatch 29, paras. 10, 11.

Despatch 29, para. 2, II, III.

Despatch 29, para. 2, IV.

- Despatch 29, para. 2, V. 35. The same process will be followed in each grade successively, until all the officers of the Indian regiments of Artillery have been absorbed, after which the whole corps will be Royal Artillery.
- Despatch 30, para. 6. 36. The Engineer corps of Her Majesty's Indian forces will be immediately formed into three battalions for Bengal, and two each for Madras and Bombay, of the following strength respectively :—
 1 Colonel Commandant.
 2 Colonels.
 5 Lieutenant-Colonels.
 8 Captains.
 8 Second Captains.
 24 Lieutenants.
37. The promotions in the Engineer regiments requisite to complete the formation of battalions on the new organization will be made without delay, with effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the despatches by the Government of India.
38. The Colonels of the Engineers who will become supernumerary under the new organization in the three Presidencies, will receive the regimental rank of Colonel Commandant from the date on which they came into the receipt of the Colonel's allowance, and will continue to receive that allowance. Their number will be reduced to that fixed by the new organization, by omitting to fill up one out of every four vacancies.
- Despatch 30, para. 8. 49. Colonels of Engineers, not being Colonels Commandant, will be in the same position as Colonels of Artillery, as described in paragraph 29 above.
- Despatch 30, para. 9. All general officers, not being on the new fixed establishment of Colonels Commandant, and not drawing Colonel's allowance, will be supernumerary or unattached, as at present.
- Despatch 30, para. 10. 40. Officers of the Indian Engineers will receive commissions in the Royal Engineers, but will rise by seniority in their respective regiments.
- Despatch 30, para. 11. 41. They will not be required to serve out of India unless at their own request, but will be eligible to serve anywhere, receiving the pay and allowances fixed for Royal Engineers in similar positions.
- Despatch 30, para. 12. 42. The places of Engineer officers of the Indian service who may elect and who may be permitted to serve out of India on the above terms, will be filled up by officers of the Royal Engineers who may be willing to undertake the several duties required from Engineer officers in the Public Works Department.
- Despatch 30, para. 13. 43. The Engineer corps of the several Presidencies will continue to be, as at present, principally corps of officers having no European soldiers attached to them. But Engineer officers may be posted, as at present, as far as they can be made available, to the corps of Native Sappers, which will be maintained on its present footing.
- Despatch 30, para. 4. 44. All fresh appointments of young officers will be made to the Royal Engineers, and when all the subalterns of any of the three Indian regiments shall have become Captains, the next vacancy in that regiment will cause the promotion of the senior subaltern of Royal Engineers, and the same process will be followed in the higher grades until all the officers of the Engineers shall have disappeared.
- Despatch 27, para. 9. 45. Officers of Engineers now in Staff employ other than appointments in the Public Works or Survey Departments; and officers of Artillery now in Staff employ other than appointments with batteries of native Artillery, or in the Ordnance Department, or as superintendents of Ordnance manufacturing establishments in India, will be required to exercise the option of joining the Staff corps, or of not joining it, in the same way as officers of Infantry or Cavalry, as hereafter explained. Officers of the Indian Artillery and Engineers now on Staff employ, who may not elect to join the Staff corps, and officers of the Indian Artillery and Engineers in general, will in common with the rest of the army, be available for any duty to which they may be appointed.
- Despatch 27, para. 7. 46. The general gradation list of general and other officers of the armies of the three Presidencies, and their promotion therein, will remain exactly as at present.
- Despatch 27, para. 8. 47. The promotion of field officers of Cavalry and Infantry will go on as usual, in separate regimental gradation lists of "Majors," "Lieutenant-Colonels," and "Colonels;" but a gradual reduction will be made in the number of regimental Colonels entitled to Colonel's allowance, in due proportion to the reduction in the number of regiments.
- Despatch 27, para. 8. 48. The extent of this reduction will be determined hereafter; but in pursuance of the instructions given in Despatch No. 27, paragraph 8, the Governor General in Council now announces that the reduction will be commenced at once in Bengal, by promoting only three Lieutenant-Colonels for every four vacancies in the rank of Colonel regimentally, in the Cavalry and Infantry respectively. This arrangement will commence to operate from the 18th of February 1861, and will not include vacancies which occurred previous to that date.
- Despatch para. 13. 49. The course of promotion of officers who belong to regiments will, as heretofore, go on to the regimental rank of Major inclusive, and that of unposted officers as directed in the General Orders No. 1637 of 1859, No. 1115 of 1860, and No. 214, 12th March 1861.
- Despatch para. 13. Despatch para. 14. 50. All the officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian forces will be placed on two general lists of Cavalry and Infantry respectively for each Presidency; those below the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel will, however, retain their places in the cadres of their old regiments, for the purpose of regulating promotion as hereafter explained. These general lists will be distinct from that of the Staff corps and from the existing gradation lists of each Presidency, and the gradation list of officers of all arms of the three Presidencies. From these two general lists officers of Cavalry and Infantry will be invited to volunteer for Her Majesty's general service, to the number required for the new regiments of Cavalry and Infantry respectively, according as such officers belong to either branch of the service. Those officers who may not be appointed to the new regiments of Her Majesty's line service, or to the Staff corps, will continue to be available as heretofore for their present duty, or for any other duty to which they may be appointed by Government. The general lists will be immediately formed in the three Presidencies, and measures will be taken by the several Governments to ascertain the wishes of officers in regard to volunteering for Her Majesty's general service.
- Despatch para. 21. 51. The officers of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Bengal Cavalry will be permitted to volunteer for general service in the three regiments respectively representing those to which they now belong; and any vacancies that may then remain in the cadres of officers on the establishment of a Dragon regiment, as laid down in paragraph 55, will be filled up in the 19th Light Dragons by volunteers from the remaining officers of the Bengal Cavalry, in the 20th and 21st Light Dragons by volunteers from the officers of the Madras and Bombay Cavalry respectively. In the event of vacancies still remaining in any of the three regiments they will be filled by officers who may volunteer, selected from the general lists of Cavalry in the three Presidencies.
- Despatch para. 1. 52. It is necessary that the officers of the three general service regiments of European Infantry, to be now formed in each of the three Presidencies, should be generally under the conditions of service of line officers; and it is desired that they should be taken from among the officers of the Indian armies, and as far as possible, from the old regiments, which will be respectively represented by the new.
- Despatch para. 1. 53. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that such of the officers as may have belonged to the three older local regiments shall be appointed respectively to the new regiments, representing those to which they belonged, and that it should be secured to them that they shall hold a position in the new regiments as far as possible the same as that which they held in the old ones.
- Despatch para. 2. 54. Such of the German officers now attached to the 3rd Bombay European regiment as may desire it will receive commissions in their present grades in the 109th foot.
- Despatch para. 2. 55. The new regiments will consist of cadres of the strength noted in the margin* exclusive of regimental Staff. From the officers who may volunteer for general service the number who may be required to fill up these cadres will be appointed by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in India, subject to the approval of the Government of India. These officers will eventually receive new commissions from Her Majesty, bearing the same dates respectively as the commissions which they now hold.

* Cavalry.

1 Lieutenant-Colonel.
 2 Majors.
 9 Captains } Including one troop for the Depôt.
 9 Lieutenants }
 9 Cornets.
 A Colonel will hereafter be appointed to each regiment.

* Infantry.

1 Lieutenant-Colonel.
 2 Majors.
 12 Captains.
 14 Lieutenants. } Including two companies at the depôt.
 10 Ensigns.
 A Colonel will hereafter be appointed to each regiment.

Despatch 23, para. 14, and instructions.

56. The system of purchase, as practised in the Queen's army, is not to be introduced into these regiments. They will be seniority corps; but in the promotion to field officers, the fitness and efficiency of the officers will be taken into account.

57. The commanding officers of the two reduced Bengal European Cavalry and Infantry regiments, the 4th and 5th Bengal Light Cavalry, and the 4th and 6th Bengal Infantry are allowed to keep their command allowances for one year, unless otherwise provided for.

Despatch 27, para. 13, 14.

58. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government that, notwithstanding the formation of the two general lists of Cavalry and Infantry in the several Presidencies, and of the Staff corps, the names of all officers shall continue to be borne on the cadres of their former regiments. Officers joining the Staff corps, or the new line regiments, will, by so doing, forego promotion in their former cadres, and their names will continue to be borne on their former cadres, in *italics*, only for the purpose of regulating the promotion of their juniors; but by joining the Staff corps, or the new line regiments, officers will not prejudice their claims on the military and orphan funds and to retiring pensions under the Indian regulations.

Despatch 23, para. 14.

59. Thus, the promotion of officers who do not join the Staff corps or the new line regiments will continue, as heretofore, to depend on their position in their former cadres; and the rise of officers in the new regiments and in the Staff corps will be entirely irrespective of their position in their former cadres, but will depend in the one case on their promotion in the new regiments, and in the other on their length of service.

Despatch 27, para. 23, 14.

60. The same rule will apply to promotion in the regimental gradation list of field officers, on which the names of officers transferred will be placed in the same position which they would have held had they not joined the Staff corps or volunteered for the new line regiments. Thus, until the death or retirement of such officers, their names will remain on the rolls of the Indian army to regulate the promotion of their juniors.

Despatch 27, para. 13, 14.

Note.—The following illustration will show the operation of the new system:—

Number of old Cadres.	General List.	Present Position.	101st Fusiliers	Cadre of old 10th Native Infantry
10th N. I.	Captains A	(101st Fusiliers) -	Captains *	Captains *
4th N. I.	" B	(General duties) -	" "	" "
1st N. I.	" C	(Staff corps) -	" "	" A
20th N. I.	" D	(General duties) -	" A	" "
1st N. I.	" E	(ditto) -	" "	" "
10th N. I.	" F	(Staff corps) -	" G	" "
3rd N. I.	" G	(101st Fusiliers) -	" "	" "
	&c.		" "	" "
			" "	" "
			" "	" "
			" "	" "
20th N. I.	Lieutenants H	(General duties) -	Lieutenants K	Lieutenants I (14 yrs. service).
10th N. I.	" I	(ditto) -	" M	" "
1st N. I.	" J	(ditto) -	" "	Lieutenants F (12 yrs. service).
1st N. I.	" K	(101st Fusiliers) -	" "	" M
2nd N. I.	" L	(General duties) -	" "	Lieutenants
10th N. I.	" M	(101st Fusiliers) -	" "	" "
2nd N. I.	" N	(General duties) -	&c.	" "
4th N. I.	" O	(ditto) -	" "	" "
20th N. I.	" P	(ditto) -	" "	&c.
3rd N. I.	" Q	(ditto) -	" "	" "
	&c.		" "	" "

Suppose A to retire from the 101st Fusiliers, then K, the senior lieutenant in that regiment, becomes Captain in it, and his name is included amongst the captains on the general lists; G, a Captain in the 101st, rising one step in the gradation of the corps; also I, the senior Lieutenant in the cadre of the old 10th Native Infantry, to which A belonged, becomes Captain, standing above K in the general list. Thus the retirement of one officer has given two effective steps. But J, who stood before K in his former cadre, remains a Lieutenant. Next, suppose C to retire from the Staff corps, no officer in that corps is promoted; but J, the senior lieutenant on the cadre of the old 1st Native Infantry to which C belonged, is promoted.

Now, suppose E to retire, then K would be promoted (nominally) in his old cadre, he being already a Captain in the 101st Fusiliers. Thus, in fact, E's retirement has given no effective step.

Again, suppose F to retire, then, as he is actually only a Lieutenant on his former cadre, he gives no step;

the only result is, that M becomes senior Lieutenant on his old cadre.

Lastly, suppose G to retire, then M becomes Captain in the 101st Fusiliers, and on the general list; and Q also becomes a substantive Captain on the general list.

Also note, that F, an officer of 12 years' service, by joining the Staff corps, passed over I, his senior in the army, and in his former cadre.

The general list will then stand thus:—

Captains B	Lieutenants H
D	L
&c.	N
I	O
K	P
J	&c.
M	
Q	

APP. H.

61. It is intended by Her Majesty's Government that the regular native Infantry regiments in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, and the regular native Cavalry regiments in Madras, shall eventually be officered on the irregular system; and, therefore, that the number of their European officers shall eventually be fewer than at present. This change will be effected gradually, and each regiment, after the change shall have been made in it, will be officered from the general lists and from the Staff corps; and as far as may be practicable, officers will be allowed to continue to serve with the regiments to which they have been attached.

Despatch 27, paras. 4, 5, 13.

62. It will be the anxious desire of the Government of India to carry out this important change with due regard to the interest and claims of all officers now serving with the regular native regiments of the army; and, meanwhile, officers commanding regiments, and all officers serving with them, will continue to draw the allowances they now receive.

63. The position and claims of the field officers of the army who are now unemployed, and for whom it may be difficult to find suitable employment under the new system, are also under consideration by the Governor General in Council.

64. It is intended that the irregular regiments of Cavalry and Infantry in the three Presidencies shall each have six officers, besides the medical officer.

Despatch 27, para. 4.

65. It will be observed, that, in the Despatches, No. 27, paragraphs 12 and 34, and No. 28, paragraph 14, it is distinctly announced that the present and prospective advantages which officers now in the service derive from the Military and Orphan Funds, will be secured to them; and further, that the retiring pensions, under the Indian regulations, will be scrupulously preserved. Officers ordered to serve out of India with their regiments will be allowed to count such service in completion of the period required, under the Indian regulations, for the several rates of pension. Officers who may serve out of India under any other conditions will be allowed to count for pension, in addition to their service in India, one year for every two years of their service out of India.

Despatch 27, paras. 12, 34.

Despatch 28, para. 14.

66. The organization and regulations of the Staff corps to be formed in the several Presidencies are given in full detail in the Royal Warrant, and the Despatch, No. 27, now published. The object of forming the Staff corps is to supply a body of officers for service in India, by whom various offices and appointments, hitherto held by officers borne on the strength of the several corps of the Indian forces, shall in future be held; it having been resolved that the practice of withdrawing officers for such employment, while remaining on the strength of their regiments, be discontinued; and that, ultimately, all officers selected for such employment be transferred to Staff corps.

Staff corps, —Royal Warrant, clause 1. Despatch 27 para. 6.

67. These corps will be denominated the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Staff corps, respectively, and will consist of such officers as may be required for employment therein, and may be selected by the Governments of the several Presidencies, with the approbation of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Royal Warrant, clause 1.

68. Officers of the British and Indian armies now on Staff employ in India, not having the substantive rank of Colonel, are eligible for admission to the Staff corps; and officers of either service, under the rank of field officer, not now on the Staff, may, now or hereafter, become candidates.

Royal Warrant, clause 2. Despatch 27 para. 6.

69. Officers at present holding civil and political appointments of every description, and appointments in all public offices and departments; officers holding military appointments on the general and personal staff, and the appointments of commandant, second in

APP. H.

command, and Adjutant of irregular and local corps; of Adjutant, and Interpreter, and Quartermaster of existing local European and native regiments; will be held to be now on Staff employ, and will be eligible, under the conditions hereafter noted, to have their names placed on the list of the Staff corps; but officers doing duty with irregular and local regiments will not be regarded as being now in Staff employ.

70. So soon as the proposed changes in the organization of the regular native regiments shall have come into operation, the whole of the officers who will be permanently attached to them will be held to be on Staff employ.

71. There will then be, as at present, two great divisions of employment for officers of the Staff corps:—

1. Purely military, as in regiments of the native army.
2. Various civil appointments, as political, public works, &c.

There will also be, practically, many subdivisions of employment, for each of which there will be, as at present, separate departmental lists.

72. Officers of the Indian army, now holding Staff appointments of any description, will have the option of joining the Staff corps, if they do not possess the substantive rank of Colonel, or of continuing in Staff employ, whatever their regimental rank, without joining the Staff corps; and, in the latter case, they will not, as heretofore, be required to vacate their appointments on the attainments of a certain regimental rank. This paragraph does not affect the provisions of paragraph 45.

73. Officers of the Indian army, not now on the Staff, not having the substantive rank of Colonel, but who within the last three years, or who, at the commencement of their present unexpired furlough, may have served permanently on the Staff, and who may make application within the next six months, will be considered eligible to join the Staff corps on the same terms as those now on Staff employ; provided always, that they have passed the prescribed examination in Hindoostanee, and that they did not lose their appointments through misconduct, and are not otherwise disqualified.

74. Officers of the British army now in Staff employ will have the option of declaring their desire to be transferred to the Staff corps, with the consent of the Commander-in-Chief in India, within six months from the date of the notification of the Royal Warrant in India, or of retaining their appointments on their present footing, if their services are required by Government, for the unexpired portion of a period of five years from the date of their appointment, unless the regiments to which they belong shall be previously removed from the Indian establishment.

75. Those whose tenure of Staff appointments, at the time of transfer to the Staff corps, shall have exceeded one year will not be subjected to probation or to any introductory test other than those already prescribed for any department in which they may be serving; but officers who may have held their appointments for less than one year will not be transferred permanently to the Staff corps unless they possess the requisite qualifications, to be hereafter laid down, and shall have completed the period of probation to be prescribed. The option of joining the Staff corps will be open to those officers only who may be considered by the Governments under which they are serving to be in all respects fit for the Staff corps.

76. Appointments on the general Staff of the army specified in the margin, can only be held for five years; they may be held by officers of the Staff corps, or by other officers of either army, but will be subject henceforward to the limitations as to rank, which are laid down in the "Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army," in Clauses 30 to 33 of the Section entitled "Duties of general and other officers employed upon the Staff of the army."

77. Officers now holding such appointments will not be required to vacate them for a period of two years from this date, or a period of seven years from the date of their appointment.

78. Officers not having the substantive rank of Colonel, now holding appointments on the Staff, as defined in paragraph 69, will at once be called upon to declare whether or not they desire to join the Staff corps. To enable such officers to avail themselves of the advantages in the way of promotion, notified in paragraphs 84 and 85, they must communicate their decision to the Adjutant-General within six months of the date of the publication of the Royal Warrant in India,

79. The selection of officers hereafter, for the Staff corps, will rest with the Governments in India, but no officers serving with any regiment will be admitted on probation without the consent of the Commander-in-Chief, or without a certificate from the commanding officer of his regiment, that he has efficiently performed his regimental duty for the period prescribed in paragraph 80.

80. For the future officers not on the Staff will not be eligible for the Staff corps unless they be below the rank of regimental field officer, and have served three years with a regiment, of which two must have been in India, and have passed the prescribed examination in Hindoostanee. They will not be permanently appointed to the Staff corps unless, after due probation, they shall pass the prescribed tests for the branch of the Indian service for which they may be selected. This rule applies equally to officers of the British and Indian armies.

81. A subsequent notification will prescribe the period of probation and the tests of qualification in the several departments.

82. The promotion of officers while on probation will go on in their respective regiments.

83. Officers of the British army, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will be removed from the strength of the regiment to which they belonged.

84. The promotion of officers of the Staff corps will be regulated as follows:—

Ensigns, when permanently transferred to the Staff corps, will have the rank of Lieutenant. Other officers will have the rank which they may hold in their regiments.

Officers of 12 years service, of which four must have been in the Staff corps, will become Captains. After 20 years service, of which six must have been in the Staff corps, they will become Majors. After 26 years service, of which eight must have been in the Staff corps, they will become Lieutenant-Colonels.

Five years service in the Staff corps, as Lieutenant-Colonel, will entitle the officer so employed to the brevet rank of Colonel.

85. Officers now in Staff employ will be allowed to count, to the extent laid down in the Royal Warrant, as noted in the preceding paragraph, their past service towards promotion, as if it had been performed in the Staff corps. One step of rank will be given to every officer whose period of service would qualify him for it according to the above rules. An interval of two years at least must intervene between each succeeding step. But these privileges will be restricted to those officers who, whether now in India or on leave out of India, may declare their desire to be transferred to the Staff corps within six months of the date of the notification of the warrant in India.

86. The officers referred to in paragraph 73 will also be allowed this privilege, should they be permitted to join the Staff corps.

87. The past service on the Staff, counting for promotion in the Staff corps, will include any service of a permanent nature which an officer now on the Staff may, from the date of his first arrival in India, have passed on the Staff.

88. Officers of the Staff corps under the substantive rank of field officer will be allowed to exchange with regimental officers of the line of the same rank, on the recommendation of the Governments of the several Presidencies, with the concurrence of the Government of India and the Commander-in-Chief in India, and subject to the confirmation of Her Majesty; but it is to be understood that the regimental officer entering the Staff corps by exchange will not necessarily assume the Staff appointment held by the officer with whom he exchanges. He will merely enter the Staff corps on being found qualified for the department of the Staff on which the Government may desire to employ him. Officers of the Staff corps exchanging into a regiment will become the juniors of their regimental rank.

89. An officer of the Staff corps whose name is borne on the cadre of an Indian regiment, exchanging from the Staff corps with an officer of a British regiment, other than the new line regiments about to be formed, will give an effective step in the cadre of his former regiment.

90. It will be discretionary with the Governments in India, as at present, to employ the officers of the Staff corps in such manner as they may think best, in the situations for which their respective qualifications may render them most fitted. The appointments and promotions in the several departments will rest, as at present, with the Governments in India, and will be made

Despatch 27, para. 6.

Royal Warrant, clause 2. Despatch 27, paras 13, 17.

Royal Warrant, clause 2. Despatch 27, para. 26.

Despatch 27, para. 16.

Royal Warrant, clause 2. Despatch 27, paras 13, 19.

Despatch 27, para 15. Adjutant-General's Department. Quartermaster-General's Department. Brigade Majors and Fort Adjutants. Personal Staff.

Despatch 27, para. 26.

Despatch 27, para. 20.

Royal Warrant, clause 2. Despatch 27, paras. 19, 21.

Despatch 27, para. 20.

Despatch 27, para. 21.

Despatch 27, para. 21.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, paras. 1 and 2.

Despatch 27, para. 26. Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 3.

Royal Warrant, clause 2.

Despatch 27, para. 26.

Royal Warrant, clause 2.

Despatch 27, para. 26.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 6.

Despatch 27, para. 22.

irrespective of the rank which the officer may hold in the Staff corps. Those appointments, promotions, and recommendations now in the gift of the Commanders-in-Chief remain as heretofore.

Despatch 27, para. 25.

91. Officers of the Staff corps of one Presidency may, with the sanction of the Government of India, be employed in any other Presidency.

92. Unattached officers of the Indian service are eligible for the Staff corps on the same terms as other Indian officers.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 9.
Despatch 27, para. 32.

93. Officers of the Staff corps while on furlough will draw the pay of their rank, as laid down in the clause of the Royal Warrant for officers out of India, and in case of sickness will have the privilege of drawing for six months the allowances of officers on sick leave in India. They will be allowed to retain their appointments during short periods of leave, not exceeding 20 months, during which time they will only receive the unemployed pay of their rank. With the above exceptions, the officers of the Staff corps will be under the new furlough regulations of the Indian army.

Despatch 27, para. 30.

94. A certain proportion of the senior officers of the Staff corps will receive Colonel's allowance. Eventually the number will be fixed in the proportion of one for every 30 officers on the Staff corps; but this number can only be filled up as the establishment of Colonels on the old footing diminishes, so that the aggregate number of officers receiving Colonel's allowance at one time shall never exceed the regulated number of Colonel's allowance for each Presidency.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 9.
Despatch 27, para. 29.

95. Officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces joining the Staff corps will be entitled to pensions under the regulations of the Indian service. Officers of the British army entering the Staff corps will be allowed to retire on the following scale of pension, provided that not less than half of the required periods of service shall have been passed in the Staff corps:—

SCALE.	£	s.	d.
After 20 years service in India	191	12	0 per annum.
" 24 "	292	0	0 "
" 28 "	365	0	0 "
" 32 "	456	5	0 "

These periods of service will include the proportions of leave of absence in India or elsewhere laid down in the new furlough regulations, viz.:—

2 years in 20 years service
3 " 25 "
4 " 30 "

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 10.
Despatch 27, para. 31.

96. All officers of the Staff corps in England who may not wish to retire, but are unable to return to India, and officers removed from the effective list of the Staff corps, who may not be entitled to retire on the above scale of pension, may, provided they have served three years in India in the Staff corps, be placed on a half-pay list, on the same rate of half-pay and on the same conditions as officers of a similar rank in the British army. Officers belonging to the Indian forces who may avail themselves of this privilege, will give an effective step in the cadres of their regiments. Officers placed on half-pay will be eligible to return to effective service, either in the Staff corps or in regiments of the line. In the former case, their names will not be restored to their old cadres.

Despatch 27, para. 33.

97. No unemployed general officer of the Staff corps, who is not required by the Governments in India to remain there, will be allowed to receive pay on the Indian scale for a longer period than three years. At the expiration of that period, he will be restricted to the pay fixed for officers of his rank "out of India." This rule in no way affects the Colonel's allowance.

Despatch 27, para. 33.

98. Officers of the Staff corps under the rank of Major-General, whom the Governments of India may not see fit to employ in any capacity, will not be allowed to draw pay for more than four years, of which one year may be on the Indian scale and three years on the scale fixed for officers "out of India," after which period they will be placed on half-pay or on pension according to the scale of their rank, if entitled thereto.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, para. 10.
Despatch 27, para. 33.

99. The pay of officers of the Staff corps whilst unemployed has been fixed at the following rates:—

	Whilst required to remain in India.			Out of India.		
	Per Mensm.	Rs.	a.	Per Dem.	£	s.
General officers	1,295	5	0	1	5	0
Brevet Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel	827	14	0	1	0	0
Major	640	14	0	0	16	0
Captain	374	1	6	0	10	6
Lieutenant	225	12	0	0	6	6

100. The pay and allowances to be established for the several Staff appointments, in all departments of Staff employ, will be announced in a subsequent notification, and, meanwhile, the Staff salary and other allowances of all appointments will remain unchanged.

Despatch 27, para. 23.

101. Officers of the Staff corps are eligible for brevet rank, and will take their places on the general gradation list in common with the rest of the army. Those holding military appointments will take military command according to their army rank, but officers whilst holding only civil appointments will not be entitled to assume such command. Civil appointments are those in any civil branch of the army or under the civil administration of Government.

Royal Warrant, clause 3, paras. 4, 5

102. Officers of the Staff corps will succeed to Colonel's allowance according to their seniority as Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff corps. Lieutenant-Colonels entering the Staff corps on its first establishment will take rank for Colonel's allowance according to the dates of their commissions as substantive Lieutenant-Colonels. All officers entering the Staff corps will take with them the substantive rank they held at the time of joining it. Should two officers of the same rank enter the Staff corps and be promoted on the same day, they will stand in the corps according to the dates of their previous substantive commissions; but officers of the Staff corps will take precedence and exercise command among each other according to their army rank.

103. All promotions in the Staff corps, in the case of officers who may join the Staff corps within six months of the publication of the Royal Warrant, will take effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the warrant in India.

104. The power of removing officers from the effective list of the Staff corps will be exercised by Her Majesty through the Secretary of State for India.

Royal Warrant, clause 7.

105. The provisions of para. 90 are also applicable to appointments in the Ordnance, Survey, and Public Works Departments.

106. The promotion of officers of the Indian armies, on the occurrence of vacancies, will be notified, as heretofore, by the Governments of India, in the "Official Gazette," and will be stated to be "subject to Her Majesty's approval." Periodical lists of these promotions will be submitted to the Secretary of State for India, that measures may be taken for the preparation and signature of corresponding commissions. Pending the receipt of these commissions the officers provisionally promoted by the Indian Governments will enjoy the pay, provision, and privileges of the rank to which they may have been advanced.

Despatch 31, paras. 5, 6.

(Signed) R. J. H. BIRCH, Major-General, Secretary to the Government of India.

DECLARATION to be made by a soldier volunteering from Her Majesty's Indian Forces to Regiments of Her Majesty's General Army.

I, A.B., do declare, that I have been till now a (private, or corporal, or serjeant, as the case may be) in the regiment of _____ in Her Majesty's Indian Military Forces: That I enlisted on the day of _____ for a term of _____ years, of which _____ years and _____ months remain unexpired. That I am of the age of _____ years: That I am willing to be transferred from the Infantry (or as the case may be) of Her Majesty's Indian Forces to the 101st Regiment Royal Bengal Fusiliers (or as the case may be), of Her Majesty's army, for the unexpired residue of my term of service; and to accept, according to the terms of a general order of his Excellency the Governor General of India in Council, No. 332, of the 10th day of April 1861, the bounty of rupees _____ upon such transfer: And that I will serve Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors, for the said unexpired term of _____ years and _____ months from this date, provided my services should so long be required, and also for such further term, not exceeding two years, as shall be directed by the commanding officer on any foreign station.

Signature of Soldier.

Signature of Witness.

Declared before me, _____
(Signature of Justice of the Peace or Magistrate.)

APP. I.

APPENDIX I.

India Office, S.W.,
15th September 1863.

SIR,

1. I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 14th instant, and to inform you in reply, that the Commissioners on the Claims of Indian Officers are correct in assuming that effective officers at the head of the regimental list of Lieut.-Colonels with date of rank prior to 1st January 1862, must be promoted in ordinary course, before any other effective officer, junior to those who have retired on the annuities can claim promotion under the 12 years service, laid down in Despatch 270 of 1862, para. 12; and that the effective officer will not be precluded from promotion to the rank of Colonel, and the Colonel's allowance after 12 years service by the retention of retired officers above him on the list.

2. The Commissioners are also right in assuming that promotion to the rank of Colonel under the 12-years rule are to be followed by corresponding promotions in all the junior grades.

3. I am desired to avail myself of this opportunity to transmit, for the information of the Commissioners, copy of a Despatch to the Government of India on the subject of the practice to be followed in making promotions to the rank of Colonel under the 12-years rule.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
T. T. PEARS, Major-General.

J. Milton, Esq.

Military Secretary.

India Office,
London, September 1863.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor
General of India in Council.

MY LORD,

Para. 1. I have received and considered in Council your Lordship's letter, dated 27th June, No. 39A., which transmits the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief and the Government of Madras, that the names of the Lieutenant-Colonels of the three Presidencies, borne on the regimental gradation lists in italics, should be removed from those lists on the completion of twelve years from the date of their commissions as Lieut.-Colonels.

2. The recommendation has the support of the President in Council, but your Lordship is hardly of opinion that such a course was intended. As a doubt, however, has arisen on the point, it is necessary that

it should receive an authoritative settlement, and your Lordship refers the question accordingly for my decision.

3. I can have no hesitation in stating, that such a course was not contemplated by Her Majesty's Government when the instructions contained in my despatch, No. 270, of the 31st July 1862, were issued. That despatch stated (para. 12) that all regimental Lieut.-Colonels on the general lists, whose commissions, as such, date prior to the 1st January 1862, shall be considered entitled to promotion to the rank and allowances of Colonel, when they shall have been 12 years in the rank of regimental Lieut.-Colonel; provided, however, that no promotion under this rule shall take place until those not in any way affected by the retention of the names of the retired officers on the list shall have received the step in ordinary course.

4. This could only apply to the effective Lieut.-Colonels on the list.

5. Para. 14 of the same Despatch stated further,—
“The names of the officers of the Staff corps and those of the new line regiments will be treated in a similar manner with those of the effective officers on the list, with the exception that, in the case of the two former, their names, upon coming into the position of Colonel, with Colonels' allowances, under the operation of the above rule, will be removed altogether from the general regimental list of the Indian army, and promotion made in their places.”

6. Nothing was said about the removal from the list of the names of the Lieut.-Colonels, borne in italics, on the completion of 12 years from the date of their commission.

7. The Government of Madras must be informed that the course recommended by them in this case cannot be sanctioned.

8. I observe that the Government of Madras have removed the names of Lieut.-Colonels Clemens and Cotton from the regimental list of the Madras army, on which they were borne in italics, in consequence, I presume, of the promotion of the effective officers standing next below them to the rank of Colonel with Colonel's allowance, under the operation of the 12-years rule.

9. I approve of this measure and desire that the same course may be adopted on future similar occasions.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient, humble Servant,
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

APP. J.

APPENDIX J.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor
General of India in Council.

MY LORD, India Office, London, 31st July 1862.

1. I HAVE received and considered in Council your letters Nos. 60 and 130, dated severally 3rd March and 17th March 1862, the former forwarding copies of a letter from the Government of Bombay, No. 169, of 17th January 1862, enclosing a memorial from Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart of the 25th Bombay Native Infantry, and the latter submitting a memorial from Lieutenant-Colonel Macpherson of the 10th Bengal Native Infantry, relative to the effect produced on the promotion of the senior officers of the Indian army by the rules laid down in my despatch, No. 320, of 10th August 1861, under which the names of the Lieutenant-Colonels who have accepted the annuities authorized in that despatch are retained on the general list to regulate the succession to the Colonel's allowance.

2. Upon this point, you observe that there can be no doubt that as none of the Lieutenant-Colonels who have retired with their annuities can possibly give their juniors a step, unless by their death, the rule must operate injuriously on the prospects of promotion of those more immediately below them.

3. The Government of Bombay, whose suggestions appear to be contained among the papers forwarded by you in a “draft of an intended letter,” recommends that instead of the system of succession recently prescribed by Her Majesty's Government, each regimental Lieutenant-Colonel should receive promotion to the position of Colonel with Colonel's allowance, after the

expiration of 10 years from the date of attaining his regimental Lieutenant-Colonelcy.

4. Your Government, in general terms, recommended the case of the Lieutenant-Colonels to my favourable consideration.

5. The proposal to reduce the number of Colonels with Colonels' allowances in the manner described in my despatch, No. 320, of 10th August, was made upon a consideration that a certain number must be withdrawn from the list of Colonels in a given ratio to the number of officers appointed to the Staff corps, and that some further reduction would have to be made, in consequence of the reduction of the number of regiments.

6. In consequence of the mutiny nearly the whole of the native regular regiments of the army of Bengal have disappeared, and a smaller number of irregular regiments have been raised in their place. Several regiments also have been reduced in the other Presidencies.

7. These reductions were rendered necessary by considerations both of a financial and of a political character.

8. It is almost impossible when a reduction of force becomes necessary but that officers as well as men should in some degree suffer from the consequences of a diminution of the strength of the army.

9. In carrying out the measures which were necessary for this purpose in India, men have been discharged in large numbers with gratuities or pensions.

10. Great consideration has also been shown to the European officers. They have been retained in their respective cadres on full pay, and with no alteration

in the system of promotion to the higher ranks by seniority.

11. A considerable impulse has lately been given to promotion among the officers generally by the retirements under the annuity scheme; but the Lieutenant-Colonels of date prior to 1st January 1862, who did not accept annuities, derived no such benefit; on the contrary, their prospects of promotion under the operation of that scheme would, as shown by Lieutenant-Colonel Macpherson, be affected injuriously to some extent.

12. In order to remove any reasonable ground of complaint, Her Majesty's Government have determined that all regimental Lieutenant-Colonels remaining on the general list of the local armies in the three Presidencies, whose commissions as such date prior to the 1st January 1862, shall be considered entitled to promotion to the rank and allowances of Colonel when they shall have been 12 years in the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel; provided, however, that no promotion under this rule shall take place until those not in any way affected by the retention of the names of the retired officers on the list shall have received the step in ordinary course (vide note*).

* Lieutenant-Colonel Browne stands, at present, fifth on the list of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of the Madras Infantry. Two of those above him are effective officers, and two are borne on the list *in statu*. When the Lieutenant-Colonel second on the list, viz., Lieutenant-Colonel Fitzgerald, succeeds to the Colonel's allowance, Lieutenant-Colonel Browne will become entitled to benefit by the rule as to succession to the allowance after 12 years, but not before.

13. All officers who may have held the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on the 1st January 1862, will also be entitled to promotion to the superior grade of Colonel, with Colonels' allowances, if the step come to them in ordinary course before the completion of 12 years service as Lieutenant-Colonel; but when these Lieutenant-Colonels have been removed from the list, the promotion of those whose commissions bear date on the 1st January 1862, or subsequently will only be made, as in the Staff corps, after 12 years service in that grade.

14. The names of the officers of the Staff corps and those of the new line regiments will be treated in a similar manner with those of the effective officers on the list, with the exception that, in the case of the two former, their names, upon coming into the position of Colonel with Colonels' allowances, under the operation of the above rule, will be removed altogether from the general regimental list of the Indian army, and promotions made in their places.

15. The principle upon which the succession to Colonels' allowances of officers of the Indian army who have not joined the Staff corps or the new line regiments is to be hereafter regulated, is to be considered as determined by this arrangement.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) C. Wood.

APP. J.

APPENDIX K.

APP. K.

Major-General Pears presents his compliments to Mr. Milton, and begs to inform him, with reference to his note of the 2nd instant, that, taking the average of the years from 1845 to 1861, the basis of the calculation given in the India Office paper of 23rd March 1863, the period elapsing before a Lieutenant-Colonel obtained the colonelcy, with Colonel's allowance, at Madras, was 11 8 years; in Bengal, 10 2 years; in Bombay, 10 9 years. India Office, 4th September 1863.

APPENDIX L.

APP. L.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor General of India in Council.

India Office,

My Lord, London, 10th August 1861.

1. I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Military Despatch, No. 66, dated 4th May 1861, transmitting a copy of the third Report by the Commission appointed at Calcutta to arrange the details of the re-organization of the army.

2. I have carefully considered in Council the proposal contained in that Report for inducing a large number of the senior officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces to retire from the service by the offer of enhanced pensions, together with the Minutes thereon, recorded by the members of your Government, including that subsequently received from his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and I have now to inform you of the conclusions which Her Majesty's Government have arrived at on the perusal of these important papers.

3. I need scarcely observe that I noticed with surprise and very great dissatisfaction the publication of this scheme in the Indian newspapers. I am aware of your intention, that an outline only of the Report should be communicated, unofficially, to the press; but, considering the opinion held by the Governor General, and expressed in your despatch, that the number of surplus officers, assumed as the basis of the calculation, was much exaggerated, considering also that his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief had objected both to the principle of the proposal and to the calculations on which it was founded, and that you had no reason to expect that such a proposal would be favourably received by Her Majesty's Government, I cannot but think it very objectionable that any scheme holding out the hopes of extraordinary advantages on retirement should have been placed in any shape before the officers of the army.

4. The publication of this report in the official form in which it appeared was a grave error, and cannot fail to be attended with most embarrassing and mischievous consequences. It is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to sanction the proposals; and their refusal to do so may cause deeper disappointment, in consequence of the expectations which have been raised by the promulgation of the scheme.

5. Irrespective, however, of the inconvenience

likely to arise from the publication of these papers, the scheme proposed is open to objection because it greatly over estimates the number of officers likely to be in excess of the wants of the service is so extensive as to include a large number of officers whose service has been long enough to give them mature experience, but not so long as to impair their physical powers; so that, if these proposals were adopted, the Government might lose many officers who are quite fit for employment, and whom they must replace, thus unnecessarily adding to the retirements and ineffective charge on the revenues of India.

6. In calculating the number of officers likely to become supernumerary under the new arrangements, the Commission have assumed that the complement of officers with native regiments, in all the Presidencies, will be at once reduced to six; but this assumption, as observed in your despatch, is erroneous. The ultimate adoption of what has hitherto been called the irregular system in the native armies of the three Presidencies has, indeed, been determined upon; but the introduction of this change in the few regiments of Bengal army which have retained their old organization, and in the armies of Madras and Bombay, was intended to be gradual. The views expressed on this subject in the 41st paragraph of your despatch No. 65, of the 4th May, are entirely in accordance with the intentions of Her Majesty's Government.

7. Under these circumstances there could be no advantage in making so large a reduction of the number of officers in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies; and even in Bengal the retention of a moderate number of officers, in excess of that exactly calculated for the present wants of the service, will be a measure of prudence and public convenience. It will afford time to test by experience the estimate of the future requirements of the service, and will furnish, for some time after the first formation of the Staff corps, a valuable reserve from which to draw officers of some Indian experience to fill vacancies, which must otherwise be supplied by taking officers from the line regiment to an inconvenient extent.

2. The estimates of the number of officers that will be surplus under the new organization are very discordant; that put forward by the Commission is, as I have before observed, greatly exaggerated, and, on the

APP. L.

other hand, I am not prepared to admit the necessity for so large a reserve of officers for native regiments as that proposed by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

9. It is certain, however, that in consequence of the reductions which have been, and will be, effected in the number of native regiments in the armies of the three Presidencies, there will be a considerable number of officers in the ranks of Lieutenant-Colonel and Major, beyond those for whom suitable employment can now be found in regimental commands, and in the higher positions of the army Staff; and that this is especially the case in the Bengal Presidency, where the old native army was almost entirely broken up by the mutiny, and the new levies raised to take the place of the regular native regiments were organized and are now commanded by younger men.

10. Under the changes which have thus taken place a considerable proportion of the field officers of the native armies are deprived of the advantage which they enjoyed under the old system, of continuing to serve in India in command of regiments until entitled to Colonels' allowances, and I concur in the opinion expressed by your Government and by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that it would be just and expedient to facilitate the retirement of such officers by the offer of any terms which would not entail an undue financial loss on the State.

11. After much consideration, I have resolved to offer to the regimental field officers of the three Presidencies annuities (in addition to the pensions to which they may be entitled under the regulations) according to the accompanying graduated scale, in the preparation of which I have advisedly abstained from attempting to make any accurate calculation of the value of each officer's position, and have thrown the whole of such officers into groups, allotting an annuity of the same amount to every officer in each group.

12. With this scale as your guide, you are authorized to offer to the whole of the field officers of cavalry and infantry of Her Majesty's Indian forces, as they stand on the effective lists of Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors regimentally in their several Presidencies, the option of retiring from the service, at a given prospective date, upon the annuities to which they may become entitled under this scheme.

13. In carrying this plan into effect, I desire that you will cause to be prepared and published, as soon as possible after the 1st October next, nominal rolls of the field officers of Cavalry and Infantry as they stand on the effective lists of Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors regimentally, according to the official records of the Adjutants-General of the three Presidencies on the 1st of October, grouped after the principle exhibited in the accompanying scale, with a notification to these officers that they will be permitted to retire with the annuities placed opposite their respective names, provided their applications are received and laid before their respective Governments on or before the 15th December next.

14. It is to be clearly understood that the annuity granted to each officer will be that due to his position in the above nominal roll, and that no change whatever in that position, or in the annuity assigned to him, will be admitted as a consequence of any casualty that may occur or become known at the Adjutant-General's office subsequent to the 1st October.

15. All retirements under this scheme will date from the 31st December next, and promotions arising out of such retirements will take effect from 1st January following, and will be carried on in the manner and to the extent to be now explained.

16. In a former despatch,* I stated my intention of gradually reducing the number of Colonels in receipt of Colonel's allowance, by making for the future three promotions only for every four casualties among their rank.

17. Considering the very liberal provision now offered to the senior effective officers of the Indian army, and the very great expense that will be entailed upon the Government of India thereby, the most obvious and equitable mode of effecting the reduction, so as at once to make compensation for the severe strain that would otherwise be imposed upon our finances, will be to retain upon the list of Lieutenant-Colonels in the several Presidencies the names (printed in italics) of such of their body as retire under the conditions now offered, and to regulate the succession to Colonel and to Colonel's allowance thereby. This arrangement therefore, will supersede that detailed in paragraph 8 of my despatch No. 27.

18. The working of the system may be illustrated thus:—Should the senior Lieutenant-Colonel be among those who retire under the scheme, his name will remain in the usual place on the list until his death, or until a casualty occurs among the Colonels, in either of which cases his name will be removed, no promotion being made. On another casualty occurring among the regimental Colonels, should the name then at the head of the list of Lieutenant-Colonels be that of an officer who has not retired under the operation of the present scheme, he will succeed as usual to the rank and allowances of Colonel, and promotions will be made in succession.

19. I further propose that promotion in succession to the Lieutenant-Colonels, who retire under this order, shall be made in the proportion of one to two of such retirements, these promotions being made on the principle illustrated in paragraphs 59 and 60 of your General Order of the 10th April 1861.

20. By this course, you will observe that very great promotion will be at once given to the Captains and to the junior officers of the army, that the establishment of Lieutenant-Colonels will be immediately reduced, to a certain extent, and that of Colonel in receipt of Colonel's allowance gradually brought down to a strength (to be hereafter defined) proportionate to the number of commissioned officers remaining on the general list.

21. The future strength of the establishment of Colonels in receipt of Colonel's allowance will depend on the result of the several measures, now in progress, connected with the re-organization of the Indian army. When those results are fully known, I shall be in a position to communicate to you my intentions upon this point.

22. Should the numbers of field officers, who make application to retire upon these terms, fall short of 300 (in the three Presidencies), you are authorized to offer annuities of 120*l.* per annum to so many of the regimental Captains of the three armies as may suffice to make up that number, making the offer to them in succession, according to length of service, reckoned from date of first commission, and confining the offer to men of or above 25 years service. It will be necessary, therefore, in promulgating this scheme, to call upon all regimental Captains of or above 25 years' service to declare their wishes as to retiring under the above conditions, should the opportunity be eventually afforded them.

23. I have considered and adopted the resolution, now made known to you, under the impression that it is most desirable to put an end to the suspense under which officers have been suffering, and in order that they may know their exact position and prospects, and may be enabled to make their election without further delay.

24. It is my wish that the option of retiring upon these terms may be given to all regimental Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors of Cavalry and Infantry on the effective list of the three Presidencies, including such as may have already elected for the new line regiments or the Staff corps.

25. Notification of this measure will be published in the "London Gazette," for the information of officers in this country, who will be informed that their applications to be permitted to retire on additional pension under the above scheme must be addressed to the Secretary to Government in the Military Department of their respective Presidencies, and it will be intimated that it is a final arrangement, and that no further proposals connected with schemes for the retirement of Indian officers will be entertained.

26. I desire that you will give a similar intimation, in promulgating the scheme to the officers of the Indian army.

27. It will be observed that, in accordance with the proposal of the Amalgamation Commission, I have not contemplated extending the option of retirement with enhanced pension to field officers of Artillery and Engineers. These regiments stand on a very different footing from the rest of the army, with regard to the recent changes. Their organization is modified, not broken up, and the modifications are, on the whole, very favourable to the officers. Nor am I prepared to admit any claim of the nature referred to in the 55th paragraph of the Commission's report, on account of compensation for the presumed extinction of their retiring funds. These funds, though permitted, have never been officially recognized by the late Court of Directors, nor by Her Majesty's Government. The officers joining them have already received some value for their subscriptions, in the shape of accelerated regimental promotion, and in more early succession to commands and Staff appointments. The routine of promotion

* No. 27, para. 8.

being maintained without disturbance in the Indian Ordnance Corps, there is no reason why their retiring lands should now be abruptly closed, should the officers wish to continue them, but, admitting that some loss may eventually fall on individual officers on this account, it is not of a nature to form a proper subject for compensation.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. Wood.

SCALE OF PROPOSED ANNUITIES for FIELD OFFICERS of the INDIAN ARMY, referred to in paragraph 11 of Despatch No. 320, dated 10 August 1861.

LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.

Cavalry.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
	per annum.	per annum.	per annum.
1st - - -	550	550	500
2d - - -	450	450	300
3d - - -	400	350	250
4th - - -	350	300	—
5th - - -	300	250	—
6th - - -	280	250	—
7th - - -	260	250	—
8th - - -	250	250	—
9th - - -	250	—	—
10th - - -	250	—	—

Any number of Lieutenant-Colonels in excess of the establishment in consequence of the promotion of Lieutenant-Colonels to be Major-General, will receive the pension of the junior in the above list.

The regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of Infantry will be divided into groups, as shown in the following table, an annuity of the same amount being allotted to every officer of each group.

INFANTRY.

No. of Group	No. in each Group for Bengal.	No. in each Group for Madras.	No. in each Group for Bombay.	Amount per Annum.
1	5	3	3	£ 550
2	5	4	3	500
3	5	3	2	450
4	5	4	2	400
5	5	3	2	350
6	5	4	2	300
7	5	3	2	280
8	5	4	2	260
9	10	7	4	250
10	10	9	4	250
11	10	7	4	200
12	10	9	7	200

The groups have been formed with reference to the established number of Lieutenant-Colonels of Infantry in the several Presidencies, as they stand for succession to Colonel's allowance.

Any number of Lieutenant-Colonels in excess of that establishment, in consequence of the promotion of Lieutenant-Colonels to be Major-Generals, will receive the pension of the last group.

MAJORS.

The regimental Majors of Cavalry and Infantry of each Presidency will be thrown together into one list, according to regimental seniority, and will be divided into four groups, as nearly equal as possible, every member of each group to receive the offer of annuities according to the following scale, in addition to any previous pension to which they may be entitled under the regulations of the service:—

	per annum.
1st Division will be eligible to receive	- £200
2d " "	- 180
3d " "	- 160
4th " "	- 150

APPENDIX M.

MAJOR General Pears presents his compliments to Mr. Milton, and forwards the information required in his note of the 10th instant.

It is to be observed, that the Parliamentary Return includes the promotion of names in italics. The numbers given in the Memorandum do not.

India Office, 14th October 1863.

(A).

RETURN showing the Corps in which promotions were made, consequent on the retirement of the Lieutenant-Colonels on the special Annuities.

Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
4th Regiment Light Cavalry, R.W.	4th Light Cavalry	—	6th European Regiment.	Native Infantry	3rd European Regiment.
2nd " L.W.	3rd " -	—	2nd Native Infantry	41st " -	12th Native Infantry.
1st " R.W.	6th " -	—	4th European Regiment.	1st " -	8th " -
2nd " R.W.	1st " -	—	5th " -	21st " -	—
5th " R.W.	—	—	58th Native Infantry	28th " -	—
3rd " L.W.	—	—	61st " -	26th " -	—
11th Native Infantry	48th Native Infantry	31st Native Infantry.	22nd " -	11th " -	—
44th " -	4th " -	14th " -	63rd " -	1st European Regiment.	—
1st European Regiment.	—	—	40th " -	18th Native Infantry	—
67th " -	27th " -	1st European Regiment.	6th European Regiment.	2nd European Regiment.	—
4th " -	35th " -	26th Native Infantry.	73rd Native Infantry	36th Native Infantry	—
38th " -	20th " -	30th " -	19th " -	38th " -	—
50th " -	8th " -	5th " -	2nd European Regiment.	44th " -	—
55th " -	1st European Regiment.	2nd " -	17th Native Infantry	—	—
20th " -	40th Native Infantry	10th " -	—	—	—

NOTE.—These promotions include the officers borne on the list in italics (Staff Corps). The number of promotions given in the India Office statement of 23rd March 1863 was inclusive of the number borne in italics.

APP. M.

(B.)

RETURN showing, by Regiments, the Number and Rank of Officers who retired from the Service on the extra Annuities sanctioned in August 1861.

CAVALRY.

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.		Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
Lieutenant-Colonels	9	7	—	5th Regiment.			
1st Regiment.				Majors	1	1	—
Majors	1	1	—	Captains	—	—	—
Captains	—	1	—	6th Regiment.			
2nd Regiment.				Majors	—	1	—
Majors	—	1	1	Captains	—	—	—
Captains	—	1	—	7th Regiment.			
3rd Regiment.				Majors	—	1	—
Majors	—	1	—	Captains	—	—	—
Captains	1	1	—	8th Regiment.			
4th Regiment.				Majors	—	1	—
Majors	1	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—				

INFANTRY.

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.		Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
1st European Regiment.				11th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	1	—	—
Captains	—	—	1	Captains	1	—	—
2nd European Regiment				12th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	1
Majors	1	—	1	Majors	1	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
3rd European Regiment				13th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	—	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—
Majors	2	1	1	Majors	1	—	—
Captains	—	—	1	Captains	—	—	—
4th European Regiment.				14th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	2	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	2
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	1	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
5th European Regiment.				15th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	2	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	1
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
6th European Regiment.				16th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	1
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	1
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
1st Native Infantry.				17th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	1
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	1	1	1
2nd Native Infantry.				18th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	1
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	1	—	1
Captains	—	1	—	Captains	—	—	—
3rd Native Infantry.				19th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	2
Majors	—	—	1	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	2	—	Captains	—	—	—
4th Native Infantry.				20th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	—	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
5th Native Infantry.				21st Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	—	1	—	Majors	1	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
6th Native Infantry.				22nd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	1
Majors	—	1	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	1	—	Captains	—	1	—
7th Native Infantry.				23rd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	1
Majors	—	1	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
8th Native Infantry.				24th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	1
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	1	1	1
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	2	—
9th Native Infantry.				25th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—
Majors	1	—	1	Majors	1	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	1	—	—
10th Native Infantry.				26th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	1	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—

Infantry—continued.

APP. M.

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.		Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
27th Native Infantry.				50th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	2	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	2	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	2	—
28th Native Infantry.				51st Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	1	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	—	1	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
29th Native Infantry.				52nd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	2	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	1	1	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
30th Native Infantry.				53rd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	2	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
31st Native Infantry.				54th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	2	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	1	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
32nd Native Infantry.				55th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
33rd Native Infantry.				56th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	1	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
34th Native Infantry.				57th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	2	—
35th Native Infantry.				58th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
36th Native Infantry.				59th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	2	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
37th Native Infantry.				60th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	1	—
38th Native Infantry.				61st Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	1	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
39th Native Infantry.				62nd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
40th Native Infantry.				63rd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
41st Native Infantry.				64th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
42nd Native Infantry.				65th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	1	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
43rd Native Infantry.				66th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	1	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	1	2	—	Captains	—	1	—
44th Native Infantry.				67th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	—	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	1	—
45th Native Infantry.				68th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	1	—	Captains	—	—	—
46th Native Infantry.				69th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	—	1	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
47th Native Infantry.				70th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	1	—
48th Native Infantry.				71st Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	—	—	Majors	—	—	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—
49th Native Infantry.				72nd Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	—	1	—	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	—
Majors	1	1	—	Majors	—	1	—
Captains	—	—	—	Captains	—	—	—

APP. M.

Infantry—continued.

	Bengal	Madras	Bombay		Bengal	Madras	Bombay
73rd Native Infantry.				74th Native Infantry.			
Lieutenant-Colonels	-	-	-	Lieutenant-Colonels	-	-	-
Majors	-	-	-	Majors	1	-	-
Captains	-	-	-	Captains	-	-	-

ABSTRACT.

				Cavalry.	Infantry.	Total.
BENGAL	}	LIEUTENANT-COLONELS	-	9	44	53
		MAJORS	-	3	38	41
		CAPTAINS	-	1	16	17
MADRAS	}	LIEUTENANT-COLONELS	-	7	42	49
		MAJORS	-	7	22	29
		CAPTAINS	-	3	12	15
BOMBAY	}	LIEUTENANT-COLONELS	-	-	20	20
		MAJORS	-	1	10	11
		CAPTAINS	-	-	3	3

(C.)

A RETURN showing the Regiments in each Presidency in which no immediate Regimental Promotion took place in consequence of the Retirement of Officers on the Extra Annuities offered by the Government.

BENGAL.

Regiments.		Regiments.	
1st European Cavalry		36th Native Infantry	No promotion.
2nd "		37th "	No promotion.
3rd "		38th "	
4th "		39th "	
5th "		40th "	
1st European Regiment		41st "	No promotion.
2nd "		42nd "	
3rd "		43rd "	
4th "		44th "	
5th "		45th "	
6th "		46th "	No promotion.
2nd Native Infantry		47th "	
4th "		48th "	
9th "		49th "	
10th "		50th "	
11th "		51st "	
12th "		52nd "	
13th "		53rd "	No promotion.
14th "		54th "	No promotion.
15th "	No promotion.	55th "	
16th "	No promotion.	56th "	No promotion.
17th "		57th "	
18th "		58th "	
19th "		59th "	
20th "		60th "	
21st "		61st "	
22nd "		62nd "	
23rd "	No promotion.	63rd "	
24th "		64th "	No promotion.
25th "		65th "	
26th "		66th "	
27th "	No promotion.	67th "	
28th "	No promotion.	68th "	
29th "	No promotion.	69th "	No promotion.
30th "		70th "	
31st "		71st "	No promotion.
32nd "		72nd "	
33rd "		73rd "	
34th "		74th "	
35th "			

16 regiments.

MADRAS.

1st Light Cavalry		1st Native Infantry	
2nd "		2nd "	
3rd "		3rd "	
4th "		4th "	
5th "		5th "	
6th "		6th "	
7th "		7th "	
8th "		8th "	
1st European Regiment		9th "	
2nd "		10th "	No promotion.
		11th "	

Madras—continued.

APP. M.

Regiments.		Regiments.	
12th Native Infantry	No promotion.	33rd Native Infantry	No promotion.
13th "	No promotion.	34th "	No promotion.
14th "	_____	35th "	_____
15th "	_____	36th "	_____
16th "	_____	37th "	No promotion.
17th "	_____	38th "	_____
18th "	_____	39th "	No promotion.
19th "	No promotion.	40th "	_____
20th "	_____	41st "	_____
21st "	_____	42nd "	_____
22nd "	_____	43rd "	_____
23rd "	_____	44th "	_____
24th "	_____	45th "	_____
25th "	_____	46th "	_____
26th "	_____	47th "	No promotion.
27th "	_____	48th "	_____
28th "	_____	49th "	_____
29th "	_____	50th "	_____
30th "	No promotion.	51st "	_____
31st "	_____	52nd "	No promotion.
32nd "	_____		

11 regiments.

BOMBAY.

1st Light Cavalry	No promotion.	12th Native Infantry	_____
2nd "	_____	13th "	No promotion.
3rd "	No promotion.	14th "	_____
1st European Regiment	_____	15th "	_____
2nd "	_____	16th "	_____
3rd "	_____	17th "	_____
1st Native Infantry	No promotion.	18th "	_____
2nd "	_____	19th "	No promotion.
3rd "	_____	20th "	No promotion.
4th "	No promotion.	22nd "	No promotion.
5th "	_____	23rd "	No promotion.
6th "	No promotion.	24th "	_____
7th "	No promotion.	25th "	No promotion.
8th "	_____	26th "	_____
9th "	_____	28th "	_____
10th "	_____	29th "	_____
11th "	No promotion.	30th "	_____
		31st "	_____

13 regiments.

Bengal	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
Madras	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Bombay	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
							40

NOTE.—The Regimental Majors in these 40 regiments obtained by the retirements a considerable advance in the seniority list, thus giving the regiment in each case a corresponding advance towards a step.

T. T. PEARS, Major-General,
Military Secretary.

India Office, 14th October 1863.

RETURN showing the Regiments of the Indian Local Armies, in which immediate Regimental Promotion took place, in consequence of the Retirement of Officers on the Extra Annuities offered by the Government.

BENGAL PRESIDENCY.

Regiment.	Cause of the Promotion.	Regiment.	Cause of the Promotion.
1st European Cavalry	Major promoted on Field Officer's List. Major retired.	22nd Native Infantry	Major promoted.
2nd "	2 Majors promoted.	24th "	Major retired.
3rd "	Major promoted. Captain retired.	25th "	Major and Captain retired.
4th "	Major promoted. Major retired.	26th "	Major retired.
5th "	Do. Do.	30th "	Major and 2 Captains retired.
1st European Regiment	Major promoted.	31st "	Major and Captain retired.
2nd "	Do. Major retired.	32nd "	Major retired.
3rd "	2 Majors retired.	33rd "	Major and Captain retired.
4th "	Major promoted. Major retired.	34th "	Major retired.
5th "	Do.	35th "	Do.
6th "	2 Majors promoted.	38th "	Major promoted.
2nd Native Infantry	Major promoted.	39th "	Major retired.
4th "	Do.	40th "	Major promoted.
9th "	Major retired.	42nd "	Major and Captain retired.
10th "	Do.	43rd "	Captain retired.
11th "	Major promoted. Major and Captain retired.	44th "	Major promoted.
12th "	Major retired.	45th "	Major retired.
13th "	Do.	47th "	Do.
14th "	Do.	48th "	Do.
17th "	Major promoted. Captain retired.	49th "	Do.
18th "	Major retired.	50th "	Major promoted.
19th "	Major promoted.	51st "	Major and Captain retired.
20th "	Do.	52nd "	Major retired.
21st "	Major retired.	55th "	Major promoted.
		57th "	Major and 2 Captains retired.
		58th "	Major promoted.

APP. M.

Bengal Presidency—continued.

Regiment.	Cause of the Promotion.	Regiment.	Cause of the Promotion.
59th Native Infantry	- Major retired.	67th Native Infantry	- Captain retired.
60th "	- Major and Captain retired.	68th "	- Major retired.
61st "	- Major promoted.	70th "	- Captain retired.
62nd "	- Major retired.	72nd "	- Major retired.
63rd "	- Major promoted.	73rd "	- Major promoted.
65th "	- Major retired.	74th "	- Major retired.
66th "	- Captain retired.		

MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

1st Light Cavalry	- Major promoted. Major and Captain retired.	18th Native Infantry	- Major promoted.
2nd "	- Major and Captain retired.	20th "	- Do.
3rd "	- Major promoted. Major and Captain promoted.	21st "	- Do.
4th "	- Major promoted.	22nd "	- Major retired.
5th "	- Major retired.	23rd "	- Do.
6th "	- Major promoted. Major retired.	24th "	- Major and 2 Captains retired.
7th "	- Major retired.	25th "	- Major retired.
8th "	- Do.	26th "	- Major promoted.
1st European Regiment	- 2 Majors promoted.	27th "	- Do.
2nd "	- Major promoted.	28th "	- Do.
3rd "	- Major retired.	29th "	- Major retired.
1st Native Infantry	- Major promoted.	31st "	- Do.
2nd "	- Do. Captain retired.	32nd "	- Do.
3rd "	- 2 Captains retired.	35th "	- Major promoted.
4th "	- Major promoted.	36th "	- Do.
5th "	- Major retired.	38th "	- Do.
6th "	- Major and Captain retired.	40th "	- Do.
7th "	- Major retired.	41st "	- Do.
8th "	- Major promoted.	42nd "	- Major retired.
10th "	- Major retired.	43rd "	- Major and 2 Captains retired.
11th "	- Major promoted.	44th "	- Major promoted.
14th "	- Major retired.	45th "	- Captain retired.
15th "	- Do.	46th "	- Major retired.
16th "	- Do.	48th "	- Major promoted.
17th "	- Major and Captain retired.	49th "	- Major retired.
		50th "	- Major and 2 Captains retired.
		51st "	- Major retired.

BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

2nd Light Cavalry	- Major retired.	14th Native Infantry	- Major promoted.
1st European Regiment	- Major promoted. Captain retired.	15th "	- Major retired.
2nd "	- Major retired.	16th "	- Do.
3rd "	- Major promoted. Major and Captain retired.	17th "	- Captain retired.
2nd Native Infantry	- Major promoted.	18th "	- Major retired.
3rd "	- Major retired.	24th "	- Do.
5th "	- Major promoted.	26th "	- Major promoted.
8th "	- Do.	28th "	- Major retired.
9th "	- Major retired.	29th "	- Do.
10th "	- Major promoted.	30th "	- Major promoted.
12th "	- Do.	31st "	- Do.

LIST OF REGIMENTS of the Indian Local Armies in which no immediate Regimental Promotion took place, in consequence of the Retirement of Officers on the Extra Annuities offered by the Government.

BENGAL PRESIDENCY.

15th Native Infantry.	37th Native Infantry.	64th Native Infantry.
16th "	21st "	69th "
23rd "	46th "	71st "
27th "	53rd "	
28th "	54th "	Total - 16
29th "	56th "	
36th "		

MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

9th Native Infantry.	33rd Native Infantry.	47th Native Infantry.
12th "	34th "	52nd "
13th "	37th "	
19th "	39th "	Total - 11
30th "		

BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

1st Light Cavalry.	7th Native Infantry.	22nd Native Infantry.
3rd "	11th "	23rd "
1st Native Infantry.	13th "	25th "
4th "	19th "	
6th "	20th "	Total - 13

Grand Total, 40 Regiments.

APPENDIX N.

APP. N.

Military,
No. 440. India Office, London,
15th November 1861.
To his Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor
General of India in Council.

MY LORD,

1. I have lately had under my consideration the position of officers of the Indian army who may be in the receipt of Colonel's allowance, and the practice that has hitherto prevailed of allowing such officers, when residing in India unemployed, to draw full Indian allowances.

2. It seems to me that there is no sufficient reason for allowing officers so circumstanced, when residing in India merely for their own pleasure or convenience, to

receive a different rate of pay in India from that to which they are entitled when residing in England or elsewhere.

3. I have determined, therefore, to discontinue the Indian allowances to officers attaining to the Colonel's allowance on and after the 1st January next, who may not be required to reside in India by any of the Indian Governments. Such officers will receive, in addition to that allowance, the furlough rate of regimental pay as long as they may be unemployed, wherever they may be permitted to reside.

4. I have to request that this may be notified in general orders.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. Wood.

APPENDIX O.

APP. O.

Copy Military Letter to the Government of India,
No. 183, dated 8th July 1858.

1. We have given full and anxious consideration to the important subject of the relative rank held by officers of the Royal Engineers and Royal Artillery, as compared with that of officers of the Company's Engineers and Artillery, as brought to our notice in numerous memorials and in the letter from the Governor General, dated 1st April 1858.

2. There are three points of difference in the two services which affect relative rank, viz., first in the Royal service Captains rise to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel regimentally, whilst in the Company's service there is the intermediate grade of Major. 2nd. In the Royal service there are two grades of Captains, whilst in the Company's service there is only one grade. 3rd. In the Royal Service there is only one grade of subaltern, whilst in the Company's service there are two grades, viz., 1st Lieutenant and 2nd Lieutenant.

3. On the first point we have resolved that the distinction between the two services shall be forthwith corrected, and that accordingly the Regimental Majors in the Company's Engineers and Artillery shall, on the receipt of this despatch, be promoted to the regimental rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, with dates of rank from the dates of their regimental majorities, and that the commissions of the present Lieutenant-Colonels be antedated in like manner to the dates of their regimental majorities, but without any retrospect as to pay and allowances, and that as vacancies occur Captains of Artillery and Engineers shall succeed to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in their respective corps.

4. On the next point of difference we have resolved that the grade of second Captain shall be introduced into the Company's Engineers and Artillery, and that the future establishment shall be in the proportion of

six Captains and six second captains to each brigade and battalion.

5. The aggregate of officers of these grades will then be as follows:—

	Captains.	Second Captains.
Bengal Artillery " " "	72	72
Madras " " "	42	42
Bombay " " "	30	30
	288	
Bengal Engineers - - -	30	30
Madras " " "	18	18
Bombay " " "	18	18
	132	

Supernumeraries or Captains are to be absorbed as vacancies occur.

6. On the third point, viz., the grades of subaltern, we have resolved that the grade of second Lieutenant shall be abolished, so that subalterns of Engineers and Artillery of the Queen's and Company's services shall take rank together according to the dates of their first commissions. You will therefore issue to the present Lieutenants and second Lieutenants commissions as Lieutenants, with date of rank from their first commissions, but without retrospect as to allowances, and hereafter all appointed to these corps are to be commissioned as Lieutenants.

7. The number of Lieutenants for each brigade and battalion of Artillery to be 14, and for each battalion of Engineers 12, or in the aggregate for—

Bengal Artillery - 168	Bengal Engineers - 60
Madras " - 98	Madras " - 36
Bombay " - 70	Bombay " - 36

being about equal to the present establishment, after deducting therefrom the number of Lieutenants promoted to be second Captains.

APPENDIX P.

APP. P.

EXTRACT MILITARY DESPATCH to the Government of India, No. 199, dated 14th June, 1859.

REPLY to letter of 3rd March (No. 27); also para. 4 of No. 40 of 1859. In continuation of letter from the Governor General, dated, Allahabad, 15 December 1858, forward further correspondence on the subject of the supersession of officers of Cavalry and Infantry by the recent changes in the organization of the Artillery and Engineers at the three Presidencies.

1. In reference to the Despatch now under reply, I have reconsidered in Council the previous correspondence on the subject of inconveniences which have arisen from the operation of that part of the measure ordered by the late Court of Directors for altering the organization of the Artillery and Engineer corps, by which the commissions of the Majors of those regiments who were made Lieutenant Colonels, as well as those of existing Lieutenant Colonels, were antedated to the dates respectively on which they originally became Majors.

2. By my Despatch No. 97, dated 24th March 1859, you were informed that the special consideration of the adjustment of rank in the Artillery and Engineer Corps would be deferred until the full effects of the application to Her Majesty's Indian Forces of the Royal Warrant of the 14th October 1858 shall have been reported.

3. In consideration, however, of your further communications on this subject, and of your strong recommendation coinciding with that of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that a remedy should be provided for these inconveniences, and for the general supersession of officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the three Presidencies, which has been occasioned by the antedating of the commissions of Majors and Lieutenant-Colonels, when introducing the recent changes in the organization of the Artillery and Engineer corps, Her Majesty's Government have determined to cancel the back rank given under the orders of the late Court of Directors, dated 8th July 1858, No. 183, to the Lieutenant-Colonels of Artillery and Engineers of the three Presidencies, and to the Lieutenants of those corps respectively, and to direct that, following the rule which was adopted when the rank of Major was abolished in the Royal Artillery, their promotion shall take effect only from the date of the new organization coming into operation.

4. You are accordingly authorized to carry this decision into immediate effect.

APP. Q.

APPENDIX Q.

VICTORIA R.

WHEREAS We have judged it expedient to approve of the amalgamation of the General and Field Officers of Our Indian Armies with the General and Field Officers of Our Regular Army: Our Will and Pleasure is, that such Amalgamation, and the promotion of the Officers to higher rank, shall be carried into effect in the manner prescribed in the Regulations hereunto annexed.

Given at Our Court at St. James's, this First day of January 1862, in the Twenty-fifth year of Our Reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,

G. C. LEWIS.

REGULATIONS.

1. The existing General Officers of either army shall continue, as at present, on separate lists.
2. All Colonels of either army who attained that rank prior to the 17th February 1861 shall be continued on separate lists as at present, and shall succeed on separate lists to the rank of Major General, Lieutenant-General, and General, under the regulations now in force for each army respectively; but if all the Colonels on one of the separate lists shall have become Major Generals, while some of the Colonels on the other separate lists are still unpromoted, those Colonels shall have the benefit of vacancies occurring in the lists of Generals of either army, and Colonels so promoted shall be placed on an amalgamated list of Major Generals, from which promotion shall be made by seniority in succession to all vacancies in the higher grades, whether of the British or Indian service.
3. All officers in either army who shall have attained the rank of Colonel on or after the 17th February 1861, shall at once be placed according to the dates of their commissions as Colonels on one general list, from which, so soon as the separate lists of Colonels are exhausted, promotion shall be made according to seniority in succession to all vacancies in the establishments of General Officers, whether of the British or the Indian service, and Colonels so promoted shall enter upon the amalgamated list above provided, from which promotion shall be made by seniority in succession to all vacancies in the higher grades, whether of the British or Indian service.
4. All promotions in the lower grades, in consequence of vacancies amongst General Officers, shall, until the general fusion herein-after provided, fall in each case to that service to which the officer creating the vacancy belonged; and such promotions shall be made under the regulations now in force in either service.
5. When all the Colonels on the separate list of the Cavalry, Guards, and Line, of the British army, and on that of the Indian army, shall have become Major Generals, the whole of the field officers, including those of the Artillery and Engineers of both armies, as well as field officers of the Royal Marines, shall be placed on one general list, from which all promotions shall be made up to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel inclusive, in succession to vacancies on the General Officers list; and from that time the senior Captain of the united army and Royal Marines shall succeed to a brevet majority, under the 15th Clause of the Warrant of the 14th October 1858.
6. Promotion to the rank of General Officer, in the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, will continue to be carried on under the regulations now in force, until all the Colonels of Artillery and Engineers, as the case may be, on the separate list of the Indian armies, shall have become Major Generals; then the General Officers of the Artillery of the Indian army shall be amalgamated with those of the Royal Artillery; and in like manner, the General Officers of the Engineers of the Indian army with those of the Royal Engineers; promotions to the rank of General Officer in the Ordnance Corps being made subsequently to their respective amalgamations from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian

Artillery, and from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian Engineers.

Indian Artillery.
4 Generals.
8 Lieut. Generals.
12 Major Generals.

24

Indian Engineers.
2 Generals.
3 Lieut. Generals.
6 Major Generals.

11

35

Artillery.
5 Generals.
8 Lieut. Generals.
13 Major General.

26

Engineers.
2 Generals.
4 Lieut. Generals.
6 Major Generals.

12

38

7. The present establishment of General Officers of Her Majesty's Indian Artillery and Engineers was fixed at the rate of one officer for each battalion,* but as these corps are now being incorporated with the Royal Artillery and Engineers respectively, it is necessary that the proportion of Generals to combatant Officers adopted for Her Majesty's Forces should be extended to the brigades and battalions now being added to the Artillery and Engineers respectively. Eventually, therefore, the establishment of General Officers of the brigades and battalions now being transferred from the Indian service will be fixed at 26 for the Artillery and 12 for the Engineers respectively.†

8. If at the time of the amalgamation of the General Officers of Artillery and Engineers provided in the 5th paragraph of this warrant, there shall be more General Officers of the Indian Artillery or Engineers than the proportion fixed as their establishment, viz., 26 for the Artillery and 12 for the Engineers—(a circumstance which might arise, from all promotions to the rank of general officer in the Indian service being now made on one general list, which includes officers of all branches of the service,)—the excess shall be absorbed before a Colonel of the branch concerned can be promoted. Or if there be less than the established number, promotions shall be made to supply the deficiency from the general lists above mentioned of Colonels of Royal and Indian Artillery and Engineers respectively.

9. Upon the transfer of the present 12 regiments of European Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian army to the British army, a like number of General Officers will be taken off the Indian establishment, and will, as Colonels of such regiments, be transferred according to the dates of their commissions to the fixed establishment of General Officers of the British army.

But as the number (12) of General Officers thus brought from the Indian establishment is less than the proportion (15) of General Officers due to the number of combatant officers belong to the transferred regiments, an addition of three General Officers shall, on this account, be made to the unattached list of the British army at the time referred to in paragraph 8 of this warrant.

And in making these additions to the list of General Officers, the proportions of the different grades of General Officers now on the establishment of the British army shall be maintained.

10. The field officers coming to the British army with these regiments shall take their position on the general list of field officers, according to the date of their army rank, by which their future promotion shall be governed.

11. The amalgamation of the lists of General Officers, in accordance with these provisions, will in nowise affect the system which regulates the succession to the Colonelcies of regiments of the British army, or to the Colonels' allowances of Her Majesty's Indian Forces.

12. The present establishment of General Officers of the Indian army, inclusive of Artillery and Engineers, consists of 25 Generals, 50 Lieutenant Generals, 145 Major Generals, which numbers are, however, liable to reduction.

But the proportion of Generals maintained on account of the Indian establishment shall all times be governed by the principles adopted in respect to the British forces, both as to numbers and gradation.

And reductions shall be made by gradual absorption, and by the promotion of not less than one Colonel for three vacancies amongst General Officers, until super-numeraries are exhausted.

APPENDIX R.

APP. R.

Horse Guards,
25th August 1863.

SIR,
I HAVE the honour to forward to you the Returns, as requested in your letter of the 15th instant, for the information of the Commissioners on Memorials of Indian Army Officers.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. Milton, Esq. (Signed) W. F. FORSTER.

Generals under the existing Warrant 58 (including Major Generals Sir Richard Dacres and Dupuis, now supernumeraries).

(Signed) L. GARDINER, A.A.G.,
The Military Secretary,
&c. &c. &c.
Horse Guards.

(b.)

(a.)

Horse Guards, S.W.,
17th August 1863.

NUMBER of Colonels of the Royal Artillery whose commissions as Colonels are dated prior to 17th February 1861, and who will be entitled to promotion as vacancies occur in the fixed establishment of Major

Generals under the existing Warrant 58 (including Major Generals Sir Richard Dacres and Dupuis, now supernumeraries).

THE number of Colonels of the Guards, Cavalry and Infantry, whose commissions as Colonels are dated prior to 17th February 1861, and who will be entitled to promotion as Major General under the existing Warrant 191.

(Signed) W. F. FORSTER.
J. Milton, Esq., Secretary.

APPENDIX S.

APP. S.

MAJOR-GENERAL PEARS presents his compliments to Mr. Milton, and begs to forward him information in reply to the queries contained in his note of this day's date.

India Office, 28th August 1863.

COLONELS of INDIAN ORDNANCE CORPS promoted to be Colonels on 18th February 1861, consequent on the Amalgamation.

Questions to India Office.	Colonel O. (senior of Engineers.)	Colonel M. (junior of Engineers.)	Colonel S. (senior of Artillery.)	Colonel W. (junior of Artillery.)
1. On what date would he have been a Colonel, if that step had not been granted him in consequence of the measures attendant on the amalgamation?	He could not have been promoted by line step, being a field officer of 1854 (June).	Do.	He would have been a Colonel about the present date.	He could not have been promoted by the line step, being a field officer of 1854 (June).
2. How many Lieutenant-Colonels of Infantry and Cavalry did he pass over by that step?	25.	69.	58.	65.
3. What would have been his present place in the graduation list but for that step?	He would not have been on the list as Colonel, unless promoted under the 5 years' service rule.	Do. He would have remained a Lieutenant-Colonel, not having yet completed 5 years.	About the present date.	He would have remained a Lieutenant-Colonel, not having yet completed 5 years.

APPENDIX T.

APP. T.

India Office, S.W.,
15th August 1863.

SIR,
I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 15th instant, and in reply to transmit the following statement:—

- Number of Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry whose commissions as Colonels are dated prior to 17th February 1861, and who will be entitled to promotion as Major General under the existing Warrant - 37
- Do. do. of Artillery - 16
- Do. do. of Engineers - 3
- Number of Colonels of the year 1854 remaining to be promoted, and entitled thereto under the existing Warrant - 13

2. There are two vacancies amongst the General Officers at present unfilled. This will absorb two of the Colonels.

3. In addition to the numbers above given, there are 14 officers belonging to the several Staff corps of date prior to the 17th February 1861, who keep their places in the list of Colonels for promotion to the rank of Major General.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
G. S. COCHRANE,
Assistant Military Secretary.

J. Milton, Esq.

APP. U.

APPENDIX U.

EXTRACT from RETURN ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 27th July 1863.

No. 22.

RETURN showing the Number and Grades of Officers of the respective Arms of the Three Armies of India, and the Total Number and Grades for all India, who Retired on Extra Annuities, as also the Number in these several Grades in lieu of whom Advancement has been given to the Officers remaining in the Service, either joining the Staff Corps, or remaining on the old Conditions of Service; distinguishing the Number and Grades of Officers of the Staff Corps to whom Promotions have been given in the Regimental Lists from the Number and Grades of Officers on the old Conditions of Service to whom Advancement has actually been given consequent on the Retirements; showing also the Number of the several Grades of the several Arms of the Service in the respective Armies in which the Promotions have been made.

		Artillery.	Engineers.	Cavalry.	Infantry.	TOTAL.
Bengal	Lieutenant-Colonels	—	—	9	47	56
	Majors	—	—	4	42	46
	Captains	1	—	5	27	31
Madras	Lieutenant-Colonels	8	4	7	42	56
	Majors	—	—	8	25	33
	Captains	—	—	6	36	42
Bombay	Lieutenant-Colonels	1	—	—	21	22
	Majors	—	—	1	13	14
	Captains	—	—	—	4	4
India	Lieutenant-Colonels	4	4	16	110	134
	Majors	—	—	13	80	93
	Captains	1	—	9	67	77

Number of Lieutenant-Colonels retired on annuity in Bengal, 56, in lieu of whom 30 Majors were made

Lieutenant-Colonels, and of these seven are in the Staff corps.

Number of Lieutenant-Colonels in Madras were 56, in lieu of whom 32 Majors were made Lieutenant-Colonels, of whom six are in the Staff corps.

Number of Lieutenant-Colonels in Bombay were 22, in lieu of whom 11 Majors were made Lieutenant-Colonels, of whom three are in the Staff corps.

Number of Majors retired on annuity in Bengal, 46, in lieu of whom 46 Captains were made Majors, of whom about 20 are in the Staff corps.

Number of Majors who retired on annuities in Madras were 33, in lieu of whom 33 Captains were made Majors, and of these about 12 are in the Staff corps.

Number of Majors who retired on annuities in Bombay were 14, in lieu of whom 14 Captains were made Majors, and of these about six are in the Staff corps.

Number of Captains who retired on annuities in Bengal were 31, in lieu of whom 31 Lieutenants were made Captains, and of these about 15 are in the Staff corps.

Number of Captains who retired on annuities in Madras were 42, in lieu of whom 42 Lieutenants were made Captains, and of these about 20 are in the Staff corps.

Number of Captains who retired on annuities in Bombay were four, in lieu of whom four Lieutenants were made Captains, and of these one is in the Staff corps.

(Signed) T. T. PEARS,
India Office,
27th July 1863.
Major General, Military Secretary.

LONDON.

Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

INDIAN OFFICERS' COMMISSION.

R E P O R T

OF

THE COMMISSIONERS;

WITH

A P P E N D I X.

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



LONDON:

PRINTED BY GEORGE EDWARD EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1866.

C O N T E N T S.

	Page
COMMISSION - - - - -	- iii
REPORT - - - - -	- ix
APPENDIX - - - - -	- 1

COMMISSION.

VICTORIA R.

Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith,

To Our trusty and well-beloved Sir John Aitchison, Knight, Commander of the most Honourable Order of the Bath, General of Our Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Robert Napier, Knight, Commander of the most Honourable Order of the Bath, Lieutenant-General of Our Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Sydney John Cotton, Knight, Commander of the most Honourable Order of the Bath, Major-General of Our Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved Henry Eyre, Esquire, Major-General of Our Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved Charles Alfred Browne, Esquire, Major-General of Our Indian Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved David Russell, Esquire, Companion of the most Honourable Order of the Bath, Major-General of Our Forces;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir William Marcus Coghlan, Knight, Commander of the most Honourable Order of the Bath, Major-General of Our Forces;

Whereas the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the complaints made in certain memorials from officers of the late Indian Armies, that in framing and carrying into execution the measures adopted by the Government of India towards the re-organization of the Indian Army, and the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian forces with Her Majesty's general forces, the assurance given by Parliament in the provisions of certain Acts of Parliament as to the preservation of the advantages of the late military forces of the East India Company as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, and promotion, had been departed from, have reported that in certain cases herein-after mentioned, arising out of such amalgamation and re-organization in Her Majesty's Indian forces, such assurances have been departed from, that is to say, as regards the three following cases, in the words following:

1stly. "The rules under which it (*the Staff Corps*) has been formed are complained Par. 42.
"of as unjustly giving superior rank to many of the officers selected for that corps and
"so causing extensive supersession of the officers remaining with their regiments. If
"a new regiment had been formed, subject to the old rules of promotion, and the
"officers of the new regiment had been transferred from regiments already in existence,
"remaining in their former regimental rank, there would not necessarily have been any
"supersession of the officers remaining unremoved. Casualties might occur in the new
"more rapidly than in the old regiments; but this would be a mere chance, such as
"must always exist in all regimental organization, where accidents may give rise to
"promotion in one corps more rapidly than in another. But what the officers complain
"of on this head is, the immediate and prospective supersession in rank of regimental
"officers by those in the staff corps, which was the inevitable consequence of the rules
"regulating promotion in the staff corps, and especially of that which allows previous
"staff service to count towards the period of service qualifying for promotion in the
"staff corps.

"We have to state our opinion that there are solid grounds for this complaint. The Par. 43.
"three or four senior captains of an Indian regiment are generally of more, sometimes
"of much more, than 20 years' standing in the army; and whenever a second or lower
"captain of that standing, having had six years of previous staff service, joins the staff
"corps, he immediately becomes a major and supersedes his senior captains whom he
(3112.)

“ leaves behind him ; and at the end of two years he will become a lieutenant-colonel, and so supersede, not only the captains, formerly his seniors, but also perhaps the major of his old regiment. The same observation applies to lieutenants. Now, considering how keenly officers feel the being superseded by their juniors, and how much their interests may be thereby affected, we cannot be surprised at the complaints which are made on this subject ; and we are of opinion that in this respect the Parliamentary assurance has not been adhered to.”

Par. 44. 2ndly. “ The next complaints to which we will refer are those which relate to retaining on the cadres of the old regiments the names of those officers who joined the new line regiments formed under the general order of amalgamation. The Memorialists allege that every officer who so joined the new line regiments ought to be considered as having created a vacancy in the regiment from which he was removed, thereby giving occasion to promotion.”

Par. 46. * * * * * “ With respect to such of the officers of the new line regiments as were brought in from the native cavalry and infantry we think that the case of vacancies occasioned by bringing officers from the native regiments falls under the ordinary rule under which promotion has always been given on the transfer of an officer to another regiment ; that no public interest interferes with their promotion, that it is not contrary to reason, and therefore that the denial of such promotion is an unnecessary departure from the assurance given by Parliament.”

Par. 61. 3rdly. “ We will next advert to what, though not distinctly appearing on the memorials referred to us, is, as appears by the first paper submitted to us on behalf of the officers, considered by many Indian officers to be a violation of the privileges guaranteed to them, namely, the alteration of the system on which officers become general officers.”

Par. 80. * * * * * “ Should this arrangement (*as to the colonels of cavalry and infantry*), be carried into operation it appears to us that it will cause injury of by no means an imaginary character. It will be felt less and less by officers as they are further and further removed from the rank of colonel. But the new rule must cause to many officers great delay in their promotion without any countervailing advantage, and we therefore feel bound to express our opinion that in this respect the Parliamentary assurance has not been fulfilled.”

And Whereas the said Commissioners have reported further as regards two cases arising out of the large reduction in the Native Army of India, that if certain loss of advantages should hereafter occur, the assurance given by Parliament will have been departed from ; that is to say, in the following cases and in the following words :—

1. As regards “ Colonels' Allowances.”

Par. 50. “ The new regulations on this subject are, as we have already stated, different in the ordnance corps from those in the cavalry and infantry. The principle on which the amalgamation was made in the ordnance corps was the same in all the Presidencies, and the same as to the artillery and the engineers. We may therefore confine our remarks to the case of the Bengal artillery, which will be a sample of the whole. Before the amalgamation there were in Bengal 12 battalions of artillery, each with a colonel drawing colonel's allowances, and two lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.*, there were in all 12 colonels and 24 lieutenant-colonels ; and on any casualty among the colonels the senior lieutenant-colonel succeeded to his place and drew the allowances, besides his pay as colonel. By the amalgamation of the Indian with the Royal artillery, the whole became one regiment, the former 12 Bengal battalions being divided into seven brigades, each brigade having its colonel commandant drawing colonel's allowances, with two colonels and four lieutenant-colonels. The whole establishment of the seven brigades is therefore seven colonels commandant, 14 colonels, and 28 lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.*, 49 field officers, instead of 36 under the old system of battalions. The five senior of these 14 colonels were colonels before the amalgamation, and drew colonel's allowances. This right is still preserved to them, and they enjoy the rank of colonels commandant, being supernumerary to the seven actually commanding brigades. The other nine colonels, making up the 14, were before the amalgamation only lieutenant-colonels, so that they are benefited by the increased rank and pay to which they become entitled as colonels instead of lieutenant-colonels. Upon the happening of any vacancy among the colonels drawing colonels' allowances

“ it is filled up by seniority, according to the general rule of the service, save only that
 “ in order to get rid eventually of the supernumeraries, every fourth vacancy is left
 “ unsupplied, so that after 20 vacancies there will cease to be supernumeraries. The
 “ memorialists complain of this latter arrangement, as unjustly retarding the progress of
 “ officers towards the attainment of colonels' allowances.

“ In order to enable us to say how far this complaint is well founded, we must consider Par. 51.
 “ what is the precise operation of the rule on the different ranks of the whole corps. In
 “ the first place it can have no operation on those officers who are actually drawing
 “ colonels' allowances, nor on the three colonels who shall happen to stand next in order
 “ to the five supernumeraries on the occurrence of the first three casualties among those
 “ above them. The colonel who stands next to the supernumeraries when the fourth
 “ vacancy occurs will be retarded in his promotion, and this will, more or less, affect
 “ every officer below him. He will have to wait for a fifth vacancy before he succeeds
 “ to colonels' allowances, and the same observation applies to the 8th, 12th, 16th, and
 “ 20th vacancies. This is the extent of the injury occasioned by the amalgamation, and
 “ what we have to consider is whether this is such a grievance as to amount to a breach
 “ of the Parliamentary guarantee. There is great difficulty in saying that it is so. Every
 “ officer thus retarded in his promotion will, until his turn for promotion arrives, have
 “ been in the enjoyment of rank and pay beyond what he would have had under the old
 “ system; and the question is whether such increased rank and pay may not be fairly
 “ considered as compensating the officer for the retardation of his progress towards the
 “ colonels' allowances. To those who are juniors in the corps, the increased rank and
 “ pay and the greatly increased number of field officers must be more than an equivalent
 “ for delay in reaching the highest step to occur at a very distant day. To those who
 “ are at or near the head of the list the retardation must occur sooner, while the enjoy-
 “ ment of the increased rank and pay will have endured for a shorter time. It is impossible
 “ to find any general rule by which the balance of advantage and disadvantage at each
 “ particular stage of the service can be accurately struck. But the principle on which
 “ the change has been made seems to be just; and it is clear that immediate pecuniary
 “ benefits are secured to all whose interests may be affected by the rule in question, likely,
 “ in the case of the junior officers to exceed the pecuniary loss occasioned by retardation,
 “ and often to equal it even in the case of the seniors. We therefore think that under
 “ this head any solid ground of complaint, if any should arise, must be of very rare
 “ occurrence and of a very limited character, resulting from circumstances which it is
 “ not possible to foresee. We cannot think, therefore, that what has been done is a
 “ breach of Parliamentary guarantee.

“ A similar principle as to colonels' allowances was originally contemplated for the Par. 52.
 “ cavalry and infantry, but this was found difficult, in consequence of the very extensive
 “ reductions of the native regiments, and the rule ultimately adopted has been that every
 “ lieutenant-colonel shall become a full colonel, and be entitled to colonel's allowances after
 “ holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel for 12 years. If 12 years were a fair average of
 “ the time usually passed in the rank of lieutenant-colonel, the principle adopted would
 “ be a fair one. The memorialists say that the number ought to have been 10, not 12.
 “ Whether this rule is open to objection, as being a violation of the Parliamentary
 “ guarantee, appears to us to depend on the question whether the number 12 has been
 “ ascertained to be a fair average.

“ It appears, by information which we have received from the India Office, that the Par. 53.
 “ average in Bengal is 10·2 years, in Madras 11·8, and in Bombay 10·9; so that 12
 “ years is just more than a year beyond what has been the average for the three Presi-
 “ dencies; but it is very nearly two years above the average in Bengal, of which the army
 “ constituted nearly one-half of the whole army of India. The rule must have been
 “ adopted in consequence of its having been felt that without some such provision, under
 “ the new circumstances of the army, there would have been a retardation in the advance
 “ of lieutenant-colonels to the rank of colonel, which would have placed them in a
 “ position of disadvantage, compared with that in which they formerly stood, and there-
 “ fore that in this respect the assurances of Parliament would have been departed from.
 “ The rule, as we have explained its operation, does not appear to have removed this
 “ grievance, as under it the period passed in a lieutenant-colonelcy will, on the average
 “ of the whole army, be about one-twelfth longer, and on the average of Bengal nearly
 “ one-sixth longer than it was before. The new rule, however, is not to affect the
 “ lieutenant-colonels who attained that rank before the date of the new system, and so
 “ the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three Presidencies
 “ will be tested by the time at which these lieutenant-colonels will succeed to the
 “ allowances in question, and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally

“ in less than 12 years we consider that unless the shorter average period be adopted the guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to.”

54.

2ndly. As regards the complaint, as “ to the course pursued by the Government to encourage retirement from among the senior officers of the cavalry and infantry. In consequence of the very large reductions in the number of the native regiments, there were a number of lieutenant-colonels and majors for whom it was impossible to find employment. These officers would, in ordinary course, reach the rank of full colonel, and so become entitled to colonels' allowances. It was considered that by offering them a large addition to the pension on which, by their length of service, they were entitled to retire, they might be induced to retire, and so that a considerable boon would be conferred on the officers who should remain. A scale was therefore framed, fixing the sum to be offered to field officers below the rank of colonel as an inducement to them to retire. The amount varied according to the standing of those to whom it was to be offered. To officers who were of a standing which made it likely that by remaining in the service they would soon become full colonels, an additional pension was offered, amounting to 550*l.* per annum. To those further removed the sum was less, descending as low as 200*l.* per annum; and if as many as 300 field officers should not accept these terms, then they were to be offered to captains of 25 years' standing and upwards. It was, however, made part of the scheme that, for every two lieutenant-colonels accepting these terms only one vacancy should be filled up. In the case of majors and captains accepting them, every vacancy was to be filled up.

. 55.

“ To so much of this arrangement as regards the filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the lieutenant-colonels, several of the memorialists object. They say that, by the rules of the service, every officer retiring thereby occasioned a vacancy, however his retirement might have been brought about, and so that it was a breach of the guarantee not to fill up all the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the lieutenant-colonels who accepted the additional pensions and quitted the service. This arrangement appears to have had a very unequal operation. In many regiments there has not occurred any regimental promotion. In the rest the promotion has been of very varied amount. Those not benefited by immediate promotion may seem to derive a certain prospective advantage from the advance towards promotion occasioned by so many retirements in the superior ranks; but it must be remembered that this advantage will in all cases be materially diminished by the diminution in the number of lieutenant-colonelcies to which promotion is denied. They advance towards a receding object.

r. 56.

“ We are unable to calculate the loss or the advantage, varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments; but we think that where loss can be ascertained to have taken place there the guarantee has not been adhered to.”

And whereas the said Commissioners have further reported generally that

r. 34.

“ It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if in the interests of India and of the Empire at large it should deem it necessary, from reducing the numbers of the Indian Army or altering its organization. It would have been in the power of the Company to make such reductions and changes, and a similar power was transferred to the Crown. All we can understand Parliament to have guaranteed to the officers is, that in making any such reductions their interests should as little as possible be interfered with, and that in any change of organization the Crown should, as no doubt the Company would have done, reserve all the rules as to pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, which existed at the time the Act was passed, or, if in any case that should be impossible, then that some counterbalancing benefit should be given to compensate any advantage which it might be impossible to retain.”

And whereas Her Majesty's Government deemed it just and expedient that certain measures should be taken in order to remove the causes of complaint in those several cases in which the said Commissioners have reported (as herein-before mentioned), that a departure from the said assurances given by Parliament had taken place; and also to obviate such causes of complaint in the cases in which the said Commissioners had reported (as herein-before mentioned), that such departure might, in certain contingencies, take place:

And whereas the Secretary of State, by Despatch of the 17th June 1864 to the Government of India, indicated the said measures, and directed their adoption by the Government and Military Authorities of India, of which Despatch a copy is annexed

to this Commission ; and whereas We have thought it expedient that an inquiry should be made as to the effect and sufficiency of the said measures :

Now We, reposing great trust and confidence in your zeal, discretion, and ability, have authorized and appointed, and do by these presents authorize and appoint you, the said Sir John Aitchison, the said Sir Robert Napier, the said Sir Sydney John Cotton, the said Henry Eyre, the said Charles Alfred Browne, the said David Russell, and the said Sir William Marcus Coghlan, to be Our Commissioners to inquire into and to examine whether the measures aforesaid are effectual and sufficient for the purpose of removing such causes of complaint as have been reported in the terms herein before stated by the said first-mentioned Commissioners to have arisen by a departure from the assurances given by Parliament, or for the purpose of giving a counterbalancing benefit in any cases where any rules as to pay, pension, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, which existed when the Acts above referred to were passed, have not been retained ; and in what respects, and to what extent, if at all, such measures fall short of what may be required for removing the causes of such complaints, or for giving such counterbalancing benefit in lieu thereof.

And We do hereby authorize and empower you Our said Commissioners, or any three or more of you, to obtain information thereupon by the examination of all persons most competent by reason of their knowledge, habits, or experience to afford it ; and also by calling for all documents, papers, or records which may appear to you or any three or more of you, calculated to assist your researches and to promote the formation of a sound judgment on the subject.

And We do hereby command and require you or any three or more of you, to report to Us under your hands and seals, with all convenient speed, your opinion on the questions submitted to you.

And We will and command, and by these Presents ordain, that this Our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you Our said Commissioners, or any three or more of you, may from time to time proceed in the execution thereof, and of every matter and thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

And for your further assistance in the execution of these presents, We do hereby authorize and empower you to appoint a Secretary to this Our Commission, whose services and assistance We require you to use from time to time as occasion may require.

Given at Our Court at Windsor, this Twenty-sixth day of June One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, in the Twenty-ninth year of Our reign.

By Her Majesty's command,

(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

REPORT.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

WHEREAS by a Commission under Your Majesty's Sign Manual, bearing date the Twenty-sixth day of June 1865, directed to us, the undersigned:—Reciting that the Commissioners appointed* to inquire into the complaints made in certain memorials from officers of the late Indian Armies, that in framing and carrying into execution the measures adopted by the Government of India towards the re-organization of the Indian Army, and the amalgamation of Her Majesty's Indian Forces with Her Majesty's general Forces, the assurance given by Parliament in the provisions of certain Acts of Parliament as to the preservation of the advantages of the late military forces of the East India Company as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, and promotion, had been departed from—have reported that in certain cases herein-after mentioned, arising out of such amalgamation and re-organization in Her Majesty's Indian Forces, such assurances have been departed from, that is to say, as regards the three following cases, in the words following:

In 1863.

1stly. "The rules under which it (*the Staff Corps*) has been formed are complained of as unjustly giving superior rank to many of the officers selected for that corps and so causing extensive supersession of the officers remaining with their regiments. If a new regiment had been formed, subject to the old rules of promotion, and the officers of the new regiment had been transferred from regiments already in existence, remaining in their former regimental rank, there would not necessarily have been any supersession of the officers remaining unremoved. Casualties might occur in the new more rapidly than in the old regiments; but this would be a mere chance, such as must always exist in all regimental organization, where accidents may give rise to promotion in one corps more rapidly than in another. But what the officers complain of on this head is, the immediate and prospective supersession in rank of regimental officers by those in the staff corps, which was the inevitable consequence of the rules regulating promotion in the staff corps, and especially of that which allows previous staff service to count towards the period of service qualifying for promotion in the staff corps." Par. 42.

"We have to state our opinion that there are solid grounds for this complaint. The three or four senior captains of an Indian regiment are generally of more, sometimes of much more, than 20 years standing in the army; and whenever a second or lower captain of that standing, having had six years of previous staff service, joins the staff corps, he immediately becomes a major and supersedes his senior captains whom he leaves behind him; and at the end of two years he will become a lieutenant-colonel, and so supersede, not only the captains, formerly his seniors, but also perhaps the major of his old regiment. The same observation applies to lieutenants. Now, considering how keenly officers feel the being superseded by their juniors, and how much their interests may be thereby affected, we cannot be surprised at the complaints which are made on this subject; and we are of opinion that in this respect the Parliamentary assurance has not been adhered to." Par. 43.

2ndly. "The next complaints to which we will refer are those which relate to retaining on the cadres of the old regiments the names of those officers who joined the new line regiments formed under the general order of amalgamation. The Memorialists allege that every officer who so joined the new line regiments ought to be considered as having created a vacancy in the regiment from which he was removed, thereby giving occasion to promotion." Par. 44.

* * * * * "With respect to such of the officers of the new line regiments as were brought in from the native cavalry and infantry we think that the case of vacancies occasioned by bringing officers from the native regiments falls (3112.) b"

“ under the ordinary rule under which promotion has always been given on the transfer of an officer to another regiment; that no public interest interferes with their promotion, that it is not contrary to reason, and therefore that the denial of such promotion is an unnecessary departure from the assurance given by Parliament.”

3rdly. “ We will next advert to what, though not distinctly appearing on the memorials referred to us, is, as appears by the first paper submitted to us on behalf of the officers, considered by many Indian officers to be a violation of the privileges guaranteed to them, namely, the alteration of the system on which officers become general officers.”

* * * * *

“ Should this arrangement (*as to the colonels of cavalry and infantry*) be carried into operation it appears to us that it will cause injury of by no means an imaginary character. It will be felt less and less by officers as they are further and further removed from the rank of colonel. But the new rule must cause to many officers great delay in their promotion without any countervailing advantage, and we therefore feel bound to express our opinion that in this respect the Parliamentary assurance has not been fulfilled.”

And further that the said Commissioners have reported further as regards two cases arising out of the large reduction in the Natiye Army of India, that if certain loss of advantages should hereafter occur, the assurance given by Parliament will have been departed from; that is to say, in the following cases and in the following words:—

1. As regards “ Colonels’ Allowances.”

“ The new regulations on this subject are, as we have already stated, different in the ordnance corps from those in the cavalry and infantry. The principle on which the amalgamation was made in the ordnance corps was the same in all the Presidencies, and the same as to the artillery and the engineers. We may therefore confine our remarks to the case of the Bengal artillery, which will be a sample of the whole. Before the amalgamation there were in Bengal 12 battalions of artillery, each with a colonel drawing colonel’s allowances, and two lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.*, there were in all 12 colonels and 24 lieutenant-colonels; and on any casualty among the colonels the senior lieutenant-colonel succeeded to his place and drew the allowances, besides his pay-as colonel. By the amalgamation of the Indian with the Royal Artillery, the whole became one regiment, the former 12 Bengal battalions being divided into seven brigades, each brigade having its colonel commandant drawing colonel’s allowances, with two colonels and four lieutenant-colonels. The whole establishment of the seven brigades is therefore 7 colonels commandant, 14 colonels, and 28 lieutenant-colonels, *i.e.*, 49 field officers, instead of 36 under the old system of battalions. The five senior of these 14 colonels were colonels before the amalgamation, and drew colonel’s allowances. This right is still preserved to them, and they enjoy the rank of colonels commandant, being supernumerary to the seven actually commanding brigades. The other nine colonels, making up the 14, were before the amalgamation only lieutenant-colonels, so that they are benefited by the increased rank and pay to which they become entitled as colonels instead of lieutenant-colonels. Upon the happening of any vacancy among the colonels drawing colonels’ allowances it is filled up by seniority, according to the general rule of the service, save only that in order to get rid eventually of the supernumeraries, every fourth vacancy is left unsupplied, so that after 20 vacancies there will cease to be supernumeraries. The memorialists complain of this latter arrangement, as unjustly retarding the progress of officers towards the attainment of colonels’ allowances.

“ In order to enable us to say how far this complaint is well founded, we must consider what is the precise operation of the rule on the different ranks of the whole corps. In the first place it can have no operation on those officers who are actually drawing colonels’ allowances, nor on the three colonels who shall happen to stand next in order to the five supernumeraries on the occurrence of the first three casualties among those above them. The colonel who stands next to the supernumeraries when the fourth vacancy occurs will be retarded in his promotion, and this will, more or less, affect every officer below him. He will have to wait for a fifth vacancy before he succeeds to colonels’ allowances, and the same observation applies to the 8th, 12th, 16th, and 20th vacancies. This is the extent of the injury occasioned by the amalgamation, and what we have to consider is whether this is such a grievance as to amount to a breach of the Parliamentary guarantee. There is great difficulty in saying that it is so. Every officer thus retarded in his promotion will, until his turn for promotion arrives, have been in the enjoyment of rank and pay beyond what he

“ would have had under the old system; and the question is whether such increased rank and pay may not be fairly considered as compensating the officer for the retardation of his progress towards the colonels' allowances. To those who are juniors in the corps, the increased rank and pay and the greatly increased number of field officers must be more than an equivalent for delay in reaching the highest step to occur at a very distant day. To those who are at or near the head of the list the retardation must occur sooner, while the enjoyment of the increased rank and pay will have endured for a shorter time. It is impossible to find any general rule by which the balance of advantage and disadvantage at each particular stage of the service can be accurately struck. But the principle on which the change has been made seems to be just; and it is clear that immediate pecuniary benefits are secured to all whose interests may be affected by the rule in question, likely, in the case of the junior officers to exceed the pecuniary loss occasioned by retardation, and often to equal it even in the case of the seniors. We therefore think that under this head any solid ground of complaint, if any should arise, must be of very rare occurrence and of a very limited character, resulting from circumstances which it is not possible to foresee. We cannot think, therefore, that what has been done is a breach of Parliamentary guarantee.

“ A similar principle as to colonels' allowances was originally contemplated for the cavalry and infantry, but this was found difficult, in consequence of the very extensive reductions of the native regiments, and the rule ultimately adopted has been that every lieutenant-colonel shall become a full colonel, and be entitled to colonel's allowances after holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel for 12 years. If 12 years were a fair average of the time usually passed in the rank of lieutenant-colonel, the principle adopted would be a fair one. The memorialists say that the number ought to have been 10, not 12. Whether this rule is open to objection, as being a violation of the Parliamentary guarantee, appears to us to depend on the question whether the number 12 has been ascertained to be a fair average. Par. 52.

“ It appears, by information which we have received from the India Office, that the average in Bengal is 10·2 years, in Madras 11·8, and in Bombay 10·9; so that 12 years is just more than a year beyond what has been the average for the three Presidencies; but it is very nearly two years above the average in Bengal, of which the army constituted nearly one-half of the whole army of India. The rule must have been adopted in consequence of its having been felt that without some such provision, under the new circumstances of the army, there would have been a retardation in the advance of lieutenant-colonels to the rank of colonel, which would have placed them in a position of disadvantage, compared with that in which they formerly stood, and therefore that in this respect the assurances of Parliament would have been departed from. The rule, as we have explained its operation, does not appear to have removed this grievance, as under it the period passed in a lieutenant-colonelcy will, on the average of the whole army, be about one-twelfth longer, and on the average of Bengal nearly one-sixth longer than it was before. The new rule, however, is not to affect the lieutenant-colonels who attained that rank before the date of the new system, and so the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three Presidencies will be tested by the time at which these lieutenant-colonels will succeed to the allowances in question, and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally in less than 12 years we consider that unless the shorter average period be adopted the guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to.” Par. 53.

2ndly. As regards the complaint, as “ to the course pursued by the Government to encourage retirement from among the senior officers of the cavalry and infantry. In consequence of the very large reductions in the number of the native regiments, there were a number of lieutenant-colonels and majors for whom it was impossible to find employment. These officers would, in ordinary course, reach the rank of full colonel, and so become entitled to colonels' allowances. It was considered that by offering them a large addition to the pension on which, by their length of service, they were entitled to retire, they might be induced to retire, and so that a considerable boon would be conferred on the officers who should remain. A scale was therefore framed, fixing the sum to be offered to field officers below the rank of colonel as an inducement to them to retire. The amount varied according to the standing of those to whom it was to be offered. To officers who were of a standing which made it likely that by remaining in the service they would soon become full colonels, an additional pension was offered, amounting to 550*l.* per annum. To those further removed the sum was less, descending as low as 200*l.* per annum; and if as many as 300 field officers should not accept these terms, then they were to be offered to” Par. 54.

“captains of 25 years' standing and upwards. It was, however, made part of the scheme that, for every two lieutenant-colonels accepting these terms only one vacancy should be filled up. In the case of majors and captains accepting them, every vacancy was to be filled up.

Par. 55.

“To so much of this arrangement as regards the filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the lieutenant-colonels, several of the memorialists object. They say that, by the rules of the service, every officer retiring thereby occasioned a vacancy, however his retirement might have been brought about, and so that it was a breach of the guarantee not to fill up all the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of the lieutenant-colonels who accepted the additional pensions and quitted the service. This arrangement appears to have had a very unequal operation. In many regiments there has not occurred any regimental promotion. In the rest the promotion has been of very varied amount. Those not benefited by immediate promotion may seem to derive a certain prospective advantage from the advance towards promotion occasioned by so many retirements in the superior ranks; but it must be remembered that this advantage will in all cases be materially diminished by the diminution in the number of lieutenant-colonelcies to which promotion is denied. They advance towards a receding object.

Par. 56.

“We are unable to calculate the loss or the advantage, varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments; but we think that where loss can be ascertained to have taken place there the guarantee has not been adhered to.”

Par. 54.

And that the said Commissioners have further reported generally that
 “It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if in the interests of India and of the Empire at large it should deem it necessary, from reducing the numbers of the Indian Army or altering its organization. It would have been in the power of the Company to make such reductions and changes, and a similar power was transferred to the Crown. All we can understand Parliament to have guaranteed to the officers is, that in making any such reductions their interests should as little as possible be interfered with, and that in any change of organization the Crown should, as no doubt the Company would have done, reserve all the rules as to pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, which existed at the time the Act was passed, or, if in any case that should be impossible, then that some counterbalancing benefit should be given to compensate any advantage which it might be impossible to retain.”

And further that Her Majesty's Government deemed it just and expedient that certain measures should be taken in order to remove the causes of complaint in those several cases in which the said Commissioners have reported (as herein-before mentioned), that a departure from the said assurances given by Parliament had taken place; and also to obviate such causes of complaint in the cases in which the said Commissioners had reported (as herein-before mentioned), that such departure might, in certain contingencies, take place:

And that the Secretary of State, by Despatch of the 17th June 1864 to the Government of India, indicated the said measures, and directed their adoption by the Government and Military Authorities of India, of which Despatch a copy is annexed to this Commission.

And further reciting that Your Majesty had thought it expedient that an inquiry should be made as to the effect and sufficiency of the said measures, and that Your Majesty had been therefore pleased to authorize and appoint us the undersigned to be Your Majesty's Commissioners to inquire into and to examine whether the measures aforesaid are effectual and sufficient for the purpose of removing such causes of complaint as have been reported in the terms herein-before stated by the said first-mentioned Commissioners to have arisen by a departure from the assurances given by Parliament, or for the purpose of giving a counterbalancing benefit in any cases where any rules as to pay, pension, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise, which existed when the Acts above referred to were passed, have not been retained; and in what respects, and to what extent, if, at all, such measures fall short of what may be required for removing the causes of such complaints, or for giving such counterbalancing benefit in lieu thereof.

And Your Majesty was pleased to command and require us or any three or more of us to report to Your Majesty, under our hands and seals, with all convenient speed, our opinion on the questions submitted to us.

Appendix A. Now, therefore, we do hereby humbly certify to Your Majesty that in pursuance of the authority so given to us we have from time to time met and taken into consideration the several matters so submitted to us.

Applied for and obtained from the—			
House of Lords -	-	-	156
House of Commons -	-	-	732
India Office -	-	-	21
Total -			909

Of these 204 proved on examination to be upon points not within the scope of this Commission—leaving 705 for consideration.

1. And in order to their fullest consideration, we have examined the whole of the memorials submitted by officers of Your Majesty's Indian Army, as noted in the margin—as also the following documents :

1. Report of the Royal Commission on the memorials of Indian officers, 1863.
2. Despatch of the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for India, 17th June 1864, No. 194.
3. Speech of the Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, Bart., House of Commons, 2nd May 1865.
4. Memorandum from the India Office.

2. We have also received and considered statements* from all officers concerned who have submitted them to us. * Appendix B.

Major-General Pears, C.B., Secretary for Military Correspondence, India Office.

Major-General Flemyng, Bengal Infantry.

Major-General Balfour, C.B., R.A. (Madras.)

Major-General North, late Royal Engineers, Bombay.

Colonel McGoun, Controller of Finance, Madras.

Lieutenant-Colonel Silver, Madras Infantry.

Lieutenant-Colonel Simpson, Madras Infantry.

3. And we have been in communication with certain officers of the Indian army of experience, named in the margin.

4. We find the alleged grievances so interwoven and connected with each other that it is not always possible to preserve a distinct line which shall separate them. The questions for consideration are, from their nature, necessarily involved. A great organic change, such as that made in the Indian armies, could not be effected without disadvantage to some interests—and it was difficult, or rather impossible, to devise any single scheme which should at once redress such inevitable injuries. This indeed is proved by the fact that the several † measures successively adopted by Your Majesty's Government with the design of removing, or at least of alleviating as much as practicable every grievance, have not been entirely successful,—and that however much may have been effected by the liberal concessions already granted, there yet remain some reasonable complaints of injury which those concessions have not redressed. Instances indeed are adduced to show that the remedy applied to one class of injuries has seriously aggravated those of another class.

- † 1. Offer of annuities of 50*l.* in addition to regulated pensions.
2. Further offer of annuities increased to 150*l.*
3. Offer of additional pensions varying from 550*l.* to 200*l.*
4. Grant of colonel's allowance after 12 years' service as lieutenant-colonel.
5. Promotion in place of officers of the Staff Corps and new line regiments on their becoming lieut.-colonels regimentally.

These measures leading to a large acceleration of promotion.

applied to one class of injuries has seriously aggravated those of another class.

"In what respects, and to what extent, if at all, such measures fall short of what may be required for removing the causes of such complaints, or for giving such counterbalancing benefit in lieu thereof?"

5. To all these, acting as we consider, in the spirit of our instructions, we now address ourselves, in the hope that the observations which we shall offer may assist in clearing away some of the difficulties by which the whole question is complicated. Appendix, C, G.

6. We arrange the points upon which we have to submit our opinion in the following order :—

- i. The retention on the cadres of native regiments of cavalry and infantry of the names of officers transferred to the new line regiments of Your Majesty's army.
- ii. Arrangements for regulating the promotion of colonels of the Indian army, of date subsequent to the 17th February 1861, to the rank of general officer.
- iii. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of lieutenant-colonels upon increased pensions from 31st December 1861, and the retention of the names of the retired lieutenant-colonels upon the regimental gradation lists in order to regulate subsequent promotions to colonel with colonel's allowances.
- iv. The rule under which lieutenant-colonels are to be promoted to colonel, with colonel's allowance, on the completion of 12 years' service in the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel.
- v. The supersession of regimental officers by officers of the staff corps.

7. We now humbly submit to Your Majesty the result of our deliberations.

X.
The retention on the cadres of native regiments of the names of officers transferred to the new line regiments.

8. Consequent upon the report of Your Majesty's Commissioners upon this point in 1863, Your Majesty's Government directed that the names of these officers should be removed from the cadres and that promotions should be made in their places.

Despatch to Government of India, 17th June 1864, No. 194, para. 55.

9. We have to report that the measure adopted upon this point has been effectual and sufficient.

II.

Arrangements for promotion to the rank of general officer.

Appendix D.

Warrant
15th June
1864.

10. The warrant of 1st January 1862 has been modified, and a revised warrant substituted. Officers of cavalry and infantry have been replaced on the general list for promotion as before. Officers of artillery and engineers, being colonels prior to 18th February 1861, (date of amalgamation with the Royal corps) to rise on the general list as before. After that date to rise on separate lists.

11. We consider these measures effectual and sufficient so far as the arrangements connected with the Ordnance Service come within the scope of our inquiry.

Appendix D.

12. We have received a special representation upon this point from Lieutenant-General Griffith, R.A. (Bombay), as also observations from Major-General Balfour, C.B., R.A. (Madras), and Lieutenant-Colonel T. Brougham, R.A., (Bengal,) but these have not appeared to us to affect the correctness of our conclusion.

III.

The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of lieutenant-colonels, and retention of their names upon the regimental gradation lists.

* Report,
para. 56.

13. In regard to the filling up only half the vacancies, Your Majesty's Commissioners in 1863 stated* that they were "unable to calculate the loss or the advantages, "varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments "—but we think that where loss can be ascertained to have taken place, there the "guarantee has not been adhered to."

14. It appears to us, from the views which have been expressed by many of the memorialists, that there exists much misapprehension upon this point—and this we will now endeavour to remove.

15. When the arrangement objected to was adopted, it had become necessary to make large reductions in the Indian army—and those reductions were then under contemplation by Your Majesty's Government—but to what extent they should be carried out had not then been actually determined.

16. Whatever the number of regiments to be reduced, there must of course have followed a corresponding reduction in the number of colonelcies, and consequently of colonels' allowances.

17. To relieve the service generally, but especially the older lieutenant-colonels, from the effects of this reduction, Your Majesty's Government offered increased pensions to lieutenant-colonels to enable them to retire—with the intimation that only half the vacancies so occasioned in that rank were to be filled up—and that the names of the whole of the retired lieutenant-colonels were to be retained on the gradation lists of regimental lieutenant-colonels to regulate subsequent promotions to regimental colonel and succession to colonels' allowance.

18. This was intended as a means of making the retardation of succession to the rank of regimental colonel with colonel's allowance a gradual process, and so of making it less immediately felt.

19. But the exact extent of the reduction not having at that time been determined, and, consequently, no reduced establishment having been published in army orders, the effect of these arrangements could not be correctly appreciated.

Despatch to
Government
of India,
17th June
1864, No.
194, para.
52.

20. Now, however, a reduced establishment has been fixed—to stand as under:

	Former Establishment.		Reduced Establishment.		Reduction.	
	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Bengal lieut.-cols.	10	80	7	59	3	21
Madras „	8	58	6	43	2	15
Bombay „	3	35	3	26	0	9

21. Then, taking the Madras infantry for the purpose of illustration, the case may be stated thus—

*Note.—The actual reduction in the Madras infantry has been of 3 European regiments representing 4 colonels and 6 lieutenant-colonels, and 12 native regiments representing 12 colonels and 12 lieutenant-colonels—giving a total of 16 colonels and 18 lieutenant-colonels. The reduction of 15 only is therefore to advantage of the Madras army.

Each of the late 1st European regiments of the three presidencies had two colonels.

22. A reduction was required to the extent of 15 regiments of infantry*—representing therefore 15 colonels with colonels' allowances, and 15 lieutenant-colonels.

23. Supposing this reduced establishment to have been determined upon and published in December 1861, Your Majesty's Government would, of course, have been distinctly entitled to declare the difference of number, namely, 15, *supernumerary*—and, therefore, if thought good, liable to the ordinary process of absorption—more or less gradual.

24. The extra pensions, then, may be taken as one of the means devised for the purpose of alleviating the pressure of this reduction.

25. Upon the offer of these pensions 42 lieutenant-colonels retired, and 21* promotions were made in their places.

26. But, as will be seen from the subjoined statement, the promotions should, as we are now enabled to ascertain, have been 25.

Madrás Infantry. Lieutenant-colonels.

* Exclusive of 5 lieutenant-colonels who, being major-generals, were supernumerary.	* Establishment prior to reduction	-	-	-	58
	Reduced establishment 1st Jan. 1862	-	-	-	43
	Supernumerary	-	-	-	15
	Retired 31st December 1861, excluding 2 Supernumeraries	-	-	-	40
	Promotions due to complete	-	-	-	25
	Promotions made	-	-	-	21
	Promotions due, to complete reduced establishment on the 1st January 1862	-	-	-	4

27. In the margin is an explanatory statement including the three armies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay—cavalry and infantry—from which it will be seen that, allowing for the required reductions, the actual loss occasioned by the filling up of only half the vacancies has been as under:

LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.	Bengal		Madras		Bombay	
	Cavalry.	Infantry	Cavalry	Infantry	Cavalry.	Infantry
* Establishment prior to 31st December 1861 (assumed date of reduction)	10	80	8	58	3	35
Reduced establishment	7	59	6	43	3	26
Supernumerary	3	21	2	15	—	9
* Retired 31st December 1861	9	45	7	40	—	21
Promotions due to complete reduced establishment	6	24	5	25	—	12
Promotions actually made	6	24	4	21	—	11
Promotions due to complete reduced establishment	—	—	1	4	—	1

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Bengal, lieutenant-colonels	—	—
Madras	1	4
Bombay	—	1

whereas, as would appear from the memorials, officers have hitherto imagined it to be largely in excess.

28. Upon this point, therefore, we are of opinion that if promotions be allowed in continuation of the promotions already made from the 1st January 1862 to complete the numbers above indicated—no loss will have been sustained either by regiments or by officers, of anything that they could be entitled to claim under this head.

29. And we have further to report upon this point, that, the names of the retired lieutenant-colonels having been retained upon the lists solely for the purpose of regulating succession to the rank of colonel with colonel's allowance—and that succession, for all officers promoted to the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel on and after the 1st January 1862, being now dependent wholly upon the completion of 12 years' service in that rank—neither the lieutenant colonels of the 1st January 1862 nor any others junior to them, have been or can be affected by the retention of those names upon the lists.

IV.

The rule fixing 12 years' service in the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel for promotion to colonel with colonel's allowance.

30. The Commissioners of 1863 reported that in their opinion "the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three presidencies will be tested by the

* Viz., lieutenant-colonels promoted to that rank prior to 1st January 1862.

"time at which * these lieutenant-colonels will succeed to the allowances in question—and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally in less than 12 years, we consider that unless the shorter average period be adopted the guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to."

31. From what has now come before us, however, we have been led to consider that the time at which these lieutenant-colonels will succeed to the allowance in question, will not for the future afford a correct criterion.

32. It has been argued by memorialists, and apparently on reasonable grounds, that the retired lieutenant-colonels, residing as the majority of them do in Europe, no longer afford the same chances of ordinary casualties as they might probably have done had they continued on service in India—nor the same chances of retirement either by purchase, or from unfitness for further service, or, as it is represented might have happened in some instances, of their own accord.

33. We have therefore deemed it right to test the 12 years' period by other modes of calculation.

34. The Commissioners of 1863, on the authority of the India Office, stated the average years of service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel before promotion to colonel to have been,

	Years.
Bengal	10·2
Madras	11·8
Bombay	10·9

which for the whole Indian army would be 10·966, or if calculated on the aggregate, 10·85.

This calculation is stated to have been made upon a period of 15 years—or from 1845—60.

Appendix E. 35. We called for another statement from the India Office embracing a period of 20 years—or from 1835—56.

36. This statement shows the average to have been,

Bengal	10·77
Madras	11
Bombay	12·5

* No. of Infantry Lieutenant-colonels, giving a general average for the three presidencies, of 11·42—or when calculated upon the* aggregate, 11·16.
Bengal 95,
Madras 64,
Bombay 36.

37. Another calculation has been made by us of the total service of officers up to date of promotion to regimental colonel, as they stood in January 1841, 1851, 1861, in the three presidencies.

38. This calculation gives the average as under :

RANKS.	From the Experience of the Madras Military Fund, from 1808 to 1867.	Mr. Davies' Second Report of 1845.	1841. 1851. 1861.			Average.
			Yrs. Mths.	Yrs. Mths.	Yrs. Mths.	
			Bengal - 31 4	44 0	41 6	37 10
			Madras - 35 2	37 6	38 10	37 2
			Bombay - 28 9	36 3	37 9	34 3
			giving a general average for the Indian army of 36 years 5 months.			
			39. Another calculation, brought to our notice by Major-General Balfour, prepared for the purposes of the Bengal and Madras military funds by their actuaries—comprising in the case of the Madras fund a period of 50 years—1808 to 1857,—gives the average age of officers on promotion to regimental colonel at			
			Bengal		50·5	
			Madras		51·	
			which, assuming as the actuaries have done, 19 years as the age on entering the service,—decidedly as we think the maximum average of age,—would be equivalent to years of service on promotion to colonel,			
			Bengal	- - -	31	
			Madras	- - -	32	
			40. Further, according to the statement made by Mr. Melvill, in 1856, before the Duke of Somerset's Commission on the Sale and Purchase of Commissions* in the Army, the average period of service up to promotion to colonel taken for the 30 junior colonels in 1856,—and assuming the same maximum of age on entering the army as above, 19,—was about 38 years.			
			Appendix E. 41. Sir William Mansfield has stated that in October 1861 the average total service in the Bombay infantry was 39 years.			
			Staff Corps Regulations and Despatch, No. 270, 31 July 1862, to the Government of India. 42. And for the staff corps, throughout India, 38 years have been established as the fair average period.			
			43. The summary of the preceding statements stands thus:— Service in the grade of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel.			
			India Office on 15 years	- - -	10·88	
			Do. on 20 years	- - -	11·16	
			Mean	- - -	11·02	

* Question 702.

Total service up to date of promotion to Colonel.

	Years.	Months.
Taken on 1841, 1851, 1861 . . .	36	5
Military Funds - - -	32	0
Mr. Melvill - - -	38	0
Sir W. Mansfield - - -	39	0
Staff Corps - - -	38	0
Mean - - -	36	8

Lieutenant-colonels prior to 1862.

* The following lieutenant-colonels of infantry have obtained colonel's allowances since 1st January 1862.

	Yrs.	ms.
Bengal, by regimental succession - Burney	10	5
" " " - Showers	9	4
" " " - Troop	9	10
" " " - Beatson	10	6
" " " - Landers	10	3
Bombay " " - James	10	6
" " " - Long	10	3
Madras " " - Fitzgerald	13	10
" by 12 years rule - Browne	12	5½
" by succession - McCleod	11	10
" by 12 years rule - Bailie	12	0

44. Then, as regards the regimental lieutenant-colonels promoted prior to 1st January 1862, it has been ordered that they may succeed to the rank of colonel with colonel's allowance, either in the ordinary course of casualties among those above them, or on the completion of the 12 years' period, whichever may first occur.*

45. But, as has been before noticed, the progress of these lieutenant-colonels will be, in all probability, slower than if the officers above them had not retired.

	† Cavalry.	Infantry.	Total.
Bengal - - -	1	25	26
Madras - - -	1	12	13
Bombay - - -	2	9	11

46. And if so, it may be assumed that they will generally come under the operation of the 12 years' rule—that is, they will generally not succeed to their colonelcies in order of succession by seniority as of old, but by the completion of the 12 years' service.

	Yrs.	Mnths.
Lieutenant-colonels promoted previous to 1st January 1862 - - -	42	0
General average of all calculations on past years - - -	36	8
Excess - - -	5	4

47. Referring to the Army Lists for 1865, we find that the average total service of † these lieutenant-colonels, on completion of the 12 years, will be,

	Years.	Months.
Bengal - - -	43	2
Madras - - -	42	6
Bombay - - -	40	6

or for the whole Indian army 42 years—a period greatly in excess of all the various periods exhibited above, and five years and four months in excess of the average of the whole.

48. We have made this statement in order to ascertain more distinctly what period would constitute a fair average—but, bearing in mind that the ordinary course of succession to colonel has of late years been generally slower than formerly, we should not think the excess of five years and four months above indicated as that to be admitted. We take it only as affording sufficient ground for some reduction of the 12 years.

* Sir C. Wood's Speech—concluding statement, and para. 11 of Despatch No. 270 of the 31st July 1862.

49. Taking into consideration then, that none of the lieutenant-colonels* promoted prior to 1st January 1862 have benefited by any of the measures which have operated to accelerate promotion among their juniors—that, on the contrary, the changes which have occurred have been to their detriment as having lessened their chances of employment in commands—and that their succession to colonelcies in the ordinary course from the removal of their retired seniors must henceforth be slower than before—we come to the conclusion that the 12 years' term is about two years in excess of a fair period.

Para. 32 *suprà.*

Lieutenant-colonels on and after 1st January 1862.

50. As regards lieutenant-colonels promoted on and after 1st January 1862, the 12 years rule has been made absolute from that date forward.

51. As a general period, looking to the future of the Indian service, and probably not representing eventually more than 38 years total service, it may not be in excess.

52. But we deem it necessary to observe upon its operation as it will affect a number of the present regimental lieutenant-colonels promoted chiefly on the 1st January 1862, or shortly after.

	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.
1.—49	35	34½	44½
	36	47	44½
	44	34	35½
	48	53	32½
5.—39	47	34½	36½
	40	37	36½
	35	40	38
	42	48	38
	37	36	35
10.—32	38	36	36
	37	47	39
	33	39	35
	35	36	38
	37	40	38
15.—37	37	35	35
	51	42	38
	39	41	41
	34	41	37
	50	39	32
20.—37	41	37	37
Average	39½	40½	36¾

Appendix F.

53. Taking the first 20 of this class of each Presidency we find that the average period of service on completion of the 12 years will be,—

Bengal	39½
Madras	40½
Bombay	36¾

while, as will be seen in the margin, individual periods of service will range as high as 51 years in Bengal, 53 in Madras, and 44½ in Bombay—and this, notwithstanding that some of these officers have had their promotion to lieutenant-colonel accelerated by the retirements of officers upon the increased pensions.

54. And we may here observe that the periods of service of officers in the grades of major and captain are in numerous instances much longer than is generally supposed—so that with all the advantage of accelerated promotion they will for the greater part reach to 40 or more years service before promotion to regimental-colonel. There are, for example, many officers,—now regimental captains, who have already completed more than 25 years' service.

55. We therefore submit that it might be for the advantage of the public service to provide a means of relieving the Indian army from old and worn out officers, such as some may even now be and as more will hereafter become, and adverting especially to the cases of lieutenant-colonels of 1st January 1862—who are of lengthened periods of service, we consider it to be distinctly required.

Military Despatch to the Government of India, No. 5, 20th September 1837.

After 20 years' actual Indian service as captain.

" 24 "	" "	major.
" 28 "	" "	lieut.-colonel.
" 32 "	" "	colonel.

This was authorized by the Court of Directors with special reference to the difficulties experienced in the formation of general retiring funds, and its extension would in some degree mitigate the loss which is sustained by the abolition of regimental purchase.

a total service of seldom less than 40 and 43 years.

58. This boon would of course cease with the extinction of the present local line service—and it would apply to rapidly decreasing numbers, because the officers who might in consequence obtain accelerated promotion would not have length of service to entitle them to the increased rates.

V.

Supersession of regimental officers by officers of the staff corps.

59. Upon this point the Commissioners of 1863 reported as follows:—"What the officers complain of on this head is the immediate and prospective supersession in rank of regimental officers by those in the staff corps which was the inevitable consequence of the rules regulating promotion in the staff corps, and especially of that which allows previous staff service to count towards the period of service qualifying for promotion in the staff corps." And they stated their opinion, that there are solid grounds for the complaint.

Despatch to Govt. of India, 17th June 1864, No. 194, par. 52.

Your Majesty's Government, upon consideration of the above, were of opinion "that a complete remedy for this supersession in army rank must be found either in the withdrawal of the rank given to the staff corps officers, or in granting such army rank to the officers of the Indian army as shall restore them to the relative position, as regards the staff corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps," . . . and "that therefore the only satisfactory course open to the Government is to confer upon the officers of the Indian army generally such army rank as shall entirely remove all ground for complaint upon this head, by restoring to all who had been superseded the relative position, as regards the staff corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps."

60. Orders were consequently issued granting army rank, according to length of service, to the whole of the officers of the Indian army.

61. At the same time, it was resolved that, “the names of officers of the staff corps and new line regiments shall, on coming into the position of regimental lieutenant-colonel on those lists, be struck out, and that promotions shall be made in their places.” Despatch, para. 76.

62. It was perhaps scarcely practicable to forecast all the consequences of the brevet but, with its operation now before us, we find that it has not only failed fully to remedy the special grievance first complained of, but that it has created a new and continually increasing class of grievances—thus, aggravating instead of removing the original cause of complaint.

63. For we have before us complaints from regimental officers that they have now been superseded by staff corps officers who had not superseded them before; also from regimental officers that they have now been superseded by other regimental officers formerly their juniors—and from officers holding brevet rank for field service, that their brevet has now been superseded by this general brevet for mere length of service, and that they have thus been made to forfeit all advantage in this respect from their service in the field,—while as regards the officers of Your Majesty's British regiments, it may be reasonably urged that their rank is local, while the brevet rank of the Indian officers is general and permanent, at the same time that it seriously deranges their regimental position—captains, for example, becoming lieutenant-colonels and so superseding in general duties and commands even their immediate regimental superiors. Appendix G.

64. And we observe that a general gradation list for the whole army, based simply upon length of service, which is what the brevet has now established, annuls in numerous instances every advantage of rank previously obtained from regimental rise, whether accruing from regimental service or from any other cause. Thus, one regiment may have had the good fortune to be much employed, and its officers may have obtained rapid promotion, either by casualties or by brevet for field service; another has for years chanced to be left in cantonments, and its promotion has been slow. A retrospective brevet for mere aggregate length of service certainly equalizes both, but scarcely with justice to the former.

65. We have given our most anxious and earnest consideration to this very difficult and complicated question, and we consider that we shall not fulfil the duty imposed on us if we fail to submit our opinion that the measure adopted by Your Majesty's Government upon this point has not been effectual and sufficient to remove the grievance originally complained of. The main ground of that grievance we consider to be,—the regimental connexion between the Local Line and the Staff Corps, by the retention of the names of Staff Corps Officers on the cadres of regiments,—and also by the retention on the old European regimental cadres of the names of those officers who have been transferred to the new line regiments.

The measure adopted by Your Majesty's Government therefore falls short of what is required, inasmuch as it has not removed the cause of grievance, whilst the grievance itself has been aggravated by the disturbing effect of the General Brevet.

66. The removal of staff corps officers from regimental cadres might not prevent supersession either of the local line officers by those of the Staff Corps, or of Staff Corps officers by those of the local line—but belonging as they would then do to entirely distinct cadres—each body having its own distinct terms of service—such individual supersession would constitute no invasion of principle.

67. Upon a review of all that we have now submitted, we deem it advisable briefly to recapitulate our conclusions upon the several points under our consideration.

POINT I.—The retention on the cadres of native regiments of the names of officers transferred to new line regiments.

POINT II.—Arrangements for promotion to the rank of general officer.

POINT III.—The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of lieutenant-colonels, and retention of their names upon the regimental gradation lists.

POINT IV.—The rule fixing 12 years' service in the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel for promotion to colonel with colonel's allowance.

68. We have found the measures adopted by Your Majesty's Government effectual and sufficient on points I. and II.

69. On point III. we have considered that a few promotions are required in completion of the reduced establishment from the 1st January 1862.

70. On point IV. we have stated the period of 12 years to be, upon the whole, about two years in excess of a fair period for lieutenant-colonels promoted prior to the 1st January 1862.

71. We have also submitted for consideration, in connexion with the retention of the 12 years period for certain lieutenant-colonels promoted on or subsequent to the

1st January 1862, an extension of the existing Indian regulation granting graduated rates of pension for various periods of service.

POINT V.—The supersession of regimental officers by officers of the staff corps. 72. On point V. we consider that the measure adopted by Your Majesty's Government has not been effectual and sufficient, because of—

- Appendix H:
- i. The non-removal from the cadres of regiments of the officers transferred to the staff corps and the new line regiments, as indicated by the Committee assembled by the Secretary of State, 30 July 1860, of which Lord Hotham was President.
 - ii. The consequent withholding of promotion.
 - iii. The disturbing effect of the brevet.

73. In the settlement of questions of a most complicated character, arising out of extensive and organic changes in a body of such magnitude as the old Indian army, accompanied with large but unavoidable reductions, we cannot venture to suppose that all objections can be removed, or all conflicting interests reconciled—but it appears to us perfectly practicable to remove all just ground for complaining of the infraction of any real and established right in connexion with the particular points referred to us for report.

(Signed) JOHN AITCHISON, General.
 ROBERT NAPIER, Lieut.-General.
 SYDNEY J. COTTON, Major-General.
 HENRY EYRE, Major-General.
 CHARLES A. BROWNE, Major-General.
 DAVID RUSSELL, Major-General.
 WILLIAM M. COGHLAN, Major-General.

Cannon Row, 14th September 1865.

R. CREWE, Colonel,
Secretary.

APPENDIX.

CONTENTS.

	Reference in Report. At Para.	Page in Appendix.
Despatch from Sir C. Wood, No. 194, 17th June 1864	-	1
Speech of Sir C. Wood, 2nd May 1865	-	6
Memorandum furnished by the India Office	-	12
A. List of Petitions :		
No. 1. Received from the House of Lords	-	15
No. 2. Received from the House of Commons	-	16
No. 3. Received from the India Office	1	21
B. No. 1. Letter to Major-General North, R. E.	-	22
No. 2. List of Representations received by the Commission	2	22
No. 3. Major-General Balfour's Observations and Evidence	2. 12. 39.	23
No. 4. Colonel McGoun's Observations and Evidence	"	52
No. 5. Major-General Flemyng's Statement and Evidence	"	54
No. 6. Lieut.-Colonel Silver's Evidence	"	54
No. 7. Lieut.-Colonel Simpson's Evidence	"	55
No. 8. Major-General North's Reply to Questions	"	56
No. 9. Major-General Pears' Reply to Questions and Evidence	"	57
No. 10. Lieut.-Colonel Rigby's Observations	"	60
C. Letter of Lieut.-Colonel Cooke, Madras Army, respecting effect of Erevet Promotion, and Correspondence relating thereto	4	63
Correspondence on the same subject with Bombay Government	-	-
D. No. 1. Statement by Lieut.-General Griffiths, R.A.	-	81
No. 2. Petition by Lieut.-Colonel T. Brougham, R.A.	12	81
No. 3. Warrants of 1st January 1862 and 15th June 1864	-	82
E. No. 1. India Office. Statement of Average Period in Rank of Lieut.-Colonel from 1835 to 1856	35	84
No. 2. India Office. Statement of Off- reckonings in 1856	-	85
No. 3. India Office. Statement showing the Number of Lieut.-Colonels and Majors retired in 1861, and the Number of Promotions in their places	25	85
No. 4. Extract from Minutes by Sir W. Mansfield, dated 30th November 1861, 7th January 1862	-	41
F. Illustration of Service of Captains who have completed 25 years' service	-	54
G. No. 1. Examples by 12 Petitions showing the Supersession of different Classes of Officers -	4. 63.	86
No. 2. Return from the Horse Guards showing the Operation of the Local Rank to Officers of H. M. S. Line Regiments serving in India	4. 64.	93
No. 3. Lists of Supersessions in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Armies	-	94
H. Extract of Report of Lord Hotham's Committee, paragraph 5, and note	72	95

DESPATCH FROM SIR C. WOOD.

Military, No. 194. India Office, London,
17th June 1864.

To His Excellency the Right Honourable the
GOVERNOR GENERAL of INDIA in COUNCIL.

SIR,

Para. 1. YOUR Excellency's Government is aware that numerous memorials and petitions from Officers of the Indian Army have been presented to Parliament, or addressed through the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, complaining that the measures recently adopted as to the Indian Army were in violation of the assurances of Parliament contained in certain clauses of the Acts 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106., and 23 & 24 Vict. cap. 100.

2. In consequence of these circumstances Her Majesty's Government felt it to be their duty to recommend to Her Majesty to appoint a Commission* to inquire into these alleged departures from the Parliamentary guarantee, and to report their opinion thereon.

3. I herewith transmit for your Excellency's information a copy of their Report, which Her Majesty has been pleased to order to be laid upon the tables of both Houses of Parliament.

4. I have at the same time to inform your Excellency of the steps which Her Majesty's Government have felt it to be incumbent upon them to take in consequence of the opinions expressed by the Commissioners in that Report.

5. Before doing so, however, it seems to me to be necessary that I should advert shortly not only to the reasons for the changes which have been introduced into

the Indian Army in the last few years, but also to the general character of those changes. It might otherwise be supposed, from the complaints which have been made by many of the Indian Officers, that the changes were unnecessary, and that no advantages had been conferred upon them in the various measures which have been adopted. Neither of such suppositions is warranted by the circumstances of the case. That great changes in the state and condition of the Indian Army were necessary was self-evident. The recent mutiny had shown the danger of maintaining an overgrown Native Army; Parliament had determined on abandoning the system of maintaining a separate European force for Indian service; the obvious evils of withdrawing Officers from their regiments for Staff employment had been forcibly pointed out by some of the ablest Indian Officers; a reorganization of the Native Army on the system of the regiments known as "Irregular Regiments" was recommended by many of the most experienced Indian servants. These two last mentioned considerations pointed unmistakably to a measure which had frequently been under consideration in former years, *i.e.*, the formation of a Staff Corps. It was also considered desirable on general grounds to remove as far as possible all distinctions between the Officers of Her Majesty's general and Indian Armies, and to form them prospectively into one united body, retaining for the Indian Officers in the mean time such advantages as were peculiar to their service.

6. It might, perhaps, have prevented a good deal of misunderstanding if the measures for these various objects, which were distinct in themselves, had been undertaken separately, but so much change was inevitable, and it was so desirable that the full extent of any changes should be known at once, and that men's minds should not be left in

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

uncertainty as to their future condition, that it was determined to carry into effect without loss of time all the measures required for the changes which were to be made.

7. It is hardly necessary to assure your Excellency that, in framing the various measures for this purpose, both Her Majesty's Government and the Secretary of State and Council of India were desirous of showing the greatest consideration for the Officers and men who might be affected by the change, and it was their earnest wish to act towards them in the most liberal spirit consistently with a due regard to the charge which might be imposed upon the finances of India.

8. The measures which have been adopted are, the transfer of nearly all the Officers and men of the European Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army, with their own consent, to new regiments of the line in Her Majesty's general army, the completion of the assimilation of the organization of the Indian Artillery and Engineers with that of the Royal Artillery and Engineers, which had been partly made in 1858; the reduction of the Native Army, and its reorganization on a different system; and the formation of a Staff Corps, as the best mode, under the altered circumstances of the service, of providing Officers for the Native Army, as well as those required for the various and miscellaneous Staff duties of several departments, Civil and Military, which have heretofore been so well performed by Officers withdrawn from regimental duty for that purpose.

9. It was, perhaps, not to be expected that in such extensive changes every Officer should retain his existing position unaltered, but a very short review of what has been done will show that upon the general body of the Officers of the Indian Army great advantages have been conferred, and that many even of those who complain of being injured in some one respect have, nevertheless, gained, on the whole, in their position and prospects.

10. It is unnecessary to remark upon the position of those Officers who voluntarily joined the new Line regiments, except to observe that many of them have obtained more rapid promotion than they would have done under the old system.

11. The assimilation of the organization of the Indian Artillery and Engineers to that of the Royal Corps has been greatly beneficial to the former in augmenting the proportion of Officers of the higher grades,* * In the Bengal Artillery, for instance, from 86 Field Officers in 1858 to 49 in 1861.

12. The only change unfavourable to them was that of a reduction of the number of Colonel's allowances. Such reduction, however, is to be made very gradually, and, with a view of meeting the cases of certain Officers whose prospects might be affected directly or indirectly by the reduction, a limited number of special annuities were offered to the Colonels of these Corps.

13. Seven Colonels of Artillery and six Colonels of Engineers have retired from the service on the pension of their rank, with the addition of these special annuities, and promotion has been made in their places.

14. The extent to which these two Corps have upon the whole benefited by the recent changes may be, in some degree, measured by the fact that the increase in pay and allowances in the two Corps, due to those changes, amounts to a sum considerably above 100,000*l.* per annum.

15. I have already reminded your Excellency of the reasons which led to the formation of a Staff Corps, and to the arrangements connected therewith.

16. The system of promotion by length of service, introduced into these Corps, was the only system suited to their position and circumstances. It was impossible to fix any number or establishment for these Corps, inasmuch as the requirements of the service and the number of Staff appointments must vary from time to time. The promotion of the Officers could not, therefore, be made dependent upon vacancies in a fixed establishment of the several grades.

17. A certain length of service in each grade, calculated on about the average length of service in the British Army, was therefore fixed as qualifying for promotion.

18. It had been suggested that the Staff Corps should be formed gradually, and as required, by means of young Officers from Her Majesty's general army, whilst those of the Indian Army who might be appointed to Staff situations should remain in their regiments as heretofore. The objections to this course have been already adverted to, and it was considered fair to give, as far as possible, to the Officers of the old service the advantages of serving under the rules and conditions laid down for the Staff Corps. All Officers, therefore, who were, or within certain periods had been, in permanent Staff employ, were invited to join it. About 1,300 Officers have already joined those Corps and participated in the advantages given to the Staff Corps.

19. It thus appears that of the Officers of the Indian Army, those who joined the Line regiments, the whole of the Artillery and Engineers, and those who joined the Staff Corps, have been generally benefited by the change.

Line Regiments -	408
Artillery -	870
Engineers -	277
Staff Corps -	1,818
	3,373

20. If to this number be added the whole of the Officers* who entered the service since 1858, on conditions subject to any change that might be introduced into the service, it will be seen that there will remain a comparatively small number who can have any real cause of complaint. I will now advert to the circumstances by which some of them may have been affected.

21. That the reduction in the Native Army to the extent of about 130,000 men should render the existing number of Officers too many for the future requirements of the service needs no demonstration.

22. During the mutiny, 62 regiments of Native Infantry and 10 of Native Cavalry in Bengal had disappeared from the service. The new regiments which were raised were organized on what has been called the Irregular system, with fewer Officers. In Madras 4 regiments of Native Cavalry and 8 regiments of Native Infantry were reduced, and in Bombay 3 regiments of Native Infantry were reduced. Upon the whole, therefore, there was a reduction of 83 regiments officered on the old system.

23. That after the administration of India had been transferred to the Crown, it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government, in the existing circumstances, to reduce the Native Army, as it would have been the duty of the East India Company if such transfer had not been made, cannot be doubted; and it was the wish and intention of Her Majesty's Government to act towards the Officers of that Army as the East India Company would have done if the same necessity of reduction had been imposed upon them.

24. According to the system pursued in the British Army, all the Officers of the regiments reduced would have been at once placed on half-pay. The Indian Officers, on the contrary, were all retained on full pay, and with the prospect of promotion continued to them.

If the practice of the English Army had been adopted a considerable saving of expense would have been made to the extent of the difference between the permanent half pay of the rank which each Officer held on reduction, and the full pay not only of such rank, but also of the increased rank which the Indian Officer might attain, and in such case the promotion of the Officers who remained would not have been affected.

When, however, the whole body of Indian Officers was retained on full pay, it was nevertheless reasonable that some reduction in the expense of the Officers who were retained beyond the requirements of the service should be effected, and such reduction could not be made without some retardation of promotion.

25. The actual retardation will be to a very small extent and in particular ranks. The general promotion of the Indian Officers will be accelerated, and to every Officer, including the cadet who entered the service so lately as December 1861, his promotion through every grade, with the pay thereunto belonging, as if the whole Native Army of India had been kept up, is assured, and his right to Indian pension is maintained.

26. The two cases in which reduction is made and in which promotion may be affected, are in the establishment of regimental Colonels and in that of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels.

27. With regard to the first, some reduction necessarily followed a diminution in the number of regiments, but the reduction will be gradual. In order to facilitate the second, a certain number of the older Officers, under the rank of Colonel, were invited to retire on largely increased pensions. The whole of the vacancies in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel created by this extraordinary measure of retirement were not filled up, but it was accompanied by great and unusual promotion throughout the whole of the ranks below that of Lieutenant-Colonel. † This is exclusive of names of Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line Regiments which are borne on the Indian lists in italics.

† Majors to Lieut. Colonel -	49
Colonels to Major -	87
Lieuts. to Captain -	123
Ensigns or Cornets to Lieutenant -	190
	449

28. These are the only measures of reduction which affect the European Officers; and for the complete reduction of the number of Officers to a level with the requirements of the service, the Government look to the cessation of new appointments and the ordinary casualties by death and retirement.

29. That every Officer should be in precisely the same situation as if no change had been made; that an Officer

should retain all the advantages which he would have enjoyed if the Native Army had been kept up to nearly twice its present amount; that a great reduction should have been effected, and everybody be left in the same position as before, was simply impracticable; but I think it may be confidently maintained that there never was a reduction and change of system effected with so large and liberal a consideration for the interests of the persons to be affected by the change, the immediate increase of pay and pensions being not less than a quarter of a million per annum, and that nothing has been done that the East India Company might not have done as regards the Officers of the Indian Army.

30. The number of memorials and petitions, however, from Indian Officers that have been presented upon this subject has shown the impossibility of carrying out any great change in an organized body such as the Indian Army, however beneficial such change might be in general, without giving some occasion to individuals for considering themselves aggrieved.

31. You will observe that the measures which, in the various memorials referred to the Commission, have been complained of as departures from the Parliamentary guarantee have been classified by the Commission under the following heads:—

- 1st. The retention of the names of Officers appointed to the Staff Corps on the cadres of their former regiments.
- 2nd. The supersession in army rank to which Officers remaining with their regiments have been subjected by the promotion of Officers joining the Staff Corps under the regulations established for promotion in that Corps.
- 3d. The retention upon the cadres of their former Corps of the names of Officers who joined the new Line regiments from the old European regiments of the Indian army.
- 4th. The retention on the cadres of Native Corps of the names of Officers who joined the new Line regiments from such Corps.
- 5th. The retardation of promotion caused by the employment of Officers of the Staff Corps whose names are retained, on duties involving less risk to health and life than those connected with regimental employment.
- 6th. The retardation to promotion caused by the retention on the cadres of the names of Officers who have joined the new Line regiments, they being employed generally on duties less likely to create casualties than if they had remained with their regiments.
- 7th. The arrangements made for regulating future succession to the Colonel's allowance in the Ordnance Corps.
- 8th. The arrangements made for regulating future succession to the Colonel's allowance in the Cavalry and Infantry.
- 9th. The reduction in the number of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels, by making promotion in succession to one half only of the Officers of that rank who accepted the special annuities offered to them on retirement in 1861.
- 10th. The effect produced by the late measures in interfering with the operation of funds established with a view of offering inducements to senior Officers to retire.
- 11th. The regulations under which Officers in receipt of Colonel's allowance are precluded from receiving Indian allowances while residing unemployed in that country.
- 12th. The order of the Government of India, No. 1070, dated 23d July 1859, revoking so much of the Order, No. 1238, dated 27th August 1858, as related to the ante-dating the Commissions of certain Lieutenant-Colonels of Artillery and Engineers.
- 13th. Arrangements for the future promotion of Officers of the Indian Army to the rank of General Officer.

32. In addition to the above alleged grievances, the Commission have noticed, in the 82d and following paras. of their Report, a few further complaints to which they do not think it necessary to advert in detail. These are not considered by the Commission to be in violation of the Parliamentary assurance, and are merely noticed to show that they were not overlooked.

33. Her Majesty's Government have given the most serious attention to this Report, which appears to have been drawn up with much deliberation and care. They are desirous of adopting such measures as shall meet the complaints declared by the Commission to be well founded as fully and completely as possible, and at the same time with the least possible disturbance of the now established order of things.

34. It will be seen that upon the 1st, 3d, 5th, 6th, 7th, 10th, 11th and 12th of the above complaints, the Commission have given their opinion that the measures complained of cannot be considered as infringements of the Parliamentary guarantee.

35. With reference to the 8th and 9th they have expressed themselves unable to form an opinion at present, but consider that the measures should be judged by the effect which may be produced by them in the cases of individual Officers.

36. In regard to these the Commission consider doubtful—

- 1st. The regulation by which 12 years is made the period of service in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel, and
- 2d. The reduction of the number of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels, by making promotion in succession to one half only of the Officers of that rank who accepted the special annuities offered to them on retirement in 1861.

37. Upon the first of these the Commission remark as follows:—

"The new rule, however, is not to affect the Lieutenant-Colonels who attained that rank before the date of the new system, and so the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three Presidencies will be tested by the time at which these Lieutenant-Colonels will succeed to the allowances in question, and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally in less than 12 years, we consider that unless the shorter average period be adopted the guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to."

38. Upon the 2d the Commission having given their attention to the amount of benefit in the shape of promotion derived by the several regiments by the retirement under those special annuities, observe,—

"We are unable to calculate the loss or the advantages, varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments, but we think that where loss can be ascertained to have taken place, there the guarantee has not been strictly adhered to."

39. In reference to both these measures it may be necessary to explain more fully their scope and object. They were connected with and arose out of the reduction in the Army in India.

40. While anxious to avoid, as far as possible, any interference with the prospects and privileges of the Officers of the Indian Army, Her Majesty's Government considered themselves not only justified in making, but bound to make, such reduction in the Native Army of India as the exigencies of the service might admit of; nor did they consider themselves precluded from doing so by the Parliamentary guarantee.

41. In this view of the scope and intent of the Parliamentary guarantee the Commission clearly concur, as they observe,—“It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if in the interests of India and of the empire at large it should deem it necessary, from reducing the numbers of the Indian Army or altering its organization. It would have been in the power of the Company to make such reductions and changes, and a similar power was transferred to the Crown.”

42. The number of Native regiments, as well as the aggregate strength of Native force, having been largely reduced, and the whole of the remaining force being about to undergo a complete change of regimental organization, Her Majesty's Government considered that a reduction in the number of Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels was not only necessary but just.

43. With the view of effecting the reduction in the former, it was in the first instance ordered by my Despatch, No. 27, of the 18th January 1861, that three Lieutenant-Colonels only should be promoted for every four vacancies among the Colonels.

44. It was at a subsequent period determined that additional annuities, calculated generally at the value of the prospective Colonel's allowance, should be offered to a limited number of Field Officers, and for the plan of reducing the number of Colonels first proposed was substituted the more equitable mode of effecting the same object by allowing the names of the retired Lieutenant-Colonels to remain on the list until they came into the position of Colonel, and then removing them.

45. Certain Officers low down in the list complained that this would ultimately retard their promotion to a serious extent, and, as a security against such retardation, the rule was adopted of giving the Colonel's allowance after 12 years to Officers who might not have attained that position in the ordinary course at an earlier period.

APPENDIX.

46. To the Lieutenant-Colonels of and subsequent to the 1st January 1862, who had, as a consequence of the numerous retirements under the annuity scheme, attained to that rank in many cases several years before they otherwise would have done so, the period of 12 years was laid down absolutely as the term of service in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel qualifying for promotion to the Colonel's allowance.

47. By this rule, one Lieutenant-Colonel of the Madras Army has already obtained the Colonel's allowance at a much earlier date than he would have done under the old system, and others are likely to be similarly benefited, nor is it probable that more than a very few cases can occur in which an Officer will not attain the Colonel's allowance after a shorter total period of service, even though he may remain rather longer in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel.

48. With regard to the contemplated reduction of Lieutenant-Colonels, the offer of annuities acceptable to a large proportion of the existing Officers of that grade presented a favourable opportunity of effecting this object, with little injury to the interests and prospects of the service at large.

49. Promotions to the full extent of these extraordinary retirements were not made. One half only of the number of Lieutenant-Colonels retiring have been filled up, but promotions were made in succession to the whole of the Majors and Captains who retired. By these extensive promotions many Officers were placed several years in advance of the position they would otherwise have held, and the position of every Officer below them in the Army was more or less improved thereby.

50. Her Majesty's Government feel confident that while large reductions in the number of the British Officers of the Native Army were imperatively called for, and will for the most part be effected by the cessation of new appointments to the Indian Army, the reduction now made, moderate in itself, has been carried out in a manner which will be found to have no injurious effect upon the interests of the Army at large, while such an extraordinary impulse has been given to promotion as cannot fail to influence the whole career of each individual and to compensate for any subsequent retardation that may be anticipated from a reduction in the higher grades.

51. The measure by which it was intended that some reduction of establishment should be combined with accelerated promotion has been attended with unequal effect in the several Presidencies, and it appears necessary that the inequality should be rectified.

In 1861, the establishment of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels at the three Presidencies was as follows:—

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Bengal - - - -	10	80
Madras - - - -	8	58
Bombay - - - -	3	35

52. It appears that the Officers of the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel accepted the annuities in 1861 in varying proportions for the several Presidencies, and that their present relative numbers, including the names of Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line regiments, vary accordingly, viz., in

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Bengal - - - -	7	59
Madras - - - -	5	39
Bombay - - - -	3	23

exclusive of General Officers, who are supernumeraries. It has been determined to apply to the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay the same proportionate reduction of Officers of this rank as has been effected in Bengal by the annuities, so that the establishment of Lieutenant-Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry in the three Presidencies shall stand hereafter as follows:

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
Bengal - - - -	7	59
Madras - - - -	6	43
Bombay - - - -	3	26

such establishment being exclusive of Lieutenant-Colonels having the rank of General Officer.

53. I have now to notice the three subjects of complaint which the Commission have considered to be well founded. These are,—

- 1st. The supersession of regimental Officers by the promotion of their brother Officers under the Staff Corps rules.
- 2d. The retention on the cadres of Native regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line regiments; and
- 3d. The arrangements laid down in the Royal Warrant of 1st January 1862 (as far as they affect the

Officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army) for regulating the promotion of Colonels of the Indian Army, of date subsequent to the 17th February 1861, to the rank of General Officer.

54. The Commission are unanimous upon two, and those the most material, of these three points, and Her Majesty's Government, although their own views may not be changed, are, nevertheless, prepared to accept the opinion of the Commission on these questions, and have given their most careful attention to the various measures that have been suggested for meeting and remedying the grievances which, in the opinion of the Commission, appear to be well founded.

55. With respect to the second of the above three complaints, considered by only a majority of the Commission to be well founded, Her Majesty's Government have determined, in deference to the opinion of the majority, that the names of the Officers who joined the new Line regiments from Native Cavalry and Infantry, including the cadres of the 4th and 5th Regiments of European Cavalry, and of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Regiments of European Infantry in Bengal, which were formed from Native regiments, shall be removed from the cadres of their former regiments, and that promotions shall be made in their places.

These promotions will date from the 18th of February, 1861.

56. The third of the complaints recognized by the Commission as well founded is the proposed amalgamation of the list of Colonels of the British and Indian Armies by which it is considered that the advancement of the Indian Officers to the rank of General Officer would be unduly retarded.

57. The effects of the Royal Warrant of the 1st January 1862, by which the arrangements for the future amalgamation of the Field Officers of the British and Indian Armies were laid down, is altogether prospective. No promotions have yet been made under that Warrant, and there is no difficulty in altering this arrangement.

58. Her Majesty's Government have, therefore, determined so far to modify the provisions of that Warrant as to retain the whole of the Officers of the Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army on the general list of that service as before for promotion to the rank of General Officer.

59. With regard to the promotion of Officers of Artillery and Engineers to the rank of Major-General, the Commission have declared themselves unable to determine the effect produced by the Royal Warrant of 1st January 1862 upon the prospects which such of these Officers as were not Colonels before the amalgamation would have of becoming General Officers; but they state that the change will ultimately, to a small extent, be beneficial to the Ordnance Corps.

60. It is desirable that the Officers of these Corps, which have become united to the Corps of Royal Artillery and Engineers, should as soon as practicable be withdrawn from the list of the Indian Army and placed on separate lists, as is the case with those of the old Royal Corps, who rise to the rank of Major-General on separate lists. It has been determined, therefore, to give to each branch of the Ordnance Corps in India a separate establishment of General Officers, calculated in the same proportion as that which governs the establishment of General Officers of the old Royal Artillery and Engineers.

61. According to this rule there will be ultimately 26 General Officers allotted to the Indian Artillery, 12 to the Engineers.

62. All Artillery and Engineer Officers, being Colonels in the Army of date prior to 18th February 1861, will continue to rise on the general list of the Indian Army.

63. Officers of those Corps who attain the rank of Colonel in the Army on or after the 18th February 1861, will rise on the separate lists above referred to towards the allotted establishment of General Officers of each Corps.

64. As regards the Field Officers of the Staff Corps it is most desirable that they should be brought hereafter on to the general list of the British Army, and that this should be effected with the least possible disturbance of the present rate of promotion in either service, and it has been determined, therefore, to bring on to the list of the British Army all Colonels of the Staff Corps whose dates of Commissions as Lieutenant-Colonel are subsequent to the 17th February 1861, leaving all those who attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel prior to the formation of those Corps to rise to the rank of General Officer on the Indian list. In these measures His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief has concurred, and a Warrant for carrying them into effect has been submitted to and approved by Her Majesty. I enclose a copy for your information. Dated 15th June 1864.

65. It only remains to consider the first of the above three complaints. In the opinion of the Commission the extensive promotion made under the Staff Corps rules unnecessarily gave superior rank to many of the Indian Officers selected for those Corps, and caused extensive supersession of the Officers remaining with their regiments.

66. It is evident that a complete remedy for this supersession in army rank must be found either in the withdrawal of the rank given to the Staff Corps Officers, or in granting such army rank to the Officers of the Indian Army as shall restore them to the relative position, as regards the Staff Corps Officers, which they held before the formation of those Corps.

67. Her Majesty's Government would have been very reluctant to adopt the first of these two courses, which must have been productive of much embarrassment and disappointment to a very large class of deserving Officers, while the replacing of those Officers in their regiments would not have been without its disadvantages even to the complainants themselves.

68. It has been considered, therefore, that the only satisfactory course open to the Government is to confer upon the Officers of the Indian Army generally such army rank as shall entirely remove all ground for complaint upon this head, by restoring to all who had been superseded the relative position, as regards the Staff Corps Officers, which they held before the formation of those Corps.

69. Her Majesty's Government believe that the object in view can be effectually attained by an extension of a system which has for many years existed in India of giving brevet rank by length of service, heretofore applicable only to the promotion of Subalterns, and by granting to the Officers of the Indian Service army rank under the following rules, the adoption of which has, with the concurrence of His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, been determined upon, viz. :—

That all Officers whose Commissions bear date on or before the 18th February 1849 shall be promoted to the rank of Captain by brevet.

All Officers whose first Commissions bear date on or prior to 18th February 1841 shall be promoted to the rank of Major by brevet; and

All Officers whose first Commissions bear date on or prior to 18th February 1835 shall be promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel by brevet; all such promotions to bear date 18th February 1861.

After the 18th February 1861, Officers of the several Staff Corps, and of Her Majesty's Indian Army generally, shall be granted brevet rank under the following regulations :—

After 12 years' standing in the army from date of first Commission, to be	-	-	Captains.
After 20 years' do.	do.	do.	Majors.
„ 20 „ do.	do.	do.	Lieutenant-Colonels.

On and after the 18th February 1866, all Officers who have served 31 years on full pay, five of which shall have been in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel, to be promoted to the rank of Colonel by brevet.

70. His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief has expressed his intention of recommending to Her Majesty that the Officers of the British Army serving in India, including the Ordnance Corps, shall have army local rank in India conferred upon them after precisely the same periods of service and under the same rules, special provision being also made in cases where Lane and Indian Officers may serve together elsewhere.

71. It is to be understood that the system of promotion to brevet rank now introduced will cease in its application to the several grades of the Army on the extinction of those grades among the Officers of the Indian Army. Thus, when the whole of the Lieutenants of the Indian Army shall have been promoted to the rank of Captain, the promotion of Officers in the Staff Corps to the brevet rank of Captain under the above rule will be discontinued, and so on with the higher grades.

72. Her Majesty's Government have thus endeavoured fairly to meet the complaints which have been addressed either to Parliament or to the Government, and the measures which they have adopted, although not free from some objection, remove the three cases of grievances which the Commissioners reported to be well founded. Her Majesty's Government, however, being anxious to extend to the Officers of the Indian Army every boon which can be given consistently with fairness to other branches of Her Majesty's service, and without imposing any undue charges on the revenues of India, have determined on adopting a further

measure which will be attended with considerable benefit to the Indian Officers.

73. Your Government will have observed that one of the principal complaints made by the Officers of the Indian Army related to the retention on the cadres of regiments of the names of Officers who had joined the several Staff Corps.

74. The Commission do not consider that this arrangement, necessary as it was from the circumstances of the case, was an infringement of the Parliamentary guarantee.

75. Irrespective of the very great expense which would have been involved in the opposite course, i.e., that of removing those names, and making promotions in their places,—a serious objection presented itself, in the very unequal promotion that would have been given in different regiments.

76. The latter objection does not apply to the removal of the names of Officers above the rank of Major from the general regimental list of the Indian Armies, and Her Majesty's Government have resolved that the names of Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line regiments shall, on coming into the position of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel on those lists, be struck out, and that promotion shall be made in their places.

77. Such promotion will be equably distributed, instead of operating unfairly in different regiments, and although some additional expense will be thus thrown upon the finances of India, the amount will not be very serious.

78. Her Majesty's Government have not overlooked the large increase which this measure will make in the number of Officers of the higher rank serving in India. It is impossible, however, that any measure which accelerates promotion should not have this effect; and Her Majesty's Government are glad to give this additional proof of the estimation in which they hold the services of the Officers of the Indian Armies.

79. In carrying out this resolution it will be necessary to remove from the list of Colonels, with Colonel's allowance, the several Officers who have been transferred to the new Line regiments, making promotion in their room on the principle laid down in my Despatch, No. 320, dated 10th August 1861, paras. 17 and 18, and in like manner to strike out the names of all Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line regiments now borne in italics upon the list of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of Cavalry and Infantry in the three Presidencies, making promotion in their places up to the establishment laid down in a preceding para. (52). In making promotion in future from the list of Majors to that of Lieutenant-Colonel, the name of every Staff Corps Officer, on coming on the list of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels, will be struck out and promotion made in his place.

80. You will give the necessary orders for making the arrangements for the prescribed establishment of Lieutenant-Colonels for the three Presidencies; for the promotions in the cadres of Native regiments, from which Officers have joined the new Line regiments; for the promotions to brevet rank of the Officers of the Indian Army and of the several Staff Corps; and for removing from the list of Colonels with Colonel's allowance the names of the several Officers who have been transferred to the new Line regiments, as well as those of all Officers of the Staff Corps and new Line regiments now borne in italics on the list of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of the three Presidencies, and you will cause the necessary promotions to be made in connection with these arrangements, and submitted to me for Her Majesty's approval.

81. With this measure the arrangements as regards the Officers of the Indian Army will be closed. The advantages which have been conferred upon the majority of those Officers have already been pointed out, and it cannot be doubted that, under the system now established, the Officers of the Indian Army will, for the most part, attain to the several regimental grades, including that of Colonel with Colonel's allowance, in a shorter period of service than they would have done had the several Staff Corps not been formed, and had no change in the constitution of the Indian Army taken place. Her Majesty's Government trust that the Officers who are affected by these changes will feel that, whilst a reduction of the Indian Army was indispensable, and a regard for the finances of the Indian Empire was an imperative duty, neither of these considerations have prevented the Government from showing that regard for their interests which the gallantry and services of the armies of India deserved.

I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES WOOD, BART., M.P.,

Upon Captain Jervis's motion, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying she will be graciously pleased to redress all such grievances complained of by the Officers of the late Indian armies, as were admitted by the Commission on the Memorials of Indian Officers" to have arisen by a departure from the assurances given by Parliament, by the Acts 21 and 22 Vict. c. 106 and 23 and 24 Vict. c. 100.—In the House of Commons, Tuesday, May 2, 1865. — Extracted from "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," vol. clxxviii.

Sir Charles Wood—I have sometimes been accused of being unwilling to rise until late in these Indian discussions, but on this occasion I am desirous of presenting myself to the House at the earliest possible moment, not only to answer the motion of the hon. and gallant gentleman, but to state the general course which has been pursued by the Secretary of State in Council upon the various questions connected with the Indian army. For there are other questions besides the amalgamation—there is the alteration of the whole organization of the Indian army, and the extraordinary reduction of that army. The three measures were carried into execution at the same time, and many of the complaints which have been ascribed to the amalgamation are really referable to the change of organization and to the reduction. I entirely concur in the high terms in which the hon. and gallant gentleman has spoken of the officers of the Indian army. They were entitled to the greatest consideration from the Government, and if I could admit for a moment that the Government had behaved to them in the manner which the hon. and gallant gentleman states, I should feel myself most guilty in the eyes of this House. But I do not hesitate to say—and before I sit down I trust to have proved it—that the result of the measures taken by the Government on the whole have placed the officers of the Indian army in a far better position as regards pay and promotion than they ever were in before. I am anxious to state this, not only to remove the false impression which exists on this subject, but also for the sake of those members of my Council, some of them Indian officers, by whose advice and with whose concurrence all these measures have been taken, and who, connected as they are with the Indian army by sympathy and by common services, have been accused of neglecting the interests and feelings of that army. Quite independently of any Parliamentary guarantee, their very natural feelings would have prevented their allowing any hardship to be inflicted on their former companions in service. The hon. and gallant gentleman has said a great deal about the number of petitions which have been presented, and if I supposed that these petitions really expressed the opinions of the officers whose names they bear I should attach more weight to them. If I thought that the grievances were not repudiated by some of the officers in whose behalf they are put forward, ["Name, name!"] I should think them of more importance. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that a system of agitation and of invitation to sign petitions has been going on for some months past. Not very long ago an officer came to the India office and talked over the changes which had been made, and said that the new arrangement had very much improved his position. Soon after that the petitions were inspected, and it was found that his name was signed to one of them. ["Name, name!"] Certainly not, I shall not give the name.

Captain Jervis.—Then it will be my duty to move for a select committee to inquire into the circumstances under which this officer's name was attached to the petition.

Sir Charles Wood.—In a matter of this sort I shall certainly not shrink from the hon. and gallant member. Not long ago I received a letter from an officer whose name I will give. It is from Colonel Cherry, a lieutenant-colonel commanding a regiment in the Madras army. "He writes to me thus:—

"Saugor, Central India, March 22.
"Sir,—I write to inform you that a pamphlet headed 'Another Grievance,' has been printed, in which the author has used my name in the most unwarrantable manner, citing my case as a grievance. I beg to state it was composed and printed entirely without my knowledge, authority, or consent. I never knew anything of it till a printed copy was sent me. It is quite illegal, as the printer's name is not put on the pamphlet. I have no grievance, and never have petitioned, and am very much annoyed at my name being so used.
Believe me, &c.
P. G. CHERRY,
Colonel 4th Madras Light Cavalry."

The hon. and gallant member will not say that in this case I have not given the name. Next on the list to Colonel Cherry is the name of Colonel Kelso, and when it is stated that our measures with regard to promotion have injured every officer in the service, I would call attention to the case of Lieutenant-Colonel Kelso, who is, nevertheless, a petitioner. In July 1861 Colonel Cherry was lieutenant-

colonel, and Mr. Kelso was a captain; but in consequence of the accelerated promotion which our measures have produced, in six months from that time Captain Kelso became a lieutenant-colonel, passing over altogether the rank of major. Three years after—namely, in the spring of this year—Lieutenant-Colonel Kelso retired. Now he happened to be in a peculiar position. In consequence of the arrangement which I made last year for striking off the names of majors in the Staff Corps and new line regiments when they rose to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, it so happened that three regiments had an interest in getting him to retire. The system of bonus, of paying for retirements, has not, as is stated, altogether ceased in India, and if I am to believe the Madras papers, Colonel Kelso has benefited to a considerable extent by the contributions from the officers of three regiments, in order to induce him to retire. He retires on a lieutenant-colonel's pension, and then he petitions the House of Commons, says he is hardly used, and his grievance is that certain officers retiring on special bonus have not been removed from the list, whereas, if they had been so removed, he might now have been in the receipt of a colonel's allowance. Now in the Madras army the ordinary time which an officer passes in the rank of major is seven years, and the ordinary time passed in the rank of lieutenant-colonel is 12 years more. Therefore, if nothing had been done out of the ordinary course, in all probability this officer would have reached his colonelcy in 19 years from the year 1861; yet he now petitions Parliament on the ground that beyond the great acceleration of his promotion, and the extraordinary advantage he has received, something more has not been done which would have enabled him to obtain a colonel's allowance in four years from the time of his being captain. I do not think that is what Parliament will consider a legitimate grievance. A statement was sent round to members of Parliament a few days ago, in which two or three cases are specially referred to. I should be glad if the House would permit me to enter into those cases as a specimen of the grievances which those officers complain of. The first grievance on this list is stated in these terms—

"Captain W. Winson, a captain in the Bengal Staff Corps, now commands the 18th Regiment Native Infantry, and has under him Major R. Larkin, of the late 49th Regiment of Native Infantry."

Now, if that has any meaning at all, its meaning is this—that, contrary to the practice of the Indian army, we have put a captain of the Staff Corps in command of an irregular regiment over the head of his senior officer, a major. Supposing that it was in consequence of orders from hence that this had been done, it would not be contrary to the practice of the Indian army, because it was always the custom in the East India Company's service to disregard rank in the command of irregular regiments. I turn to the Army List of 1856—the year before the mutiny—and I find there that the 3rd Irregular Cavalry was commanded by a lieutenant, the second in command being a captain; and that the 14th Irregular Regiment was commanded by a captain, a major being second in command. If, therefore, we had given orders for making the arrangement which is complained of, we should only have been acting in accordance with old practice in the time of the East India Company. In point of fact, we have done quite the contrary. We have given orders that no officer shall be required to serve under his junior unless with his own consent; so that this major serving under a captain can only be doing so entirely with his own consent. The next case is that of Major Spottiswood, who is stated to have been superseded in command by Lieutenant Browne, but, for the reasons I have just stated, the lieutenant could not have been put in command over him. And, in point of fact, Lieutenant Browne was in civil employment, and not in any military employment at all. The third case is thus stated—

"In the 46th Regiment Madras Native Infantry, the third captain, Alfred Cooper, was superseded, not only by two captains junior to him, but also by the senior lieutenant, A. McNeill, who was made a substantive major in the Staff Corps."

Now, what is meant by this statement is explained in a note in one of the grievance pamphlets, where it is stated

that it is only substantive rank which counts in these commands. This is directly the reverse of the fact, for a despatch of December 1863 lays down the rule that it is not substantive rank but army rank which gives the right to command. In this case also Lieutenant M'Neill was in civil and not in military employment. In neither case, therefore, could any supersession in command have taken place. The supersession in rank is completely remedied by our subsequent measures. It has been made a charge against the Secretary of State that he withheld from the officers all knowledge of the points which he was bringing under the notice of the Commissioners; but, on reference to their Report and the Appendix, it will be found that the Commissioners very properly made the officers aware of all the points mentioned by the Secretary of State, and called upon them for their explanations. Appendix D contains the questions of the Commissioners, Appendix E contains the answers of the officers in detail. I am not going into the question of bonus, as the Commission has distinctly reported that on that point there has been no breach of the guarantee. The hon. and gallant officer, however, says that I misled the Commission by stating that the bonus was an illegal proceeding. Now, of course, I did not state that upon my own authority or my own legal opinion. I stated it on the authority of two decisions in the Court of Queen's Bench, both of which had been reported. The hon. and gallant officer shakes his head, but he will find the cases reported in the newspapers. In both cases there was an action by an officer to obtain payment of the amount of a contribution towards a bonus, which was refused by the officer who had undertaken to pay it. In both cases the defence was that the transaction was an illegal one. I have the report of one of the cases before me, and I find the statement of the defendant to be substantially this, "I won't pay the money though I promised to do so, because it was an illegal transaction, and you cannot compel me to perform an illegal bargain." I say nothing of the conduct of the officer who made such a defence; but that was the defence, and I refer to it and the judgment of the Court to show that I was justified in stating the opinion by which the hon. and gallant gentleman says I misled the Commission. The Lord Chief Justice, in giving judgment in the first case, said—

"The Court must take cognizance of what offices were legally saleable, and they knew that a commission in the East India Company's service was not legally saleable, and no rule of the Indian service could repeal the statute. There must be judgment for the defendant."

In *The Times* newspaper I find the following report of a subsequent case which came before the Court on the 4th of June 1855:—

"A rule was immediately obtained for a new trial in the Court of Exchequer. After taking time to consider, judgment was given by the Judges on the 4th of June 1855. In the unanimous opinion of the Bench, the transaction by which a sum of money was secured to the major of the regiment to which these officers belonged, to induce his retirement, was illegal, and the bond given by the defendant could not be enforced by law. The transaction amounted to the gift of a money consideration to an officer holding a commission in the East India service to induce him to leave it. It behoved the Court to let it go forth that, in its opinion, any tampering with the sale of a public office not only rendered the transaction void, but subjected the parties concerned to the penalties consequent on the commission of a misdemeanor. There must, therefore, be judgment for the defendant."

Well, Sir, I beg to say that I do not think I misled the Commission, and I do not think I misled the House, by what I said on the subject of the illegality of the payment of bonuses, when a court of law had stated, in language as strong as any which could be used, that such payment was illegal. I am not speaking in favour of the officers who made the defence, I am speaking of the illegality of the transaction. Having now disposed of these separate points, I will refer to the general terms of the motion of the hon. and gallant gentleman. He calls upon the House to vote an Address to the Queen for the redress of all the grievances of the Indian officers, admitted to be such by the Royal Commissioners, but he has not made any attempt to show that the grievances have not been redressed with respect to the cases in which he says I have not fulfilled the promise I made to accept the opinion of the Commission and to act upon it. I will not refer to those cases only, because that would not give the House a fair idea of the difficulties we had to surmount, or the way in which we have dealt with them. I will state the whole course which we have pursued from the first in order to effect the three great measures of amalgamation, change of organization, and re-

duction of the Indian army. After long and anxious deliberation with the members of my Council we made up our minds what should be done, and despatches were prepared containing all the instructions for carrying out our plan. The whole of the documents and despatches were laid before the law officers of the Crown. We did not make a case for them, we merely submitted the papers to them and asked whether there was anything in the instructions which we proposed to give which was contrary to the pledge contained in the two Acts of Parliament. The then Attorney and Solicitor General and the counsel for the East India Company stated that, in their opinion, there was nothing in what we proposed to do which might not have been done by the East India Company, and whatever the East India Company might have done it was within our power to do. Fortified in our opinion by that answer to our question, we proceeded in the course we had determined upon with considerable confidence. Various complaints were afterwards made of the effect of these measures on the position of a portion of the Indian officers, and as I did not wish to stand only on a legal and technical construction of the words of the Acts of Parliament, I referred the question to the Commission which has been alluded to. I do not know whether the hon. and gallant officer meant that blame attached to me for having appointed a law lord to the chairmanship of that Commission, but I may state that when the state of Lord Dalhousie's health (who had been appointed chairman of the Commission in the first instance) precluded him from attending their sittings the Commissioners themselves asked me to appoint somebody of legal knowledge and acquirements to the vacant place, and therefore, in nominating Lord Cranworth to the position, I merely complied with their request. I am sure the House will be of opinion that no fairer or more impartial person could have been appointed chairman than Lord Cranworth, and I am glad of having the opportunity of expressing my obligation to that noble lord, and to the rest of the Commissioners, for the care and attention they bestowed upon the matter. It is perfectly true, as the hon. and gallant gentleman says, that the Commission classed the alleged breaches of the guarantee under thirteen heads. They stated that in eight of these there was no just cause of complaint, that in three others there was cause of complaint, and that in two others there might possibly at some future time be cause of complaint. I can unhesitatingly state my belief that in the three cases in which the Commission reported actual causes of complaint to have occurred, I have completely remedied the grievances complained of. In one of the two cases in which the Committee stated that cause of complaint might hereafter arise, it is quite impossible that up to this time any grievance can have been felt for the rule under which they thought that cause of complaint might arise, has not come into operation. In the cases where there were grounds for complaint which it might be impossible to deal with directly, the Commissioners stated their opinion that it would be fair to give some compensatory advantages to the Indian army, and that this would be a redemption of the pledge given to Parliament; and I trust that, before I sit down, I shall show that, in respect to any possible retardation of promotion in a particular rank, more than ample compensation has been given, as the acceleration of promotion generally and the amount of additional pay given to the Indian army during the last four years has been unexampled. In speaking of the three measures with which we had to deal, amalgamation, change of organization, and reduction, I shall endeavour to keep them entirely distinct. As to the first measure, which is termed amalgamation, I think I shall be able to show that no cause of complaint can now exist with reference to it; and, in making that statement, I may rely upon the admission in the statement now put forward by the officers themselves, that the only complaints which could be said to have any connexion with amalgamation have been fully met by our recent measures. The word amalgamation does not exactly express what was done in the matter. What really was done was this. The three old European regiments of infantry in each of the three Indian presidencies were invited to volunteer for general service, they being already Queen's troops by the measure of the noble lord. The soldiers, almost to a man, and nearly the whole of the officers, accepted the proposal. For example, in the three first regiments of each presidency, out of 119 officers 99 volunteered either for the new line regiments or for the Staff Corps, and of the remainder 8 were already in staff employment, leaving only 12 to be disposed of. The 9 regiments thus formed were added to the regular army. A similar course was taken with regard to the 3 cavalry regiments, which were formed out of the newly raised regiments of Europeans. Nearly all the officers and men volunteered, and vacancies were filled up in them, as in the infantry regiments, by

APPENDIX.

volunteers from the rest of the army. Every man who joined did so of his own free will, and I must therefore be permitted to say that, although I have seen some newspapers endeavouring to invent grievances for them, I do not see what possible cause of complaint they can have. It was a voluntary proceeding on their part. They are officers in Queen's regiments, with the right which they had in their old regiments of rising by seniority, and they retain the privileges of the old Indian officers as to retirement and pensions. The artillery, with hardly any exceptions, volunteered for general service. Their organization was assimilated to that of the old Royal artillery, which gave them considerable promotion and advantages. The Bengal Artillery, for instance, had thirty-nine field officers before the change, and forty-eight afterwards. The whole of the increased pay and emoluments of the artillery in the three armies of India given to them in making the late changes amounted to about 75,000*l.* per annum. The only officers who could suffer in any way were some of the older officers, and additional pensions of 200*l.* per annum were offered to them, on which, I think, seven officers retired. A similar course was pursued with regard to the engineers. The increase of pay and emoluments in their case amounted to about 55,000*l.* per annum. In the mode which I have thus described the European infantry and cavalry, as well as the artillery and engineers, became part of Her Majesty's general army by their own voluntary act, with an increase of pay and of promotion and retaining their right to retire on the Indian rate of pension. It seems to me that on their part there can be no cause of complaint. There was, however, one measure adopted, and it is the only one to which the expression of "amalgamation" can properly be applied. It was thought desirable, as all the officers of the Queen's and of the late Indian armies were now to receive the same commissions from the Queen, and to be eligible for the service in any part of the world, that the field officers should rise on one list to be general officers. The commencement of this system was postponed so far that it seemed impossible to say whether they would gain or lose by it. The Royal Commission, however, reported that this step was in breach of the Parliamentary guarantee. As the warrant had not come into operation there was no difficulty in cancelling it. Nobody could be injured. The warrant was therefore cancelled, and the Indian officers rise to the rank of general officers as before. It is admitted by the officers themselves that this grievance is completely remedied. There was another complaint admitted by the Commission to be a breach of the guarantee, not indeed arising out of amalgamation, but as it is connected with the formation of the new line regiments I may as well mention it here. The Indian officers complained that the non-removal from the cadres of their regiments of the names of officers who joined the Staff Corps or the new line regiments was a breach of the guarantee. The Commission reported that it was not so as regarded those who joined the Staff Corps, or as regarded those who joined the new line regiments from the cadres of the European regiments; but that it was a breach as regarded those who joined the new line regiments from native regiments. I cannot understand the distinction, but we accepted their view, and removed the latter class from their cadres. This step is also admitted to be a complete remedy. Now these are the only two grievances complained of which have the slightest reference to amalgamation, and I wish particularly to impress this upon the House, because I know that there is a general notion that the alleged grievances arise out of the measure which I myself carried of amalgamation. It is, however, from other measures, to which I will refer by-and-by, that any grievances arise which are now said to exist. Out of amalgamation it is not now even alleged that any case of complaint remains. The other two measures we had to carry out were the changes in the organization and a very large reduction in the army. It will be obvious that it must have been within the power of the East India Company to effect both these changes, and that the power which they possessed was transferred to us in all its entirety. On that point the Commissioners said—

"It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if in the interests of India and of the empire at large it should deem it necessary, from reducing the numbers of the Indian army or altering its organization. It would have been in the power of the Company to make such reductions and changes, and a similar power was transferred to the Crown."

It only remains, therefore, to show how we acted in the exercise of what was unquestionably within our power. I will proceed, in the first instance, to explain the change which we have made in the organization of the Indian armies, an essential part of which was some such measure

as the formation of a Staff Corps. The hon. and gallant officer has talked of the Staff Corps as if it were an extraordinary and unheard of anomaly; but now let us see how that matter stands, and what were the reasons for its creation. In order to arrive at any just estimate of the merits of the system which we have introduced, it is essential to look back to that which existed before. In the Indian army as it existed before the mutiny—and that is the fairest period to take, in order to understand the former state of things—there were two descriptions of force, the regular and the irregular regiments, differing in their organization in several respects, but mainly in the number of officers. Including the armies of the presidencies, the contingents, and other forces, there were 176 regular and 108 irregular regiments. We have substituted irregular for regular regiments throughout the army of Bengal, where, indeed, the regular regiments had almost disappeared in the mutiny. We have done the same in the army of Bombay, and intend doing so with the army of Madras. Under the old system of the Indian army there were 23 officers to each regular regiment, of whom five were placed there, not for duty with the regiment, in order that they might be available for staff employment. A large number of officers, in political, civil, and other employment, and all officers of the irregular regiments were under this system withdrawn from their own regiments. It will be remembered that this was described as almost the ruin of the Indian army. It was stated that the *élite* of the officers—the picked men—were taken away from their regiments, and those who were left were kept back and discouraged. I might quote the opinions of many very distinguished officers of the Indian army, expressed in the strongest terms to that effect, but I do not wish to do so, because it might be painful to some to hear the expressions that were used. But I may be permitted to quote a short paragraph of a letter from Lord Elphinstone, which will be found in one of the papers on the table of the House, and which states the case very clearly. Lord Elphinstone says—

"The best regiments in Bengal were the irregular cavalry, and the same holds good throughout India. In these regiments you had only three or four English officers, but they were picked men, and so were the native officers. I would apply this system to the whole native army—infantry, as well as cavalry. The saving of expense would be great, for, if I am not mistaken, one regular native cavalry regiment costs as much as three times the number of irregulars. But the saving of expense would be nothing compared to the gain in efficiency."

That is the opinion of Lord Elphinstone, who had been Governor of Madras, and was then Governor of Bombay; a man of very considerable experience, and who showed by his conduct during the mutiny how sound his judgment was on such subjects. That extract shows that, in his opinion, by adopting generally the irregular system, the efficiency of the army would be improved, and no inconsiderable expense saved. In the state of Indian finance at that time, with a large yearly deficit, the saving of expense was no trifling consideration, and the same reason is hardly less strong at present. When the whole change is completed, the saving effected by substituting irregular for regular regiments will be no less than 330,000*l.* per annum. We, therefore, determined on this step. It was no measure of mine, pressed by me upon an unwilling Council. The great advocate of the change was Sir John Lawrence, and it was adopted by a large majority of the Council. It then remained to be determined how officers were to be provided for the regiments so formed, as well as for staff employment generally. The question of providing officers for staff employment in some other manner than by withdrawing them from their regiments had often been discussed in India, and it was pretty well agreed that the only means of doing so was by the formation of a staff corps. Lord Dalhousie was anxious to carry some such measure into effect when the army existed in its original state. There was, of course, great difficulty in the way; but when nearly the whole of the regular regiments of the Bengal army had ceased to exist the difficulty was very much diminished. In 1860 there were 106 regular and 131 irregular regiments in existence; we acted on the opinions so long entertained and confirmed by the great authority of Sir John Lawrence; we put the army on the irregular system, giving six European officers to each regiment instead of three. Then came the question, from whence were the officers for the irregular regiments to be drawn. In truth there was no resource but that portion of the British army which passes through India in its course of service; there was no other body from which they could be taken. Lord Elphinstone had pointed this out very clearly in the letter which I have quoted before, and Lord Clyde, Sir William Mansfield, Sir Hugh Rose, and Sir Robert Napier all concurred in opinion

that as soon as we had room for the employment of line officers we should find no difficulty in obtaining their services. At present there is no room for more line officers than were already in staff employment, as there are plenty of Indian officers, either in the Staff Corps or available from the cadres, for all the places of staff employment. There are, however, several line officers in staff employment. Now, it is obvious as regards officers of the line, who would naturally quit India with their regiments, that in order to retain their services for India they must be withdrawn from their regiments and formed into a corps devoted to Indian service, and at the disposal of the Government in India for the various staff situations in political, civil, or military employment. The formation of a Staff Corps, in order to retain the services of the officers of the line then in staff employment, and in which all line officers wishing for permanent employment in India would be placed, and as the only source from which ultimately, when the officers of the late Indian armies cease to exist as a separate body, all officers for such employment must be provided, was therefore a matter of necessity. We might certainly have formed a Staff Corps, consisting only of line officers, but would it have been right to exclude from it all Indian officers? I think that such a course would have given them a just cause of complaint, and therefore it was determined to admit into it also those officers of the Indian army who were in staff employment, or had been so within three years. The next question was how the officers of the Staff Corps were to be promoted. There could be no establishment, because the number of persons required for staff employment might vary. If the army was increased more officers would be wanted, if diminished fewer would be required, and in like manner as more or fewer officers were required for the various civil and political situations which have at all times been filled with great advantage by military men. It followed, as a necessary consequence, that the numbers of the Staff Corps must vary with the demands of the service. There could, therefore, be no possible mode of promotion except by length of service. The Commission to which the hon. and gallant member referred, which was presided over by my noble friend opposite (Lord Hotham), on the question of amalgamation, made a report, from which I will read some extracts in reference to this question of a Staff Corps. They said—

“A Staff Corps to be formed for service in India, to consist of an unlimited number of officers of all ranks. All officers of the local armies and of the line now holding permanent staff or detached appointments, excepting such as are purely military, but including service with irregulars, to have the option, subject to the approval of the Indian Government, of being transferred to the Staff Corps or returning to regimental duty. . . . Promotion in the Staff Corps to be governed by length of service, and to be irrespective of departmental position. . . . The whole of the officers of irregular native corps to be on the staff list. . . . We conceive, however, that officers so circumstanced must hold a commission for their substantive rank in lieu of their former regimental commission.”

We have done what is there recommended. We offered to all the officers of the Indian army who were in Staff employment, or who had been so within a certain time, the option of going into the Staff Corps. We went one step further. We thought it not unfair to give to those officers who had been in Staff employment the benefit of that service as regards promotion as if the Staff Corps had been formed when they went into Staff employment. It is this step which in fact has led to the complaint of supersession. I fully admit that it was the case that officers transferred to the Staff Corps might rise more rapidly in that corps than those who were senior to them in their regimental cadres, and might thus supersede them in army rank. They could not supersede them in regimental rank, for that went on as before, and an order was issued preventing a Staff Corps officer being in any case put over the head of an officer who had been senior to him in his old regiment. The only supersession was in army rank. I remember my hon. and gallant friend behind me stating the case to me very fairly in this way. He said that at Bangalore, or some other station, there were several Staff Corps officers who had gained rank in this way, and that it was very possible that if their old regiments came there these officers might take precedence at a court-martial of some of their former seniors, or take command of them on parade, or in the field. I may be permitted to say, in justification of the course which we took, that there are examples enough of supersession in rank having been caused by different measures adopted in India under the rule of the East India

Company. When my hon. and gallant friend talks of what he calls the indisputable rights of the Indian officers, he seems to forget that on several occasions the East India Company showed by their acts that they did not recognize these alleged rights. There is none on which he lays more stress than the right of rising in a regiment by seniority. I fully admit that it was only in extraordinary cases that the general practice of promotion by regimental seniority was interrupted. But if the East India Company thought right on extraordinary cases, for the good of the public service, to depart from the rule, that is enough to show that seniority was not acknowledged as a certain and indisputable right. There are examples given in the statements of the officers themselves in which regimental seniority is entirely set aside. It is stated that in the Caubul expedition some regiments lost a great number of officers. One regiment lost four, another five. Four does not seem to be a very great loss in a regiment of 18 or 20. Were, then, the officers in the regiment always allowed to rise by seniority in India? [“Yes.”] No, they were not. There are three or four cases stated by the officers themselves, which show that officers from other regiments were placed over officers in the regiments there named. In the 5th Bengal Cavalry four lieutenants were placed above cornets in that way. [Colonel SYKES: They were boys.] Does the hon. and gallant member mean to say that an officer forfeits his alleged indefeasible right of promotion because he is a young man?—In the 5th Native Infantry there were a captain and five lieutenants from another regiment placed above all the ensigns. In two other regiments four lieutenants from other Corps were placed above all the ensigns. In all these cases the officers of the regiment, according to the proposition of my hon. and gallant friend behind me, had an indisputable and indefeasible right to rise in their own regiment by regimental seniority; but that right was not recognized by the East India Company, and officers from other regiments were put over their heads in their own. We have done nothing of the kind, but I mention these facts to show that the assertions put forward as to these alleged rights are not so well founded in fact as they are asserted to be. We have not in the slightest degree interfered with regimental seniority. The officers of the Indian army continue to rise step by step on that basis. The cadet who went into the army in 1860, who has never seen a day's service, and had not even joined his regiment, will rise to the rank of colonel or general officer in a regular course by seniority, by successive steps, with the full pay of the successive ranks which he attains, and without any interruption, from the day on which he received his first commission. I come now to other instances of supersession in former years. When the Royal artillery went to India the East India Company thought it desirable to promote the majors of their own Ordnance Corps, as that rank did not exist in the Royal artillery, and they gave to all the majors of the artillery and engineers the substantive rank of lieutenant-colonels. The effect of this was that these officers superseded at one step all the majors of the cavalry and infantry of the Indian armies. The junior lieutenant-colonel of engineers in Bengal superseded 118 majors, and all these officers got substantive rank in their corps. In 1824 the East India Company formed the second battalion of each regiment of the Indian army into a new regiment, and appointed to it half of the officers of the old regiment. In these new regiments the officers transferred to them might rise in substantive rank and pay above their seniors in the old regiment, thus superseding them precisely as an officer rising in rank in the Staff Corps might supersede an officer of his old cadre. Further than that, according to the practice of the East India Company, a lieutenant-colonel might be moved from one regiment to another, so that an officer who had risen rapidly to the rank of lieutenant-colonel in one of these new regiments might have been sent to command his old regiment and so be placed over officers who had been his seniors in that very regiment. We have done nothing of this kind. We have issued a positive prohibition against any officer being put in command of a regiment containing a man who has been his senior in the same regiment. We are accused of departing from the practice of the East India Company by superseding senior officers by juniors, while we have actually prohibited its being done. Now what the East India Company did in this case, of forming the new regiments, that is giving to a great number of officers substantive pay and rank in several new corps by which they might supersede in army rank the officers of the regiments from which they were taken, is precisely what we have done in giving substantive rank and pay in one other new corps by which they might in like manner supersede in army rank the officers of their old regiments. I mention these different cases to show that the Government had some justification for the course they

APPENDIX.

pursued regarding this grievance of which the officers complain, and that we only did what the East India Company had done in repeated instances. The Commission, however, reported that in their opinion this was a breach of the guarantee. Their statement of the complaint is as follows:—

“But what the officers complain of on this head is, the immediate and prospective supersession in rank of regimental officers by those in the Staff Corps, which was the inevitable consequence of the rules regulating promotion in the Staff Corps, and especially of that which allows previous Staff service to count towards the period of service qualifying for promotion in the Staff Corps.”

I accepted their opinion. The question then was how to remedy it. The hon. and gallant officer has referred to one course which certainly was possible and would have been effectual—namely, cancelling the rank given in the Staff Corps. The gallant officer behind me (Colonel Sykes) advocated this course, but I never heard of anyone else who did so. He stood alone. It would, I think, have been a grievous hardship to have deprived many of the best officers in the Indian army of the rank which they had enjoyed for more than three years, besides which, to have sent them back to their regiments would have been injurious in some cases to the officers who had remained with the regiments. The only alternative, therefore, was to give to the regimental officers the same army rank as the staff officers had obtained. I consulted his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief upon the question, because it was one which not only affected the position of the officers of the Indian army, but also that of the officers of the line. The Duke of Cambridge has shown the greatest consideration for the Indian officers, and has done his utmost to consult their interest in every way. His Royal Highness concurred in the opinion that this was the best mode of dealing with the question. It had been always the custom in the Indian army, when a lieutenant had served 15 years, to give him the brevet rank of captain, and to lieutenants in the line of the same standing the local rank of captain was given. It was determined to follow this precedent. Brevet rank to the regimental officers of the Indian army, and local rank to the officers of the line serving in India, was given from the date of the formation of the Staff Corps, so that from that date the whole of the officers of the Indian army, including the Staff Corps, will be promoted in army rank after the same periods of service. The Bombay Government remonstrated against this order as causing some supersession of the Staff Corps' officers, and of some fortunate officers who had been lucky in obtaining their promotion, and their remonstrance was sent to the Government of India, who referred it to Sir Hugh Rose, the Commander-in-Chief in India. Sir Hugh Rose, an officer who has taken the greatest possible interest in the whole of this question for four or five years reported upon it to the Governor of India, and I may be permitted to read his opinion upon the mode of meeting the grievance which we adopted. It is as follows:—

“Under the measures directed by the right hon. the Secretary of State, the chief cause of complaint, as frequently brought to the notice of Government by his Excellency—namely, the supersession of regimental officers by their juniors of the Staff Corps—has been removed entirely. It may at the same time be observed that, while some officers will continue to suffer supersession, the privileges now conferred on the army generally are specially advantageous to the officers who have not joined the Staff Corps, and to those who have been unfortunate in their promotion. It is not for the Commander-in-Chief to question or discuss the measures deliberately sanctioned and directed by Her Majesty's Government in redress of the grievances of the officers of the Indian service, but his Excellency may be permitted to say that, without cancelling the amalgamation arrangements altogether, he does not think that a more equitable scheme could have been devised than that which the Bombay authorities desire to suspend.”

The Government of India, in forwarding copy of the above letter, says—

“It is scarcely possible that extensive changes in the army should ever be made without unfavourably affecting the position of some individuals relatively—that is, as compared with that of some others—and the instance in question is no exception to this rule. But we think that there can be no doubt that, by the measures ordered in your despatch, substantial hardship in the matter of promotion is avoided.”

I do not know that anything that I can add could be more satisfactory or could be stated more clearly than that opinion of Sir Hugh Rose. I do not think, therefore, that

I need say anything more upon this subject, and I beg the House to observe, that if this be so, the three cases in which the Commissioners reported that just cause of complaint had occurred are entirely remedied by the measures which we have taken on the Report of the Commission. In two of these cases it is admitted by the officers themselves that the grievances are completely remedied, and in the third I think that I have now shown that our remedial measure is not less complete. I come now to the last great measure which we took, and out of which arose two contingent grievances, if I may so call them—the reduction of the Indian army. It was within the power of the East India Company to have reduced their army as it was within our power; and certainly in the circumstances of the time, it would have been their duty, if the Company had been in existence, as it was our duty, to make that reduction. I doubt whether the House is at all aware of the extent of that reduction. The whole native force, including the contingents and other forces, numbered previous to the mutiny 265,000 men. Now, the only source of danger arose from our native army. The princes and people were all faithful, and it was the army alone which caused our difficulty, and it was therefore clearly incumbent upon us to reduce that overgrown force. Nor was there any means of providing for the payment of the increased European garrison of India, which everybody considers to be indispensable, smaller in numbers, but far more costly than the native army, except by diminishing the expense of the latter. This was accordingly done. The native soldiers were discharged with pensions or gratuities. The officers are all retained on full pay. The gallant officer has referred, not quite correctly, to what I have said about placing the Indian officers on half-pay, and has denied that there was any half-pay in the Indian army. I admit that there is no half-pay of the same character as that of the British army. What is termed half-pay in India is, in fact, a lower rate of pension. But what I have said, and I say again, is, that when the British army was reduced after the peace of 1815, a great number of officers were placed on the half-pay of their rank, and there they remained, were never promoted, or got anything more. The same thing occurred in the navy. The same thing takes place on any reduction—the officers are placed on half-pay. Now, I certainly stated this to show in how different a manner we had treated the Indian officers. I do not know why, if a large reduction had been made by the East India Company, they would not have been warranted in placing their supernumerary officers on some rate of pension proportioned to their pay. It is quite true that there never has been any great reduction in the Indian army. The continually increasing size of our Indian Empire never allowed of any large diminution of their military force. The only case of reduction complete in itself, though not large in amount, was the reduction of the St. Helena establishment; and in that case the officers received a retiring allowance somewhat more than the pensions of their respective ranks. I do not know why some such course might not have been taken on a reduction of the armies of India. We did not, however, adopt any such course. We have given—and this is the least advantageous position in which they can be placed—to all Indian officers full pay and promotion to the end of their career in the service. But we certainly thought that we were warranted in making some small reduction of officers on so large a reduction of the army, and it is out of the very mild measure for this purpose that the first of the possible breaches of guarantee, as stated by the Commission, may arise. We thought that, with the reduction of the number of regiments, there might fairly be some reduction of the colonels' allowances. Let the House remember what colonels' allowances really are. In former times colonels were paid by the profits on the clothing of their regiments. If there were no regiments to be clothed there could be no profits for the colonels; and in like manner when an annual payment—the colonels' allowances—was substituted for the profits of clothing, the colonels' allowance would cease also when the regiment ceased to exist. We reduced the native army by 135,000 men, or by 101 regiments, of which from sixty to seventy were regular regiments. Consequent upon this reduction was there to be no reduction of officers? The first question naturally was as to the possible reduction of the number of colonels' allowances. Upon this subject Lord Hotham's Committee, to which I have referred, reported to the following effect:—

“If in the process of passing from a war to a peace establishment any regiments are reduced absolutely, and the strength of the army reduced to a corresponding extent, then the number of colonels must necessarily be reduced also, and the number of allowances at the same time.”

Of course, we never thought of taking the allowances away

from those who had enjoyed them, or of reducing them all at once. We did propose gradually to reduce the number of colonels' allowances. We proposed, in the first instance, to fill up only three vacancies out of four. It is not unusual, I believe, in cases of reduction, to fill up only alternate vacancies, but we gave a much larger proportion. This, of course, would have caused some retardation of promotion, as there would be fewer colonels' allowances to which officers could rise. Changes of various kinds, and of a complicated nature, were afterwards proposed, into which it is unnecessary that I should enter, and the ultimate arrangement was that there should be an unlimited number of colonels' allowances, but that lieutenant-colonels who attain that rank, after a certain date, should only attain to the colonels' allowances after a service of 12 years in the rank of lieutenant-colonel. This term was shorter than the average period in the Madras army, longer than that in the armies of Bengal and Bombay. The possible retardation arising out of this measure—for none has occurred as yet, and I very much doubt whether any ever will occur—is alleged to be a departure from the pledge to treat the Indian officers as the East India Company would have done. Now, it happens that the only reduction made in the East India Company's time, that I am aware of, was in 1823. In that year two lieutenants were reduced in each regiment. These officers were kept as supernumeraries in their regiments until by casualties among the officers above them they could be absorbed. Of course, till this was done, the promotion of all the officers below them was retarded. Our measure, therefore, by which some retardation of promotion might be caused, was in strict accordance with what the East India Company had done, and I can hardly admit this to be a breach of the pledge. Another measure, one of the effects of which was of a somewhat similar character, was also taken at the same time. We gave an extraordinary bonus, in order to induce the older officers to retire. About 300 officers accepted the terms, but we did not feel ourselves bound to fill up all the vacancies created by this extraordinary measure. We filled up only half the vacancies on the list of lieutenant-colonels, giving, however, all the other promotions consequent thereon. In consequence of this extraordinary scheme of retirement 49 officers were promoted to be lieutenant-colonels, 87 to be majors, 123 to be captains, and 190 to be lieutenants. It was considered by four members of the Commission that the retardation arising out of this measure might lead to a breach of the guarantee. Three members, including one of the two Indian officers, thought that when a costly measure of retirement entirely out of the ordinary course was given, it was not incumbent on us to fill up all the vacancies, and that it was only fair, when so large a reduction of the army was to be made, that some gradual reduction of the higher rank of officers should take place. I hope the other members of the Commission will forgive me for thinking that this is the more reasonable view of the case. I hope, too, that they will forgive me for saying that I do not think that any small retardation of promotion which may arise out of these two measures, firstly, not keeping up as many colonels' allowances as before, for an army reduced nearly to one-half of its former strength; secondly, not filling up all the vacancies caused by an extraordinary retirement can fairly be considered as a breach of the pledges given by Parliament. The only ground on which it is supposed that they may lead to it, is that they may in some degree retard the attainment of colonels' allowances. I doubt whether, in point of fact, any officer will be retarded, with reference to his whole period of service, in the attainment of his colonel's allowance. I will now proceed to show to what extent we have given increased pay and promotion to the officers of the Indian army, so that I believe I am full entitled to say that never in its history was their position, in point of pay and prospects of promotion, so good. The Commission reported that if it was impossible to retain all the advantages enjoyed under the East India Company some counterbalancing benefit should be given in compensation for them. I do not know what I have taken away, and I will now proceed to state what we have given in pay, pension, promotion, in all that is of advantage to the officers; and I think the House will admit, when they have heard my statement, that what we have given is ample and more than ample compensation for any possible loss of advantage if, which I do not believe possible, that loss can be shown. I begin with pay. I have already mentioned the increased pay to the artillery and engineers; and I may now state, without going into particulars, that the whole charge imposed upon the revenue of India consequent upon the increased promotions and pensions recently given has amounted to a little more than a quarter of a million. That charge will, of course, be diminished as pensions fall off, but the immediate effect of our measures was to increase the pay, pensions, and emolu-

ments, in one shape or another, of the existing officers to that amount. I come now to promotion, and in this respect I must say that it is not fair to consider only what may occur in one particular rank. The promotion given in the whole of an officer's career should be taken into account; and I will state to the House two or three examples of the extent to which promotion has been accelerated by the measures we have adopted. It must be evident that no measures can affect the highest ranks. Vacancies in the rank of colonels only occur by death, and the tendency in the Indian army, up to the time of the mutiny, had been to prolong the period of service. The length of service of the colonels at that period and now is more than it was in 1849. But we could produce an effect upon the lower ranks, and more, of course, as we go down in rank. One of the complaints of the Indian officers was, that we had not removed from the cadres the names of the officers who joined the Staff Corps and line regiments, and given promotion in their room. This would have led to the most unequal and unjust supersession. For instance, in one regiment of Bombay infantry, the major, all the captains, and the three senior lieutenants, joined the Staff Corps. If the demand, made in the memorials from many Indian officers, had been acceded to, the fourth lieutenant would have at once become major. He was an officer of nine years' service, and he would have superseded the senior captain of the next regiment on the other side of the page in the *Army List*, an officer of 21 years' service. It is not a little remarkable that those who complain so violently of supersession by our measures should have themselves proposed a measure which must have led to greater and far more unequal supersession than any which could have resulted from our measures. But the same objection does not apply to removing from the list of regimental field officers of the Indian armies the names of such officers when they attain the rank of lieutenant-colonel, for then, throughout all the regiments of the army, the promotion in their place goes equally in their turn. Every regiment gets its fair share of the promotion. After the report of the Commission, and in addition to the measures for the remedy of the admitted complaints, we determined on removing the names of all Staff Corps and new line officers from the before-named lists on their attaining the rank of lieutenant-colonel and giving the consequent promotions to the regimental officers. The immediate effect of this step was to promote 35 officers to be lieutenant-colonels, and in 63 regiments captains got a step nearer to that rank. The prospective effect may be judged of from the fact that in the Bengal cadres there are now 82 majors, of whom 48 are in the Staff Corps or new line regiments. They will go off those lists altogether on becoming lieutenant-colonels, and the promotion of the remaining number of majors in the cadres, that is, 34 will promote 82 captains. The immense effect of this measure in rapidly accelerating promotion is obvious. Since our measures have come into operation promotion has become much more rapid. I will compare the time of service in two ranks, that of lieutenant-colonel and major in the last year before the mutiny, and in the present year. The average length of service of the lieutenant-colonels in the three Indian armies on the 1st of January, 1857 and the 1st of January 1865, were respectively—In the cavalry—Bengal, 37 years 6 months and 37 years 3 months; Madras, 37 years 6 months and 35 years 3 months; Bombay, 33 years 3 months and 28 years. In the infantry—Bengal, 36 years and 35 years respectively; Madras, 38 years and 37 years; Bombay, 36 years and 34 years. Then, coming to the majors, I find that the average service has diminished in the cavalry—Bengal, from 33 years and 4 months to 22 years and 6 months; Madras, 34 years 4 months to 25 years 6 months; Bombay, 33 years to 29 years. So with regard to the infantry, there has been a diminution in the average period of service of from four to five years, so that a considerable acceleration of promotion is clearly traceable to the operation of our measures. In 1857 I find that the 20 junior colonels of Bengal infantry had obtained that rank in 44 years and 9 months. The 20 junior lieutenant-colonels in 1865 will attain the rank of colonel under the 12 years' rule in 38 years 9 months—an acceleration of 6 years. Now, let me call the attention of the House to this fact, as bearing upon the alleged hardship of the rule for 12 years' service in the rank of lieutenant-colonel. If the officer attains his colonel's allowance in the same time as before, but of that period passes 12 years instead of 10 in the rank of lieutenant-colonel, the additional 2 years in that rank must be deducted from the time of his service in some lower rank, and at any rate he gains the advantage of lieutenant-colonel's pay instead of the pay of some lower rank for 2 years; but if he attains the colonel's allowance 6 years sooner, then 8 years is to be deducted from his service in a rank below that of lieutenant-colonel—he

APPENDIX

APPENDIX.

gains for 2 years the higher pay of lieutenant-colonel, and for 6 that of colonel's allowance. Surely so far from there being any cause of complaint, there is great advantage to the Indian officers from our measures. I will now compare the average length of service of the 20 junior lieutenant-colonels in the three armies on 1st January 1857, and 1865. Their service was at the above periods respectively—Bengal, 34 years and 30 years; Madras, 36 years and 32 years; Bombay, 36 years and 30 years; showing a gain of 4 years in two Presidencies, of 6 in the other. The average periods passed in the rank of major has been diminishing to the following extent in the three Presidencies respectively, Bengal, 2 years and 8 months; Madras, 3 years and 8 months; Bombay, 3 years and 4 months. Lastly, let me take the number of promotions to substantive rank in the three Indian armies in the four years ending 1857 and the four years ending 1865, being the last four years of the ordinary state of India before the mutiny, and the last four years since the constitution of the Staff Corps and commencement of our measures, and I think the House will be astonished to find what an extraordinary increase of promotion has taken place. I find that there have been promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel in the first period, 84 officers, and in the last, 223; to the rank of major, 142 in the first, and 534 in the last period; and to the rank of captain, 585 in the first, and 616 in the last period; but, of the 585 captains in the first period, no less than 176 are due to augmentations of the army, leaving

the natural promotions at the number of 409. I will not trouble the House with further details. I think I have shown that in respect of pay, pension, retirement, and promotion, so far from the position of the Indian officers having been prejudiced, that the promotion has been of unexampled rapidity in every rank, except the highest, which no measure could affect, and that the position of officers in that army at this moment is infinitely better than it would have been if our measures had never been adopted. I trust, therefore, that the House will be convinced that there remains now no just cause of complaint, and I earnestly hope that these discussions may now cease. They are unsatisfactory to all parties, and lead to expectations which cannot be fulfilled. All things are unsettled by these discussions, discontent is produced, and as long as this agitation is kept up no one is satisfied with his position. The measures which have been recently adopted have been so beneficial to the regimental officers, that officers of the Staff Corps, officers of the new line regiments, and retired officers, have asked to be allowed to revert to their cadres. What will be the effect if more is to be done for them? The whole Indian army will be disorganized. I entreat the House to give no encouragement to what would be an evil of such magnitude, and to show by their vote to-night that they believe that, in acting upon the report of the Commissioners, we have dealt with the subject in a fair and generous spirit towards all parties.

MEMORANDUM FURNISHED FROM THE INDIA OFFICE.

The three subjects of complaint by certain Officers of the Indian Army, which the Royal Commission of 1863 considered to be well founded, were:—

- 1st. The supersession in army rank of regimental officers by the promotion of their brother Officers under the Staff Corps rules;
- 2d. The retention on the cadres of Native regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line regiments; and,
- 3d. The arrangements laid down in the Royal Warrant of 1st January 1862 (as far as they affect the Officers of Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army), for regulating the promotion of Colonels of the Indian Army, of date subsequent to the 17th February 1861, to the rank of General Officer.

These three complaints have been met, and the evils complained of rectified, by the measures ordered in the Despatch to the Government of India of the 17th June 1864.

The first, by a comprehensive scheme of brevet promotion, extending to the whole of the Officers of the Army the same rule; that rule being similar to that which has for so many years been in operation as regards the rank of brevet Captain, and based on the simple qualification of length of service in the Army, the same number of years service in each rank being taken for the whole Indian Army as had been adopted for the Staff Corps.

The second complaint has been remedied by the removal from the cadres of Native regiments of all Officers appointed from them to the new Line regiments, and by making promotions in their places.

The third has been remedied by cancelling the Royal Warrant of the 1st January 1862, complained of, and leaving the Officers of the Cavalry and Infantry to rise on the list for promotion as before.

There remain to be considered two complaints, respecting which the Royal Commission expressed no positive opinion. These were,—

- 1st. The regulation by which 12 years is made the period of service in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel; and,
- 2d. The reduction of the number of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels, by making promotion in succession to one half only of the Officers of that rank who accepted the special annuities offered to them on retirement in 1861.

The remarks of the Royal Commission upon those points were as follow:—

On the first point, "The new rule, however, is not to affect the Lieutenant-Colonels who attained that rank before the date of the new system, and so the question whether 12 years is a fair average for the future for the three Presidencies will be tested by the time at which

"these Lieutenant-Colonels will succeed to the allowances in question; and if it should be found that they have obtained them generally in less than 12 years, we consider that, unless the shorter average period be adopted, the guarantee will not have been strictly adhered to."

On the second point, "We are unable to calculate the loss or the advantages, varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments; but we think that, where loss can be ascertained to have taken place, there the guarantee has not been adhered to."

The object and effect of the first of these measures was explained in the Despatch of 17th June 1864, para. 39, *et seq.*, but it may be observed here that although 12 years was fixed as the time of service in the Lieutenant-Colonel grade, qualifying for promotion to the rank of Colonel with Colonel's allowance, it was only so fixed absolutely in respect to the Officers who attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on or after the 1st January 1862, and whose promotion to that rank had been accelerated by the retiring scheme.

With respect to Officers above these, they will obtain it in the ordinary course, but have also the benefit of the 12 years' rule if their promotion should not take place within that period. In Bengal and Bombay, Officers have been promoted under that time; while in Madras, the rule has operated beneficially in giving one Officer,—and probably soon will to another,—promotion earlier than they would have got it had things remained unchanged.

The period of 12 years was taken as a fair average, being somewhat more than the time recently taken to pass through the Colonel's grade in Bengal and Bombay, but less than that in Madras. It is possible that the promotion of some of the older Lieutenant-Colonels in the year 1862 in the two former Presidencies may be slightly retarded, but such retardation cannot be material. It is obvious, moreover, that some such retardation must have followed any reduction, however effected, in the number of Colonels. It will be thus seen that the Officers who were Lieutenant-Colonels before the 1st January 1862 have little to complain of, because they may attain, and up to the present time have attained, to the Colonel's allowance as quickly as their predecessors did, and, under any circumstances, must get it in 12 years; while the Officers who attain to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel on or after 1st January 1862 will have had their promotion to that grade expedited to an extent that will make it no counterbalancing hardship to have to serve 12 years in that grade for their Colonel's allowance. Thus, though they may serve somewhat longer in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, they will attain to Colonel's allowances in a shorter time than heretofore from their entrance into the service, and, for part of that time, will have the advantage of being in receipt of Lieutenant-Colonel's pay, instead of that of a lower rank.

With regard to the complaint that the number of Lieu-

tenant-Colonels was reduced by promotion in succession to one half only of the extraordinary retirements in 1861, it may be observed that these extensive retirements were special and exceptional.

They were caused by an extraordinary measure, involving considerable expense, and the Army had no right to the same promotion being made in succession to vacancies occasioned by an extraordinary measure of this nature as would have followed casualties of an ordinary character. The promotion made in succession to one half was a great boon, and gave a great lift to the Army at the time.

Under the circumstances of the time, considering the disappearance of nearly the whole Bengal Native Army and the large reduction of Native force in India, a reduction in the number of Officers of the higher grade became necessary*, and cannot be considered as unjust. The object was to effect this in such a manner as to inflict the least possible injury to the remaining Officers.

To effect this object a large number of Officers were induced to retire by the offer of special annuities; promotion was given to the great body of the Army by filling up the whole of the vacancies, except one half of the retiring Lieutenant-Colonels;† and, recently, a further impulse to promotion has been given by the removal of the names of Officers who joined the new Line regiments from Native cadres, making promotion in their place, and by the permanent measure of removing the names of all Staff Corps and new Line Officers from the list of the Indian Army when they come into the position of Lieutenant-Colonels.

The effect of the last measure will last as long as the old Indian list of Officers lasts. It has already given great and unprecedented promotion, but its full effects are only now beginning to be felt, as the Officers who joined the Staff Corps in great numbers from the ranks of Captain and Lieutenant advance towards the list of Lieutenant-Colonels.

The effect of this measure on the future prospects of the Indian Army may be understood from the one fact that at the present moment the list of regimental Majors in the Bengal Army consists of 82 names, of which no less than 48 are those of Staff Corps and new Line regiment Officers, which, on their reaching the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, will be struck out and promotion through the lower grades given in their place.

The result is this, that for every vacancy among the Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels rather more than two Captains, on the average, will be promoted to the rank of Major, and the Officers may be expected to run through the grade of Major in two or three years, instead of five or six.

The promotion thus given to the army at large may be considered extravagant, and at all events the complaint that 12 years is a longer time than was heretofore passed in the grade of Lieutenant-Colonel is answered in two ways:—

- 1st. A reduction in the Colonels, the propriety of which cannot be questioned, must have been followed by some retardation in promotion among those below:
- 2d. That the general impulse given to promotion throughout the Army by other measures will more than make up for this retardation, as every Officer will reach the position of Lieutenant-Colonel and that of Colonel in a shorter time from their entrance into the Army than they have done for many years past.

The following comparison will illustrate this:—

Taking the 20 junior Colonels of Infantry in the Bengal Army in January 1857, their average length of service on attaining to that rank was 44·9 years. Taking the 20 junior Lieutenant-Colonels in the list of the same Army at the present date, we find that their average length of service on reaching the Colonel's grade under the new rule will be 38·9 years, and there can be no doubt that under the present system the Officers of the Indian Army will attain to the Colonel's allowance hereafter in even a shorter time.

The shortest time in which an Officer of the Staff Corps can attain that allowance is 38 years under present regulations.

The average length of service of the 20 senior Lieutenant-Colonels of the Bengal Army at the present time, the only class of Officers in the Army not directly benefited by recent measures, will be at the time of their attaining their Colonel's allowance, under the 12 years rule, 44·9 years, not longer, therefore, than the 20 junior Colonels in 1857 had served

before attaining this rank, but these Officers may attain to that rank by ordinary course of seniority before they have been 12 years in the Lieutenant-Colonel's grade.

The present condition and prospects of the Officers of the three Armies in India may be understood from the following statements, showing the average length of service of the Officers of the several grades as they stood on the 1st January 1849, 1857, and 1865:—

BENGAL CAVALRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	51·4	55·2	52·
Lieutenant-Colonels - - -	42·5	37·6	37·3
Majors - - - - -	33·5	33·4	22·6
Captains - - - - -	26·	19·4	13·3
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	16·	7·1	6·9

* NOTE.—It could not have been intended to prevent the Crown, if, in the interests of India and of the Empire at large, it should deem it necessary, from reducing the number of the Indian Army, or altering its organization. (Report of Royal Commission, para. 34.)

† Promotions occasioned thereby were as follows:—
49 Lieut.-Colonels.
87 Majors.
123 Captains
190 Lieutenants.

MADRAS CAVALRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	47·	54·8	51·
Lieutenant-Colonels - - -	33·5	37·6	35·3
Majors - - - - -	29·5	34·4	25·6
Captains - - - - -	22·3	22·3	15·4
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	12·6	10·1	3·4

BOMBAY CAVALRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	52·	48·	43·6
Lieutenant-Colonels - - -	33·	33·3	28·
Majors - - - - -	29·	33·	29·
Captains - - - - -	20·6	18·7	16·6
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	10·	10·	7·9

BENGAL INFANTRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	49·7	51·2	53·7
Lieutenant-Colonels - - -	40·	36·	35·
Majors - - - - -	30·	31·	27·
Captains - - - - -	22·6	19·8	20·3
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	10·8	12·	10·1

MADRAS INFANTRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	49·4	49·1	51·7
Lieutenant-Colonels - - -	32·	38·	37·
Majors - - - - -	29·	32·	27·
Captains - - - - -	21·3	20·7	20·2
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	9·7	12·4	11·1

APPENDIX.

BOMBAY INFANTRY.

Rank.	Average Years Service in		
	1849.	1857.	1865.
Colonels - - - - -	47·7	50·2	51·4
Lieutenant-Colonels - - - -	34·	36·	34·
Majors - - - - -	29·	30·	25·
Captains - - - - -	21·5	18·3	19·4
Six Senior Lieutenants of Regiments - - - - -	9·3	10·7	10·5

A further illustration of the impulse which has been given to promotion by recent measures will be gathered from statement, exhibiting a comparison between the position of the 20 junior regimental Lieutenant-Colonels in each of the three Presidencies as they stood in 1857, and of the Officers holding corresponding positions in 1865.

The following abstract statement shows the average length of service of the 20 Lieutenant-Colonels in each case, and the average time they had taken to pass through the Major's grade.

	Average length of Service.		Average Number of Years passed in Major's Grade.	
	1857.	1865.	1857.	1865.
Bengal -	34·45	30·25	$5\frac{5}{8}$	$2\frac{9}{12}$
Madras -	36·25	32·	$7\frac{9}{12}$	$3\frac{1}{12}$
Bombay -	36·1	30·5	$5\frac{2}{12}$	$3\frac{2}{12}$

There can be no doubt whatever that the position and prospects of the Officers generally of the Indian Army in all three Presidencies are better at the present moment than they have been for many years before.

The supersession by their brother Officers who have joined the Staff Corps having been rectified by the late rule regarding brevet promotion, the new complaint now seems to be that the Staff Corps Officers have substantive rank given them, while the local officers have only brevet rank, the one carrying, the other not carrying, increase of pay.

But the advantages connected with the substantive promotion given to the Staff Corps Officers are to be looked upon as merely one mode of remunerating them for their Staff services, and the Officer not appointed to the Staff Corps has no more right to complain of the advantage given to him who was so appointed, so long as no positive injury is done thereby to himself, than a regimental Officer under the old system had to complain that a brother Officer was appointed to the Staff with increased pay, while he was not.

Moreover, it is an important point to be borne in mind, that the substantive promotion given to the Staff Corps Officer loses much of its money value by the circumstance of, the full batta rate of pay having been abolished in the

Staff Corps, while it is continued to the Officers of the local Army.

The recent measures connected with the Officers of the local Army have had the effect of creating complaint that everything is being done for the local Army, and have given rise to a desire on the part of many Officers of the Staff Corps, new Line regiments, and retired Officers to revert to their former position in the Indian Army.

Referring to certain objections made by the Government of Bombay to the rule for brevet promotion recently laid down, Sir Hugh Rose observed,*— * Letter to Govern-
"Under the measures directed by the ment of India, 28th
Right Honourable the Secretary of State, September 1864.
the chief cause of complaint, as frequently brought to the notice of Government by his Excellency, viz., 'The supersession of regimental Officers by their juniors of the Staff Corps has been removed entirely.' It may, at the same time, be observed, that whilst some Officers will continue to suffer supersession, the privileges now conferred on the Army generally are specially advantageous to the Officers who have not joined the Staff Corps, and to those who have been unfortunate in their promotion.

"It is not for the Commander-in-Chief to question or discuss the measures deliberately sanctioned and directed by Her Majesty's Government in redress of the grievances of the Officers of the Indian service, but his Excellency may be permitted to say that, without cancelling the amalgamation arrangements altogether, he does not think that a more equitable scheme could have been devised than that which the Bombay authorities desire to suspend."

And again,—

"The Bombay Government adduce instances in which Officers who remained with their regiments will be superseded by Officers of the Staff Corps, but in no instance is it shown that any Officer is or can be now superseded by a Staff Corps Officer of his own cadre. Since the Army has existed, Officers of one regiment have superseded their less fortunate brother Officers in other regiments, but this kind of supersession it would be impossible to obviate unless the whole of the Officers of the Army were placed on one general list for promotion."

After showing how, under the new rule, certain Staff Corps Officers will be superseded by Officers who have remained with their regiments, Sir Hugh Rose remarks,—

"These calculations may not be absolutely exact, as they are taken from an Army List dated 1st April last, but they suffice to illustrate the favourable working of the new arrangements in regard to Officers who have remained with their regiments, and they show to the satisfaction of the Commander-in-Chief that the local Officers gain very important and solid advantages under the recently sanctioned regulations;" and the Government of India, in forwarding copy of the above letter say,—

"It is scarcely possible that extensive changes in the Army should ever be made without unfavourably affecting the position of some individuals relatively, i.e., as compared with that of some others, and the instance in question is no exception to this rule. But we think that there can be no doubt that by the measures ordered in your Despatch, substantial hardship in the matter of promotion is avoided."

APPENDIX A.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PETITIONS.

1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols. upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols. are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col. for 12 years
 5. Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
 NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF PEERS.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
1	Bt-Major W. C Hamilton	Late 2 Ben. E Fns.	—	79	Lieut. T. S. M. Robinson	21 Madras "	5
2	" G. D'Agular	Late 4 Bengal N. I.	—	80	" H. T. Harris	36 " "	—
3	Capt. David Hutcheon	Cdr. 2 Bom. Eur. Lt I.	5	81	" A. W. Godson	12 Bombay "	5
4	" C. P. Barras	Cadre 29 Bom. N. I.	5	82	" H. A. Nepean	40 Madras "	3, 5
5	" W. A. Beath	Cadre 45 Mad. N. I.	3, 5	83	" C. Richardes	63 Bengal "	—
6	Lieut.-Col. J. P. Coode	37 Madras N. I.	5	84	" W. Anderson	4 Madras "	5
7	Bt.-Col. G. S. Montgomery	Bombay Infantry	3, 4	85	Major E. Thomas	39 Bengal "	5
8	Lieut. E. B. Cox	Late 3 Ben. Eur. I.	3	86	Lieut. H. M. Buller	5 Bengal Eur. L. C.	4
9	Bt.-Col. J. C. Heath	Bombay Infantry	2	87	" M. C. Smith	6 "	3, 5
10	Bt-Major E. Grant	Cadre 3 Bom. N. I.	5	88	" C. W. Young	16 Bombay N. I.	—
11	Lieut.-Col. G. R. Cookson	Bengal Infantry	3, 4	89	Major T. T. Pears	29 "	—
12	Lieut. J. P. Cambridge	Late 2 Bengal N. I.	3, 4, 5	90	Lieut. W. Chisholm	40 Madras "	3, 5
13	Col. G. T. Haly	Ret. List Mad Army	—	91	" G. H. Tillard	40 "	3, 5
14	Bt-Major S. D. White	Late 3 Beng Eur I.	5	92	" C. C. Serjeant	2 Madras Eur.	—
15	Bt.-Col. J. D. Stewart	Bombay Infantry	3, 4	93	" J. P. Forbes	3 Bombay N. I.	—
16	Lieut.-Col. S. B. Paddy	Bengal Infantry	3	94	Col. T. T. Christie	17 "	3, 4
17	Bt.-Col. G. W. Bishop	" "	3, 4	95	Lieut. R. S. Roberts	13 Madras "	3, 5
18	Bt.-Major Robson	20 Madras N. I.	5	96	" F. J. Ravers	34 "	3, 4, 5
19	" W. C. Clarke	2 Madras C.	5	97	Major W. F. Anderson	11 Bombay "	5
20	Major W. Montrieux	24 Bombay I.	5	98	Lieut. P. L. Gordon	Late 6 Madras L.C.	5
21	Lieut. E. S. Berkeley	Cadre 7 Madras C.	5	99	" W. A. Cheke	13 Madras N.I.	3, 5
22	Bt-Major C. E. Taylor	35 Madras N.I.	4, 5	100	Vet.-Srg R. H. A. Holloway	Madras Cavalry	—
23	Capt. Frushard	Indian Navy	—	101	Lieut. H. G. Saunders	Late 3 Bengal E. I.	5
24	Bt.-Col. A. Cooper	Madras Infantry	3, 5	102	" C. M. Smith	32 Madras N. I.	5
25	Lieut.-Col. J. N. Thomas	Bengal "	3, 4	103	" T. W. Gilchrist	Cad. 50 Madras N. I.	3, 5
26	Capt. W. Rice	Bombay "	—	104	" A. H. Davis	Late 2 Bom. Eur I.	5
27	" J. W. Orr	Madras "	5	105	Capt. S. A. T. Judge	Late 67 Bengal N. I.	5
28	Major C. W. Taylor	" "	3, 5	106	Lieut. G. C. Jackson	Late 2 Ben. E. L. C.	5
29	Bt-Major R. F. Webster	Bengal "	5	107	Capt. M. Clarke	Bengal Cavalry	—
30	" W. A. Neale	Bombay "	5	108	" E. P. W. Ripley	Bengal N. I.	5
31	Bt.-Col. W. F. Nuthall	Bengal "	4	109	" H. C. Z. Claridge	37 Madras N. I.	5
32	Major H. A. Young	" "	4, 5	110	" A. N. H. Lynch	19 "	5
33	Capt. W. H. Lowther	" "	5	111	" H. A. Cockburn	53 Bengal "	3
34	" G. D. Crawford	" "	5	112	" A. H. E. Campbell	2 Madras Lt. Cav.	5
35	Major T. S. Warden	Bombay "	5	113	Bt.-Maj. W. E. McPherson	24 Bombay N. I.	—
36	Capt. T. L. Scott	Madras "	5	114	Capt. C. P. Barras	29 "	5
37	Bt-Major T. Wheeler	Bengal "	3, 4, 5	115	Bt.-Maj. H. C. Cuppage	Late 15 Bengal N. I.	3, 5
38	Major H. C. Fletcher	Madras "	5	116	" A. Grant	3 Madras Lt. Cav.	5
39	Bt-Major T. C. Bird	" "	5	117	" C. B. Basden	Late 61 Bengal N. I.	5
40	Lieut. Geo. Thomas	" "	5	118	Major J. W. F. Bean	Bengal Staff Corps	—
41	" H. L. A. Tottenham	Bengal "	5	119	Bt.-Maj. J. R. Auldjo	Late 36 Bengal N. I.	5
42	Capt. L. F. Wells	" "	5	120	Major G. G. Anderson	Cadre 15 "	3
43	" J. J. Robinson	Bengal Cav.	4, 5	121	Bt.-Col. G. Holroyd	6 Bengal N. I.	3, 4, 5
44	Bt-Major E. O. Leggatt	Madras Staff Corps	5	122	Lieut.-Col. J. Liptrott	Bengal Infantry	3
45	Col. G. R. Edwards	Madras Cav.	—	123	" H. Milne	" "	2, 3, 4
46	" C. Prior	Bengal Infantry	3, 4	124	Bt.Lieut.-Col. F. Drummond	Late 22 Bengal N. I.	5
47	Lieut.-Col. W. Q. Pogson	" "	3, 5	125	Bt.-Col. J. D. Stewart	Bombay Infantry	3, 4
48	Major N. C. Boswell	" "	3, 5	126	" C. Birdwood	" "	3, 4
49	Capt. P. D. Henderson	Madras "	5	127	" E. R. Manwaring-	Bengal Infantry	3, 4, 5
50	" R. W. Richardes	Bombay "	—	128	Lt.-Col. C. Harris	" "	3, 4
51	Capt. S. Fellowes	" "	5	129	" W. C. Gott	" "	4
52	Bt-Major Cookson	Madras Cav	5	130	Major-Gen. J. Hobson	Bombay Army	3
53	Major W. R. Hawkins	Madras Infantry	5	131	Capt. J. H. S. Pierce	24 Bombay N. I.	5
54	Capt. J. R. Fulton	" "	5	132	Major R. H. Price	12 Bengal N. I.	5
55	" F. G. Steuart	Bombay "	—	133	Capt. S. J. Prendergast	2 Madras Lt. Cav.	5
56	Major C. B. G. Bacon	Bengal "	3	134	" W. Boardman	13 Madras N. I.	3, 5
57	Lieut. H. Barber	Madras "	5	135	Lieut. J. P. James	13 "	3, 5
58	Lieut.-Col. B. R. Powell	26 Bombay N. I.	3, 4, 5	136	" C. D. L. Gostling	40 " "	3, 5
59	Capt. J. A. Smith	6 " "	—	137	Capt. E. N. Norton	18 " "	3, 5
60	Major J. Blair	2 " Lt. Ca.	5	138	Lieut. D. N. Wroughton	49 " "	3, 5
61	Lieut.-Col. J. M. McGregor	6 Madras "	5	139	" J. G. E. Cameron	13 " "	3, 5
62	Capt. C. M. W. James	6 Bombay N. I.	—	140	Capt. H. Melville	Bengal Cav.	1, 5
63	" R. C. Lindsey	24 Bengal "	—	141	Lieut.-Col. Kelso	3 Madras Cav.	3
64	" J. A. Brereton	33 " "	5	142	Bt.-Lieut.-Col. G. W. Peyton	Madras Infantry	5
65	Major A. C. Phillips	36 Madras "	5	143	Bt.-Major J. Orr	27 Madras N. I.	3, 5
66	Capt. J. Barras	15 Bombay "	5	144	Major Napper	55 Bengal I.	3, 4, 5
67	Lieut.-Col. W. W. Taylor	5 " "	—	145	Capt. G. A. Prendergast	5 Bengal Cav.	5
68	" G. Strangways	Bengal "	3, 4, 5	146	" A. T. Searle	32 Madras N. I.	3, 5
69	" J. L. Walker	71 Bengal "	3, 4	147	Lieut.-Col. E. J. Simpson	Bengal "	4
70	Capt. J. G. Matheson	2 Bengal Fusiliers	—	148	Bt.-Col. H. W. Matthews	6 Bengal "	3, 4
71	Lieut. T. H. Stoton	13 Madras N. I.	3, 5	149	Lieut.-Col. W. P. Hampton	Bengal N. I.	3, 4
72	" F. C. St. John	30 " "	5	150	Capt. R. Farrer	Madras "	—
73	" W. H. Yates	3 Bombay "	—	151	Lieut. Vanderzee	34 Madras "	3, 5
74	Lieut. W. Campbell	Bengal "	3, 5	152	Major J. A. Angus	9 Bengal "	3, 4, 5
75	" A. C. Hunter	17 Bombay "	3, 4, 5	153	Bt.-Major L. R. Hutchison	20 Madras "	3, 5
76	" E. R. C. Wilcox	4 Bengal Eur. I.	3, 5	154	Col. J. Liptrap	45 Bengal "	3, 4
77	" J. B. Leggett	47 Madras N. I.	5	155	Lieut. Ripley	47 " "	5
78	" T. E. Strong	3 Bombay N. I.	—	156	Bt.-Major Jas. Blair	2 Bombay Cav.	4

APPENDIX A.

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont.

1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols. upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols. are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col. for 12 years.
 5. Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
- NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
1	Lieut. W. E. D. Broughton	Bengal Army	5	69	Capt. S. Cousens	13 Bombay N. I.	5
2	Bt.-Major T. W. Seager	" "	5	70	Lieut. E. Armstrong	3 Madras E.	—
3	Lieut.-Col. and Bt.-Col. G. W. Bishop.	" "	3, 4	71	Lieut.-Col. C. G. T. Haly	41 Madras N. I.	—
4	Lieut. G. R. Grylls	" "	5	72	Lieut. & Bt.-Maj S.D. White	3 Bengal E.	5
5	Lieut.-Col. G. Strangways	" "	3, 4, 5	73	Bt.-Capt. S. Fellowes	Bombay Army	5
6	Capt. H. G. Jenkins	" "	—	74	Bt.-Major H. E. Jacob	" "	5
7	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. B. R. Whitaker.	2 Bombay E. L. I.	—	75	Capt. R. Burd	" "	5
8	Bt.-Maj. C. E. Taylor	35 Madras Army	3, 5	76	Lieut.-Col. E. P. Lynch	18 Bombay N. I.	4
9	Col. W. B. Wemyss	Bengal "	3, 4	77	Major C. R. Baugh	9 " " "	4, 5
10	Bt.-Major E. Grant	Bombay "	5	78	Capt. C. Need	6 " " E. I.	5
11	Major and Bt. Lieut.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Madras Army	—	79	" J. Barras	15 " " N. I.	5
12	Major J. Langston	Bombay Army	5	80	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. H. Finch	Bengal Army	5
13	Lieut. J. C. M. Russell	Madras "	—	81	Lieut. J. P. Forbes	3 Bombay N. I.	—
14	" C. J. Rose	" "	5	82	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. J. E. L. Willows.	Bengal Army	5
15	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. F. Mardall	" "	—	83	Lieut. C. L. Raikes	Madras Army	5
16	Lieut. & Bt.-Capt. J. A. Ellis	" "	—	84	Capt. J. W. Orr	19 Madras N. I.	—
17	Capt. D. Hutcheon	Bombay Army	—	85	Major and Bt.-Lieut.-Col. W. G. Owen.	Madras Army	5
18	Bt.-Maj. J. Blar, V. C.	2 Bombay L. C.	5	86	Lieut. F. D. Plowden	" "	5
19	Maj. C. Campbell	East India Com.	—	87	Bt.-Capt. F. B. Phillips	" "	5
20	Capt. C. L. Combe	Madras Army	3, 5	88	Lieut. C. McInroy	" "	5
21	Lieut. J. B. Gahan	" "	—	89	" H. W. Harris	10 Bombay N. I.	—
22	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. P. L. Holmes	" "	—	90	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. A. B. Read	Madras Army	5
23	Capt. H. C. Z. Claridge	37 Madras Grenad.	5	91	Capt. H. E. Ryves	" "	5
24	Major J. Curtis	Madras Army	—	92	Capt. and Bt. Lieut.-Col. C. P. Malony.	" "	5
25	Capt. R. S. Burge	" "	—	93	Bt.-Capt. H. C. L. B. Newbery	" "	5
26	Capt. and Bt.-Lieut.-Col. C. T. E. Hinde.	Bengal Army	3	94	Lieut. G. Murray	" "	3, 5
27	Capt. W. N. Face	Madras Army	—	95	" E. G. Morrogh	" "	5
28	Capt. and Bt.-Lieut.-Col. A. Cooper	" "	3, 5	96	Capt. A. Cumine	Bengal "	5
29	Major H. E. Young	Bengal Army	3, 4	97	Capt. & Bt.-Major J. Hood	" "	5
30	Bt.-Capt. P. Salter	Madras "	—	98	Capt. F. H. Ingfield	" "	5
31	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. C. Hight	" "	—	99	Lieut.-Col. A. J. Kelso	3 Madras Lt. Cav.	3, 4
32	Capt. and Bt. Lieut.-Col. B. Hodson.	7 Madras N. I.	—	100	Capt. T. E. Webster	Bengal Army	5
33	Capt. and Bt.-Major W. T. Bowen.	Bombay Army	5	101	" C. S. J. Terrot	" "	5
34	Lieut.-Col. H. E. S. Abbott	Bengal "	3	102	Bt.-Major H. J. Templar	" "	5
35	Lieut. Q. S. A. Jamieson	Madras N. I.	3, 5	103	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. A. C. Phillips	36 Madras N. I.	5
36	Major and Lieut.-Col. D. S. Dodgson.	30 Bengal "	3	104	Capt. S. W. Lennox	23 " "	5
37	Capt. J. G. H. Philipps	Madras Army	5	105	Capt. & Bt.-Major C. T. Harkness.	Madras Army	5
38	Lieut.-Col. C. C. Prior	Indian "	3, 4	106	Major R. R. Mainwaring	Bengal "	5
39	Capt. J. R. Auldjo	Bengal "	5	107	Lieut.-Col. S. F. Macmullen	" "	3, 4
40	Major H. L. Robertson	" "	5	108	Bt.-Col. J. Liptrop	" "	3, 4
41	Lieut.-Col. R. J. Hawthorne	" "	3, 4	109	Capt. E. N. Norton	18 Madras N. I.	3
42	" W. T. Money	Madras "	5	110	Lieut. G. Thomas	Madras Army	5
43	Capt. & Bt. Maj. A. Prichard	28 Madras N. I.	5	111	" F. E. West	" "	5
44	" A. N. H. Lynch	Madras Army	5	112	" W. C. Drummond	" "	5
45	Capt. & Bt. Maj. T. C. Ansley	9 Madras N. I.	5	113	Capt. R. W. Duff	" "	5
46	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt. T. P. B. Walsh	Bombay Army	5	114	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. F. M. Davis	" "	5
47	Lieut. C. St. J. B. Barnett	Bengal "	5	115	Lieut. H. A. T. Nepean	40 Madras N. I.	3
48	" H. Macdonald	19 Bengal N. I.	5	116	" H. G. Woods	Madras Army	—
49	" T. H. Pearson	Bengal Army	5	117	" T. S. M. Robinson	" "	5
50	Capt. J. C. Dickson	" "	5	118	Capt. & Bt.-Lieut.-Col. W. J. Hicks.	Bengal "	5
51	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt. E. O'B. Horsford.	" "	5	119	Capt. & Bt.-Major F. P. Bailey	6 Bengal Eur.	5
52	Capt. R. D. Griffin	" "	5	120	Capt. W. H. A. Buttler	Madras Army	3, 5
53	Col. Sir C. Oakley, Bart.	5 Bengal E. C.	—	121	" A. T. Baldwin	" "	5
54	Lieut. R. S. Hill	" Army	5	122	" J. F. Berthon	Bombay "	5
55	Bt.-Col. W. F. Nuthall	Indian "	4	123	" C. M. W. James	6 Bombay N. I.	—
56	Lieut. J. H. Tyler	Bengal "	5	124	Lieut. D. C. Bell	Bombay Army	5
57	Capt. G. H. Hale	" "	—	125	Capt. W. B. Peile	Bengal "	5
58	" T. Sweet	Madras "	5	126	" C. Batchelor	" "	5
59	Lieut. C. M. Busby	Bengal "	5	127	Lieut. A. F. Lindsay	" "	5
60	Capt. R. Jenkins	" "	5	128	Capt. and Bt. Lieut.-Col. P. H. K. Dewaal.	" "	5
61	Lieut. N. Alexander	22 Madras N. I.	3, 5	129	Capt. W. Playfair	" "	5
62	Lieut.-Col. R. A. Smith	Bengal Army	3, 4	130	" F. D. Ogilvie	" "	5
63	" W. C. Gott	Indian "	3, 4	131	Bt.-Major H. Grant	" "	5
64	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. H. C. Cuppage	15 Bengal N. I.	3, 5	132	Lieut. H. G. Saunders	3 Bengal Eur. I.	—
65	Lieut.-Col. T. R. Snow	Bengal Cavalry	4	133	Capt. A. Child	Madras Army	5
66	Bt.-Capt. F. M. Armstrong	" Army	5	134	" H. D. Cloete	" "	5
67	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. E. Bradford	Bombay "	5	135	" A. Hawthorn	Bombay "	5
68	Capt. H. P. Close	" "	5	136	Capt. & Bt. Lieut.-Col. J. J. Combe.	" "	5
				137	Lieut. F. S. Fitz-Patrick	" "	5
				138	Capt. E. L. M. Evans	" "	5
				139	" G. T. Dick	" "	5

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont.

APPENDIX A

1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col for 12 years.
 5. Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
- NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
140	Capt. M. K. Bourne	Bombay Army	5	212	Capt. J. H. L. Kerr	Madras Army	5
141	" H. G. Dickinson	" "	5	213	" Capt S. Reid	33 Madras N.I.	3, 5
142	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt T. R. Griffiths.	" "	5	214	" P. Wheeler	Bengal Army	5
143	Lieut. J. H. Gordon	46 Madras N. I.	3	215	" E. J. Wild	" "	5
144	Capt. R. Cox	Madras Army	5	216	" R. B. Kennedy	Madras "	5
145	" R. Church	" "	5	217	Lieut T Lavie	" "	5
146	Capt. and Bt.-Major R. H. Sankey.	Madras Engineers	5	218	Bt-Capt E. T. W. Price	" "	5
147	Capt. and Bt.-Major V. J. Shortland.	Madras Army	5	219	Capt. W. H. Parish	Bengal Artillery	5
148	Bt.-Capt. A. T. Searle	" "	5	220	Col E. R. Mainwaring	Bengal Army	3, 4
149	Capt W. Blount	" "	5	221	Capt. and Bt.-Maj C. L. Montgomery.	" "	5
150	Bt. Capt E. H. R. Chambers	" "	5	222	Lieut.-Col. H. W. Matthews	" "	3, 4
151	Lieut. G. Young	Bengal Army	—	223	Capt and Bt.-Maj. R. A. Napper.	" "	3, 4
152	Col. A. Tucker, C.B.	" Cav.	—	224	Lieut. and Bt.-Col. C. Paterson.	" "	3, 4
153	Lieut F. F. J Toke	Bengal Army	5	225	Capt. C. J. Godfrey	Madras "	5
154	Capt. M. R. Bruce	Bombay "	5	226	" W. Graves.	" "	5
155	Lieut. J. Gatacie	" "	5	227	Lieut. & Bt.-Capt. E. Maclean.	Bengal "	5
156	Capt. J. Barnes	Bengal "	5	228	Lieut H M S Magrath	Madras "	5
157	" J. S Steuart	Madras "	5	229	Capt J. M MacGregor	" "	5
158	" W. H. White	" "	5	230	Lieut. C. F. Moore	" "	5
159	Lieut. P. A. Van Homrigh	" "	3, 5	231	" A. D Grant	" "	5
160	Lieut. C. Gordon	" "	5	232	Capt. J. N Maclean	7 L.C. Mads Army	3, 5
161	Capt S. F. M. I. Grant	" "	5	233	" W S Mitchell	Madras Army	5
162	Lieut. L. B Bance	" "	5	234	Lieut. C. de Lancey Gostling	48 Madras N.I.	3, 5
163	Bt-Major H. D. Faulkner	" "	5	235	" A. Means	36 "	—
164	Capt. R. Fulton	46 Madras N. I.	5	236	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt W. W. Mercer	Madras Army	5
165	Lieut. W. Hallett	Bombay Army	5	237	Lieut J. K. McCausland	Bengal "	5
166	Capt. & Bt.-Major J. M. Holt	" "	5	238	Capt. H. Melvill	" "	5
167	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt. F. C. Davidson.	" "	5	239	Maj H. D. Maunsell	" "	5
168	Lieut. C. J. O. Chambers	Madras "	5	240	Capt J. A. Brereton	" "	5
169	Capt. H. C. B. Barnett	" "	5	241	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. C. F. Hicks.	" "	5
170	Capt. and Bt.-Major C. J. Bradley.	" "	5	242	Capt T Dunn	Late 2 E.L.L. Mad.	5
171	Major-Gen. T. F. Flemyng	Bengal "	3	243	Capt and Bt-Maj H. G. Raverty.	Bombay Army	5
172	Capt. & Bt-Maj R. H. Price	" "	5	244	Capt A Taylor	Bengal "	5
173	Capt. M. J. White	" "	5	245	Capt. and Bt-Maj T. H Wilson.	" "	5
174	" R. Farrer	Madras "	5	246	Maj L. M. MacKenzie	Madras "	5
175	Lieut A. Cockburn	Bengal "	5	247	Lieut C J B Harris	" "	5
176	" R. C. Clifford	" "	5	248	Maj and Bt-Lieut-Col. M. B Whish.	Bengal "	3, 5
177	Capt. G. Cavenagh	" "	5	249	Lieut. B. H. Preston	Madras "	5
178	" H. A. Cockburn	" "	—	250	Capt. J. M. Mackenzie	58 Bengal N.I.	—
179	" H. J. Allan	9 Bengal N. I.	5	251	" G. J. D. Hay	57 "	—
180	" E. Thomas	Bengal Army	5	252	Capt. A. Sage	Madras Army	5
181	" L. H. P. de H. Larpent	" "	5	253	Lieut W. M. Dickinson	29 Madras N.I.	5
182	Bt.-Capt. F. T. Bainbridge	" "	5	254	Bt-Capt A R. T. Pas-singham.	29 " "	5
183	" T. N. Baker	" "	5	255	" R. Brown	29 " "	5
184	Col. & Maj.-Gen. F. B. Boileau	Royal Bengal Art.	—	256	Lieut.-Col. A. K. Gore	29 " "	5
185	Bt-Major A. B. Beatson	56 Bengal N. I.	5	257	Maj K. Macaulay	Madras Army	3, 5
186	Lieut. F. J. Claugie	Bengal Army	5	258	Lieut. T. W. Gulchrist	50 Madras N.I.	3, 5
187	Capt. C. D. S. Clarke	" "	5	259	" G. Godfrey	Madras Army	5
188	Capt. & Bt-Maj. F. C. Innes	" "	5	260	Capt. W. S. Simpson	" "	5
189	Lieut.-Col. J. Liptropp	" "	3	261	Lieut. F. C. S. John	" "	5
190	Capt. F. V. R. Jarvis	" "	5	262	Capt. R. P. M. Crew	14 Madras N.I.	5
191	Col. J. C. Innes	" "	3, 4	263	Bt-Maj G. Atkinson	6 " "	5
192	Major J. W. F. Bean	13 Bengal N. I.	—	264	Lieut.-Col J. Buchanan	Madras Army	4
193	" E. W. E. Howard	Bengal Staff Corps	—	265	Lieut. E. Armstrong	3 Eur. Madras	—
194	Major & Bt. Lieut-Col. P. Drummond.	Bengal Army	5	266	" W. C. Bayley	Madras Army	5
195	Capt. D. Compton	" "	5	267	Maj. C. Cookworthy	Roy. Bengal Artly.	—
196	Lieut. E. B. Cox	3 Bengal Eur. I.	3	268	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. J. A. Angus.	Bengal Army	5
197	Lieut.-Col. B. Revell	Madras Army	—	269	Lieut. W. G. Sharp	Madras "	5
198	Lieut. G. C. Jackson	2 Bengal Eur. L.C.	—	270	Capt. & Bt-Maj. W. Serres	51 Madras N. I.	5
199	Capt. F. E. Laing	Bengal Army	5	271	Capt. S. Hodgson	2 Madras L. C.	5
200	" S. A. T. Judge	" "	5	272	Lieut. C. C. Hewetson	Madras Army	5
201	Lieut.-Col. R. Troup	" "	3, 4	273	Capt. G. C. Hodding	" "	5
202	Capt. J. Roberts	" "	5	274	Lieut. & Bt-Capt J. Swiney	" "	5
203	Capt. & Bt-Maj. F. J. Ellis	" "	5	275	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. A. H. Gordon.	" "	5
204	Lieut. C. J. Farquharson	" "	5	276	Capt. & Bt-Maj C.C. Mason	" "	5
205	Capt. A. Ellis	" "	5	277	" Maj. G. Harkness	" "	5
206	" F. W. Russell	" "	5				
207	Capt. Bt E. P. W. Ripley	" "	5				
208	Capt & Bt-Maj. E. Smyth	13 Bengal N.I.	5				
209	Lieut.-Col. E. J. Simpson	Bengal Army	3, 4				
210	Capt. and Bt-Maj S. Saye	" "	5				
211	Capt. W. M Paratt	Madras "	5				

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont

APPENDIX A

Points of Classification	}	1	Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments
		2	Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861 to rank of General Officer
		3	The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols upon the increased rates of pensions
		4	Rules under which Lieut.-Cols are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col for 12 years
		5	Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules

NOTE—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

No	Rank and Names	Regt—Presidency	Points	No	Rank and Names	Regt—Presidency	Points
278	Major A Cannon	Madras Army	5	351	Lieut J P Cambridge	2 Bengal N I	5
279	Major-Gen J Hobson	Bombay "	3	352	Capt W Rice	Bombay Army	5
280	Lieut-Col H Milne	Bengal "	3, 4	353	Capt and Bt-Maj A Y Sinclair	" "	5
281	Major and Bt-Lieut-Col J P P T Hankey	" "	5	354	Capt F G Stuart	Bombay N I	—
282	Capt E G Dixon	" "	5	355	" H B Sandford	Royal, formerly Bombay Art	2
283	Capt and Bt-Lieut-Col J Daniel	" "	5	356	Capt & Brevet W C Rich	Madras Army	5
284	Lieut H T Harris	36 Madras N I	—	357	Lieut G Lodwick	Bombay "	5
285	Lieut C E Macaulay	51 Bengal N I	3, 5	358	Capt C Thompson	" "	5
286	Capt & Bt-Maj T T Piers	29 Bombay N I	5	359	" R W Richards	" "	5
287	Lieut H D Barne	Madras Army	5	360	Bt-Maj R C Whiting	Bengal "	5
288	Major-Gen C E Faber	Ret List, Madras E	—	361	Capt J E D Wilson	" "	5
289	Capt & Bt-Maj R G Lewis	Madras Army	5	362	Capt and Bt-Maj W K Hawkins	40 Madras N I	3, 5
290	Bt-Maj E H Blomfield	7 Madras N I	5	363	Lieut J Godson	Madras Army	5
291	Lieut G C Foord	" "	5	364	Capt F W Jones	Bombay "	5
292	Lieut & Bt-Capt A C Firth	Madras Army	5	365	Bt-Lieut-Col C H Bunt	Late 64 Bengal N I	—
293	Lieut and Brevet-Capt G Stedman	" "	5	366	Lieut J B Taylor	9 Madras N I	3, 5
294	Capt G H Stiles	" "	5	367	Capt C M White	45 Madras Army	5
295	Lieut H G Symons	" "	5	368	Major-Gen J F Bird	Retired List Mad A	—
296	Lieut J P Cambridge	2 Bengal N I	3, 5	369	Lieut F H Vanderzee	34 Madras L I	3, 5
297	Capt & Bt-Maj T C Ansley	9 Madras N I	5	370	Bt-Maj R D Hoosaid	Bombay Army	5
298	Capt R V Handyside	Madras Army	5	371	Major M J Battye	" "	3, 5
299	Lieut J G E Cameron	13 Madras N I	5	372	Major-Gen J Swanson	Retired List Indian Forces	—
300	Capt L H Isacke	Madras Army	5	373	Bt-Capt P. Hodgson	Bombay Army	—
301	" C A Benson	45 Madras N I	3, 5	374	Bt-Major F Roome	" "	5
302	Capt & Bt-Maj H H Lyster	Bengal Army	5	375	Lieut T R Tabuteau	Madras "	5
303	Capt W H Lowther	" "	5	376	" T P F Tytler	" "	5
304	" R C Lindsey	24 Bengal Inf't	—	377	Major W F Anderson	Bombay "	3, 4, 5
305	Lieut W A Cheke	13 Madras N I	3, 5	378	Lieut G Tyndall	Madras "	5
306	Capt A H Cooke	Madras Army	3, 5	379	" F H Thomas	29 Madras N I	5
307	" R A Chadwick	5 Madras N I	5	380	" C J Watron	Madras Army	5
308	" A Gahagan	Madras Army	5	381	Lieut-Col C R Stamford	" "	4
309	Lieut and Bt-Capt J C W Bince	" "	5	382	Capt G Rowlandson	" "	5
310	Lieut R G Jenkins	" "	5	383	Capt C F Giltbeinson	" "	5
311	Capt R Daunt	" "	5	384	Lieut G H Tillard	40 Madras N I	3, 5
312	Lieut W H Cockell	" "	5	385	Lieut-Col & Bt-Col C Biddwood	3 Bombay Army	3, 4, 5
313	Capt W F Edwards	Bengal "	5	386	Col W F Renton	Bengal Army	3
314	Major L J Farquharson	" "	5	387	Capt N Swanson	Madras "	5
315	Capt & Bt-Maj J Ward	" "	5	388	Capt & Bt-Maj E Yates	" "	5
316	" J D L Campbell	Madras "	5	389	Capt & Bt-Maj P T Sims	" "	5
317	Lieut T D Chatterton	" "	5	390	Lieut R B Cummins	46 Madras N I	3, 5
318	Lieut R Stewart	49 Madras N I	3, 5	391	Capt A D Paines	Madras Army	3
319	" H M Buller	5 Bengal E L C	4	392	Capt & Bt-Maj G Pringle	" "	5
320	Capt G D Crawford	18 Bengal N I	5	393	Capt C P Hildebrand	Bengal "	3, 5
321	" R Elair	32 Bengal N I	4	394	Capt & Bt-Maj C W Taylor	13 Madras N I	3, 5
322	Capt & Bt-Maj E A M MacGregor	Bengal Army	5	395	Capt & Bt-Maj L R de M Hutchison	Madras Army	5
323	Capt J G Mitheson	" "	—	396	Lieut R Tait	" "	5
324	" R A Morse	formerly Bom Art	2	397	Capt & Bt-Major R S Conchman	12 Madras N I	5
325	" H T Vachell	" "	2	398	Major J J. Brine	Madras Army	5
326	Lieut H Stevenson	" "	2	399	Lieut B A Bloomfield	" "	5
327	2nd Capt G F Worsley	" "	2	400	" T J Cotton	" "	5
328	Col G S Cotter (late)	Madras Artillery	—	401	" G N Saunders	Bengal "	3, 5
329	Lieut C M Smith	32 Madras N I	—	402	" H E A Lawford	Madras "	3
330	Bt-Capt J Thompson	Bengal Army	5	403	" J B Leagett	" "	5
331	Lieut W Cunningham	Madras Army	5	404	" W N Wroughton	49 Madras N I	3, 5
332	" P Burgess	" "	5	405	Major E L Grant	Madras Army	1, 5
333	Capt & Bt-Maj J Shand	" "	5	406	Capt C M J. Thornton	Madras Artillery	1, 5
334	Lieut T H Stoton	18 Madras N I	3, 5	407	Capt & Bt-Maj L Grant	Madras Army	1, 5
335	Capt O F Smithers	Madras Army	5	408	Col W R A Freeman	" "	—
336	" S Stallard	formerly Ben Art	2	409	Lieut-Col W P Hampton	Bengal "	3, 4
337	" J W Rutherford	47 Madras N I	5	410	Bt-Maj J J Dansay	" "	5
338	" & Bt-Maj F W A Robson	20 Madras N I	5	411	Capt J Keer	" "	5
339	" J Reay	Bengal Army	5	412	" A Darling	Royal, formerly Bengal Art	—
340	" W Ramsay	10 Madras N I	5	413	Capt & Bt-Maj D'Agulhai	4 Bengal N I	—
341	" A Read	Madras Army	5	414	Lieut-Col C Harris	Bengal Army	3
342	Lieut G N Ross	" "	5	415	Capt W C Green	" "	5
343	" W Rowlandson	" "	5	416	Capt & Bt-Maj W L Cahusac	11 Bombay N I	5
344	Col C S Reid	formerly Ben Art.	—	417	Lieut W V F Jacob	Bombay "	5
345	Lieut R S Roberts	13 Madras N I	3, 5	418	Major H Menars	Ret List Mad Army	5
346	Major R A Trotter	Ret List, Ben Army	—	419	Bt-Maj E Oakes	Bengal Army	5
347	Capt R F Williams	Bombay Army	5	420	Lieut M M Carpendale	Bombay "	5
348	Lieut W F Sandwith	" "	5				
349	Lieut & Bt-Capt A Uttersson	Bombay E L I	5				
350	Capt. J A Smith	6 Bombay N I	—				

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont.

APPENDIX A.

- Points of Classification.
1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols. upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols. are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col. for 12 years.
 5. Supercession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
- NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Rank and Names	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
421	Lieut. A. P. Currie -	3 Bombay L. C.	5	489	Col. J. H. Tapp -	Ret. List Madras A.	—
422	" A. H. Davis -	Bombay Army	5	490	Capt. T. N. Holberton -	Royal Bombay Art.	—
423	" W. R. Adams -	23 Bombay L. I.	5	491	Major H. Sherwell -	Bombay Army	5
424	Maj. & Bt.-Lieut.-Col. W. M. Leckie.	Bombay Army	3, 5	492	A. M. Shewell -	2 Bombay Eur. L.I.	5
425	Lieut. A. W. Godson -	" "	5	493	Lieut. H. J. Stopford -	Bombay Army	5
426	Lieut. E. G. Jenkins -	" "	5	494	Capt. & Bt.-Maj J.M. Nuttall	Bengal "	5
427	Lieut.-Col. J. S. Kemball -	Bombay Staff Corps	—	495	" C. W. Cox	Madras "	5
428	Lieut. W. Chisholm -	40 Madras N. I.	3, 5	496	Capt. F. P. C. Roberts -	Bombay "	5
429	Bt.-Major C. W. Dun -	Madras Army	5	497	" T. B. Gibbard -	Royal, formerly	5
430	Capt. D. G. Anderson -	Royal, formerly	—	498	Lieut. C. G. Gunning -	Bombay Art.	5
431	Lieut. J. H. Prendergast -	Bombay Art.	—	499	Major H. M. Fergusson	Madras Army	5
432	Major J. P. Briggs -	Madras Army	5	500	Ret. List Madras A.	—	—
433	Lieut. C. N. Porteous -	Bengal "	5	501	Major-Gen. G. Logan -	" "	—
434	Lieut. C. N. Porteous -	27 Madras N. I.	5	502	Capt. W. A. Ross -	Royal Bengal Art.	—
435	Maj.-Gen. G. A. Baillie	Madras Army	3, 4	503	Capt. & Major F. J. Wilson	Madras Army	5
436	Capt. & Bt. Lieut.-Col. M. T. Ffrench.	" "	5	504	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. T. C. Bird	36 Madras N. I.	5
437	Capt. W. S. Davis -	" "	5	505	Lieut. H. C. Brown -	Royal, formerly	—
438	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. W. Barber	" "	5	506	Lieut.-Gen. W. Cotton -	Bombay Art.	—
439	Bt. Lieut.-Col. F. C. Barber	29 Madras N. I.	5	507	Ret. List Madras A.	—	—
440	Lieut. Col. & Bt. Col. C. Birdwood.	3 Bombay Army	3, 4	508	Lieut. F. J. Rivers -	Madras Army	5
441	Lieut.-Col. H. R. C. Moyle	Bombay Army	5	509	Lieut.-Col. W. H. Watts -	" "	3
442	Lieut.-Col. & Bt.-Col. A. R. Manson.	" "	—	510	Major-Gen. A. M. McCally	Ret. List Madras A.	—
443	Capt. & Bt. Maj. F. A. E. Lock	1 Bombay L. C.	5	511	Capt. & Bt.-Major J. Flint	Madras Army	5
444	Major E. H. Power -	Madras Army	—	512	Lieut. E. G. Battuscombe -	Royal, formerly	—
445	Bt. Maj. H. J. Day -	19 Bombay N. I.	5	513	Major-Gen. E. Apthorp, C.B.	Bombay Art.	—
446	Capt. H. le Cocq -	Royal, formerly	—	514	Col. R. E. Knatchbull -	Ret. List Madras A.	—
447	" C. Hunter -	Bombay Art.	—	515	Lieut. F. Weldon -	Royal, formerly	—
448	Lieut.-Col. E. Wray, C.B.	" "	—	516	Major and Bt. Lieut.-Col	Bengal Art	—
449	Lieut. T. C. Fletcher -	" "	—	517	C. E. M. Walker.	" "	5
450	Lieut. A. F. Dobbs -	32 Madras N. I.	3, 5	518	Lieut. J. Vibart -	14 Bombay N. I.	5
451	" W. P. Dicken -	Madras Army	—	519	Major-Gen. R. Hall -	Ret. List Madras A.	—
452	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. F.P. Drury	" "	—	520	Lieut. C. H. Luard -	Royal Bengal Eng	—
453	" W. E. Mc Pherson.	24 Bombay N. I.	—	521	" H. W. Stockley	Royal, formerly	—
454	Capt. J. H. Reid -	Royal, formerly	—	522	Capt. W. H. Saulez -	Bombay Art.	—
455	Lieut.-Col. D. Gaye -	Bombay Art.	—	523	Lieut. C. H. Campbell	" "	—
456	" R. C. Battiscombe	" "	—	524	Lieut.-Col H Wallace	" "	—
457	Capt. L. C. Milford -	Bombay Army	5	525	Capt. A. Carey -	Bombay Army	5
458	" F. P. Mignon -	Bombay Staff Corps	—	526	" Capt. R. Wallace	Royal, formerly	—
459	Lieut. A. Durand -	Bombay Army	—	527	Capt. H. R. Brownlow	Bengal Art.	—
460	" E. H. Davidson -	" "	—	528	" Capt. A. Shepherd -	Late 5 Ben. Eur Cv.	—
461	" E. R. Goode -	" "	—	529	Lieut.-Col G. R. Cookson -	Bengal Army	3, 4, 5
462	" J. W. S. Butler -	17 Madras N. I.	—	530	Lieut. C. W. Young -	16 Bombay N. I.	—
463	" W. H. S. Clarke -	7 Madras Lt. Cav.	—	531	Bt.-Major J. Bates -	Bombay Army	5
464	Capt C E Bates -	16 Madras N. I.	3	532	Lieut.-Col and Bt.-Col. T. Christie	" "	3, 4
465	Capt. & Bt.-Maj W.C. Clarke	Madras Army	5	533	Capt. A. P. Davis -	" "	—
466	Lieut. H. E. Coningham -	" "	5	534	Col. W. C. L. Baker -	Ret. List Madras A.	—
467	Capt. A. H. E. Campbell -	2 Madras Cav.	5	535	Capt. E. Waddington -	Bombay Army	5
468	Capt & Bt.-Maj J.G.C. Fraser	Madras Army	5	536	Lieut. G. W. Borradaile -	Royal, formerly	—
469	Capt. F. Pictet -	" "	5	537	Bombay Art.	—	—
470	Capt & Bt.-Maj. W. Hornidge	Ret. List Madras A.	5	538	Capt. & Bt.-Major G. L. Thomson.	Bombay Army	5
471	Lieut. H. S. Johnson -	Madras Army	5	539	Capt. W. J. Stevenson -	Royal, formerly	—
472	Capt & Bt.-Maj W.S. Kenney	27 Madras N. I.	5	540	2nd Capt. W. W. Woodward	Bombay Art	—
473	Lieut. A. J. Arnott -	Madras Army	5	541	Lieut.-Col. J. Mc K Taylor	" "	—
474	Capt G. A. Arbuthnot -	8 Madras Lt. Cav.	5	542	Lieut.-Col. G. R. Cookson -	Bombay Cav "	—
475	" C. H. Abdy -	5 Madras Cal.	5	543	Lieut. J. F. F. Calogan -	Bengal Army	5
476	" P. D. Henderson -	Madras Army	5	544	Lieut. H. Girardot -	Royal, formerly	—
477	Lieut. W. H. Hodges -	1 Madras N. I.	5	545	" "	Bengal Art.	—
478	" J. P. James -	13 "	3, 5	546	Capt. W. Weldon -	Madras Army	5
479	" C. J. T. Whitlock -	3 Madras Eur. Regt	5	547	Bt.-Capt. W. L. Fuller -	" "	5
480	" E. J. Wynch -	Madras Army	5	548	Capt. A. R. Hoskins -	Royal, formerly	—
481	Capt and Bt.-Major P. S. Cunningham.	" "	5	549	Bombay Art.	—	—
482	Capt & Bt.-Maj E.O. Leggatt	Madras Staff Corps	5	550	" C. Clarke -	" "	—
483	Capt. W. Boardman -	13 Madras N. I.	5	551	Lieut.-Col. W. S. Hatch -	" "	—
484	" J. Orr -	27 "	5	552	Capt. J. B. Hardy -	" "	—
485	" J. M. Williams -	Madras Army	5	553	Lieut. W. J. Finch -	" "	—
486	Bt. Lieut.-Col. G. W. Peyton	Ret. List Madras A.	—	554	Capt and Bt.-Maj H.E. Read	Bengal Army	5
487	Major-Gen G. Nott -	Royal, formerly	2	555	Lieut. G. E. Blew -	17 Bombay N. I.	5
488	Lieut.-Col. J. Worgan	Bombay Art.	2	556	" F. Paul -	" Army	5
				557	" A. Currie -	2 Bombay L. C.	—
				558	" J. M. Glubb -	38 Bengal N. I.	5
				559	Capt. T. P. Waterman	Bengal Army	5
				560	R. B. Dundas -	" "	5

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont.

1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols. upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols. are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col for 12 years.
 5. Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
- NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
554	Capt. and Bt.-Major T. W. Holland.	Bengal Army	5	622	Major G. Smart	Madras Army	—
555	Capt. J. Vibart	Bombay Art.	—	623	Bt.-Maj. C. D. W. S. Grant	—	5
556	Lieut. C. L. B. Constable	Bengal Army	5	624	Lieut. J. N. FitzGerald	43 Madras N. I.	3, 5
557	Major G. G. Anderson	15 Bengal N. I.	3	625	Capt. W. H. Whitlock	5 Madras N. I.	5
558	" J. C. Phillips	Ret. List Bengal A.	—	626	Lieut. P. L. Gordon	6 Madras Cav.	5
559	Lieut. C. Richardes	Bengal Army	5	627	Lieut.-Col. T. G. St. George	Ret. List Madras A.	—
560	" T. Watson	" "	—	628	Maj.-Gen. G. Burn	Ret. List Madras A.	—
561	Capt. C. B. Basden	" "	5	629	Lieut.-Col. D. J. Kinloch	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—
562	Lieut. J. F. T. Sherman	Madras "	5	630	Capt. and Bt.-Maj. T. D. Ker	6 Bombay N. I.	—
563	" H. Chichester	Royal, late Ben. Art.	—	631	A. Macnaghten	Bombay Army	5
564	Lieut and Bt.-Capt W.E.R. Roberts.	54 Bengal N. I.	—	632	Bt.-Major H. Y. Beale	" "	5
565	Capt. J. J. Robinson	Bengal Army	3	633	Major W. Montrou	" "	5
566	" J. A. Grant	" "	5	634	Bt.-Major W. A. Neale	" "	5
567	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. C S. Fowle	" "	5	635	" C. P. Newport	" "	5
568	Capt. T. W. W. Pierce	Bombay "	5	636	Lieut. W. H. Newport	" "	5
569	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. H.G. Robison	" "	5	637	" J. P. M. Newton	" "	5
570	" C.M.W. James	" "	5	638	Bt.-Major T. S. Warden	" "	5
571	Capt. W. B. Preston	" "	5	639	Major J. C. Harris	Late Ben. Engineers	—
572	" E H. Baker	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	640	Lieut. J. G. Edwardes	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—
573	Lieut.-Col. A. M. Murray	" "	—	641	Capt. M. W. B. S. Paisley	" "	—
574	Capt. and Bt.-Major T. T. Haggard.	" "	—	642	" C. E. H. Cotes	" "	—
575	" F. J. Oldfield	3 Bombay L. C.	5	643	Bt.-Major J. H. Reynolds	Bombay Army	5
576	Lieut. A. R. Oakes	25 Madras N. I.	5	644	Capt H. M. De W. Douglas	67 Bengal N. I.	5
577	" J. Miller	Bengal Army	5	645	" S. J. Thorp	Bombay Army	5
578	Major H. H. A. Wood	Bombay Staff Corps	—	646	" T. C. Graham	4 Bengal Eur Cav.	5
579	Capt. W. Walker	" Army	5	647	Lieut and Bt.-Capt. H. A. W. Waterfield	27 Bengal N. I.	5
580	Lieut. & Bt.-Capt O. V. Tanner	" "	5	648	Lieut. W. H. Yates	3 Bombay N. I.	—
581	Capt. F. Swanson	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	649	" J. B. Constable	Bengal Army	5
582	Lieut D. F. Huyshe	" "	—	650	" H. Coningham	29 Madras N. I.	5
583	Capt and Bt.-Maj A.B. Little	25 Bombay N. L. I.	5	651	Major N. C. Boswell	2 Ben. Grenadiers	3, 5
584	Major J. D. Williams	Bombay Army	5	652	Lieut R. S. Jago	39 Madras N. I.	5
585	Bt.-Capt. R. Smith	59 Bengal N. I.	5	653	Lieut. and Bt.-Capt. M.A.D. Orchard.	Bengal Army	5
586	Lieut.-Col F. Maitland	Bengal Army	3	654	Capt. D. Carey	Ret. List Madras A.	—
587	Capt & Bt.-Maj. R. F. Webster	" "	5	655	Maj.-Gen. G. W. Black	Ret. List. Madras Art.	—
588	Lieut.-Col. W. Luard	" "	3, 4	656	Lieut. H. Barber	15 Madras N. I.	3, 5
589	Capt. J. R. Henderson	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	657	" A. C. Hunter	17 Bombay N. I.	3, 4, 5
590	" C. P. Barras	29 Bombay N. I.	5	658	Lieut.-Col. T. Brougham	Royal Artillery	2
591	Col. D. Babington	Madras Army	3, 4	659	Lieut. F. J. Ashley	14 Madras N. I.	3, 5
592	Capt. & Bt.-Maj W. A. Dick	" "	5	660	" J. W. Aitchison	46 " "	5
593	Capt. J. A. Gayer	Bombay "	5	661	Capt & Bt.-Maj J B Knocker	40 " "	5
594	Lieut & Bt.-Capt R. J. Corbett	Madras "	5	662	Lieut. J. W. Swift	Madras Army	5
595	Capt W. Bannerman	3 Bombay N. I.	—	663	Capt. W. Stoddart	3 Madras Eur. I.	3, 5
596	Major and Bt. Lieut.-Col. J C. Graves	" L. C.	5	664	" C. J. Richardson	8 Bombay N. I.	5
597	Capt. & Bt.-Maj A Beecher	Bombay Army	5	665	Major T. Watson	Ret. List Bengal A.	—
598	Lieut.-Col. H. Stanley	" "	—	666	Lieut. & Bt.-Capt. J. Thompson	Bengal Army	3, 5
599	Capt. G. S. Morris	" "	5	667	Lieut. C. R. Crauford	Madras "	5
600	" G. A. Gayler	Bengal "	5	668	Lieut.-Col. W. F. N. Wallace	Ret. List Bengal A.	—
601	Lieut.-Col. G. E. Ashburner	Bombay Army	—	669	Lieut. S. H. Burnes	Bombay Army	5
602	Lieut. E. Armstrong	3 Madras Europ.	—	670	" G. C. Jackson	2 Ben. Eur. L. C.	—
603	" A. Phelps	11 Bombay N. I.	—	671	" J. N. Bennett	Madras Army	5
604	B H. Pottinger	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	672	Vet.-Sur. R. H. U. Holloway	" "	—
605	Capt & Bt.-Maj J G. Cookson	Madras L. C.	5	673	Capt. R. Blair	32 Bengal Army	4
606	Lieut.-Col J. P. Coode	37 Madras Army	—	674	Lieut.-Col. W. F. N. Wallace	Ret. List Bengal A.	—
607	Lieut. A. Richmond	9 Madras N. I.	3, 5	675	Lieut. W. T. Brereton	Madras Army	5
608	Bt. Lieut.-Col. J. N. Thomas	39 Bengal N. I.	3, 4	676	Capt. and Bt.-Major G. H. M. Aynsley.	" "	5
609	Lieut. E. S. Berkeley	Madras Army	—	677	Capt. J. R. Boswell	" "	5
610	Capt. G. Kallender	" "	5	678	Capt and Bt. Lieut.-Col. G. F. Luard.	37 Gren. Mad. A.	5
611	Lieut R. Wickham	" "	5	679	Capt and Bt.-Major W. C. Hamilton.	Bengal Army	—
612	Capt. & Bt.-Maj F. A. E. Loch	Bombay L. C.	5	680	Capt. H. H. James	Bombay "	5
613	Lieut.-Col. C. B. Fuller	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	681	Major-Gen. J. S. Hodgson	Bengal "	3
614	Capt C. J. Barton	Royal, late Bom. A.	—	682	Lieut.-Col. C. P. St John Law	Ret. List Bengal A.	—
615	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. C. S. Jessop	Bombay Army	5	683	Lieut. T. Walker	Royal, late Bombay Artillery.	—
616	Lieut. H. F. Gibb	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	684	Capt. and Bt.-Major J. Orr	Madras Army	5
617	Lieut. P. H. Greig	" "	—	685	Lieut.-Col. B. R. Powell	26 Bombay N. I.	3, 4, 5
618	Capt. & Adj. T. P. Berthon	" "	—	686	Capt. W. E. Le Geyt	2 Bombay L. C.	5
619	" C.S. De N. Lucas	" "	—	687	Major J. Pogson	Bombay Army	5
620	Major G. T. Price	Bombay Army	5	688	Lieut. H. M. Buller	5 Bengal E. L. C.	4
621	Capt. C. H. Blair	Bombay Artillery.	5	689	Major-Gen. G. Osborne	Ret. List Madras A.	—
				690	" A. G. Wight	" "	—

LIST OF PETITIONS—cont.

- Points of Classification.
1. Retention on Cadres of Native Regiments of the names of Officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.
 2. Arrangements for regulating promotions of Colonels of the Indian Army of date subsequent to 17th February 1861, to rank of General Officer.
 3. The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieut.-Cols. upon the increased rates of pensions.
 4. Rules under which Lieut.-Cols. are to become Colonels, and entitled to Colonel's allowances after holding the rank of Regimental Lieut.-Col for 12 years.
 5. Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotion of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.
- NOTE.—Those not classed do not embrace any matter within the inquiry of the Commission.—Most of those classed also contain matter not within their inquiry.

RECEIVED FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
691	Lieut. T. E. Strong -	3 Bombay N. I. -	—	709	Major J. Black -	Bombay Staff Corps	—
692	„ M. A. Chaldecott -	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	710	Capt F C. J. Brownlow -	Bengal Army	5
693	Lieut.-Col. T. Biggs -	„ „	—	711	Lieut. Wellesley Campbell -	„ „	3, 5
694	Capt. G. Napier -	„ „	—	712	Capt. W. H. Phillips -	Bengal N. I.	—
695	„ T. H. Turner -	„ „	—	713	Lieut. G. A. A. Baker -	Bengal Army	—
696	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. W. H. Cuming.	Madras Army -	5	714	Lieut.-Col W C Erskine, C.B.	Ret. List Bengal A.	5
697	Capt. & Bt.-Maj. R R. Stuart	„ „	5	715	Lieut. J. B. Chatterton -	41 Bengal N. I.	—
698	Col. H. C. Wade -	Retired, Royal Art.	—	716	Lieut.-Col. E. Harvey -	Ret. List Bengal A.	5
699	Lieut. F. L. Haleman -	37 (Grenadiers) Madras Army.	3, 5	717	Capt. W. H. Blowers -	Bombay Staff Corps	—
700	Capt. J. Shekleton -	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	718	„ W. F. Shaw -	43 Bengal N. I.	5
701	Capt. G. W. Chapman -	Bengal Army -	5	719	„ R. B. Mackenzie -	18 „	5
702	Lieut.-Col. R. B. Moore -	Bombay Army -	5	720	„ A. A. Bayly -	Bombay Artillery-	—
703	Lieut.-Col & Bt. Col. T. T. Christie	„ „	3, 4, 5	721	„ A. F. Williams -	9 Madras N. I.	5
704	Second Capt. J. Ritchie -	Royal, formerly Bombay Art.	—	722	Lieut. H. L. A. Tottenham	67 Bengal N. I.	5
705	„ C. P. Roberts -	„ „	—	723	Capt. C. Baily -	17 „	3, 4
706	Lieut.-Col. J. D. Woolcombe	„ „	—	724	Bt.-Col. Gosling -	Madras N. I.	—
707	Capt J. T. Hill -	14 Bombay N. I. -	5	725	Lieut.-Col. G. E. Voyle -	Bengal Artillery -	—
708	„ L. F. Wells -	Bengal Army -	—	726	Major W. E. White -	30 Madras N. I.	5
				727	Lieut. R. H. Inglis -	43 Bengal N. I.	5
				728	Major W. C. Stileman -	15 Bombay N. I.	—
				729	„ R. J. Edgerley -	29 „	3, 4
				730	Lieut. J. H. E. Johnson -	2 Madras European	—
				731	Major G. Holroyd -	6 Bengal N. I.	3, 4, 5
				732	Lieut.-Col. J. P. Clarkson -	„ „	3, 4, 5

RECEIVED FROM THE INDIA OFFICE.

No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.	No.	Rank and Names.	Regt.—Presidency.	Points.
1	Lieut.-Col. D. S. Dodgson -	Bengal N. I. -	—	12	Major R. G. Smeon -	Bengal Staff Corps	—
2	„ A. C. Silver -	Madras „ -	5	13	Bt.-Major E. A. Hardy -	Bombay L. C. -	—
3	Capt. S. Chalmers -	53 Bengal N. I. -	5	14	{ Col. G. W. Hamilton -	Bengal Staff Corps	4
4	Major J. Dawson -	Madras Staff Corps	5		{ „ F. E. Voyle -	„ „	4
5	Lieut.-Col. H. T. Vincent -	Bombay Staff Corps	—	15	Capt. Fulton -	32 Madras N. I. -	—
6	„ J. P. Coode -	37 Madras N. I. -	5	16	Col. Scott -	Madras Staff Corps	—
7	Col. G. Ramsay -	Bengal Staff Corps	4	17	Lieut.-Col. Wray -	Bombay Artillery -	—
8	Bt. Lieut.-Col. C. Hinde -	Bengal Army -	5	18	„ B. R. Powell -	26 Bombay N. I. -	3, 4, 5
9	Br.-Gen. D. Babington -	Madras „ -	4, 5	19	Lieut. S. De B. Edwardes -	2 Bombay N. I. -	—
10	Major J. E. Mayne -	8 Madras L. C. -	—	20	Major E. J. Spilsbury -	Bengal Staff Corps	—
11	Lieut. Frotheroe -	40 Madras N. I. -	—	21	„ T. Wheeler -	32 Bengal N. I. -	5

Not classed.

From House of Peers -	-	-	-	-	-	156	—	25
„ House of Commons -	-	-	-	-	-	732	—	168
„ India Office -	-	-	-	-	-	21	—	11

Total - 909 204

Classed 705

From Bengal -	-	-	-	-	-	294	
„ Madras -	-	-	-	-	-	372	
„ Bombay -	-	-	-	-	-	243	
						909	

APPENDIX B.

APPENDIX B.

No. 1.

SIR, Cannon Row, July 10, 1865.
I AM directed by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into some complaints of the officers of the Indian army to inform you that they are prepared to receive a written memorandum from any officers, now in England, setting forth their own individual grievances, with the names of any witnesses they would wish to bring forward in support of their complaints.
The points to which the officers must confine themselves are the following:—

- 1st. The supersession in army rank to which they have been subjected by officers joining the Staff Corps, or by the action of the brevet rank given to remedy such supersession.

No. 1.

- 2d. The reduction in the number of regimental lieutenant-colonels by making promotion in succession to one half only of the officers of that rank who accepted special annuities in 1861.
3d. The regulation by which 12 years is made the period of service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel.
4th. The arrangements for future promotion of officers to the rank Of Engineers, Artillery of General Officers.
The Commissioners conceive you may be able and willing to assist them in procuring such evidence.

I have, &c.

R. CREWE,

Colonel, Secretary.

To Maj-General North,
Royal Engineers.

No. 2.

STATEMENTS addressed to the COMMISSION.

No. 2.

	By	Regiments, &c.	Subjects.
<i>Bengal.</i>			
1	Lieut-Col Gaitskill	Retired List	The bonus system.
	Capt Sir C Oakley	Do	Do
	Lieut-Col Hobday	Do	Claim to rank and allowance as a retired lieutenant-colonel in lieu of that of major, granted in December 1861.
	Maj-Gen. Flemyng		Retardation of promotion by retention of names of retired lieutenant-colonels.
5	Major Wyld	Retired List	That the brevet rank granted to him on retirement has been cancelled by order of the Secretary of State.
	Lieut-Col Erskine	Do	Do.
	Major Trotter	Do	Do.
	Brevet-Col. Liptrop	45th N.I.	Retention of the names of retired lieutenant colonels, and the 12-year period for colonel's allowance.
	Brevet-Major Armstrong	10th N.I.	The causes that prevented his joining the Staff Corps, and the supersession he has experienced by its formation.
10	Lieut-Col. Shute	19th N.I.	Supersession of his brevet rank for field service.
	Lieut-Col. Wallace	Retired List	That he should have had brevet rank under the orders of 1864, having retired in 1863.
	Sir R. Hamilton, on behalf of Major Hutchinson.	13th N.I.	The retiring rules of the Staff Corps.
	Lieut-Col. Brougham	Royal Artillery	The amalgamation with the Royal Artillery incomplete
	Lieut-Col. Boyd		That the 12-year period is injurious to his prospects of arriving at colonel's allowance.
15	Lieut-Col Scott	Staff Corps	Do.
	Brevet-Major C. Need	7th N.I.	Supersession by his regimental juniors joining the Staff Corps, the retention of retired officers' names, and the 12 year period.
	Capt. Keppel	6th European Regt	The non-removal from regimental cadre of officers joining the Staff Corps, the 12-year period, and the bonus system.
	Lieut. J. Robinson	1st European L.C.	That the names of officers joining the line regiments have not been removed from the cadre of their regiments.
	Lieut. F. Currie	Do.	Do.
	Capt. J. A. Grant	6th European Regt	Being on special service in Africa at time of formation of the Staff Corps; had no opportunity of judging if it would be to his advantage to join; not having done so is superseded. The bonus system.
<i>Madras.</i>			
	Col. Haly	Retired List	Supersession, retardation of promotion, and the 12-year period.
	Brevet-Major Davis	44th N.I.	Supersession by regimental juniors.
	Lieut-Gen. Cotton	Retired List	That the terms under which he retired have since been altered, whereby he has suffered loss.
	Brevet-Major Drever	2nd European Regt	Supersession by regimental juniors, and loss of promotion in place of the lieutenant-colonels retired in 1861.
25	Lieut-Col. Freese	23rd L.I.	Supersession caused by the brevet of 1864.
	Major Clagett	Retired List	Claim to rank on retirement as lieutenant-colonel.
	Capt. Ramsay	10th N.I.	Supersession in army rank, the retention of the names of retired officers, and the 12-year period.
	Capt. Farrer	21st N.I.	Claim to promotion in place of regimental seniors removed to other corps; the inadequacy of the brevet to remedy supersession.
30	Brevet-Captain Corbett	38th N.I.	Supersession and retention of retired lieutenant-colonels' names.
	Brevet-Captain Frazer	25th N.I.	Supersession.
	Maj-Gen. Bird	Retired List	The terms under which he retired have since been altered, whereby he has suffered loss.
	Major R. Shawe	Do.	Claim to rank on retirement as lieutenant-colonel, as he was in the army on 18th February 1861.
	Lieut-Col. Bahmain	Royal Artillery	That the amalgamation has not been completed; that the bonus given to lieutenant-colonels of cavalry and infantry should be extended to the artillery.
35	Lieut-Col. Greenlaw	Staff Corps	Regarding various rules of that corps.
	Capt. Pictet	49th N.I.	Supersession; inadequacy of the brevet; retention on regiment of officers transferred to Staff Corps; that increased opportunities for retiring should be given to local officers.
	Lt-Col. Triscott	7th N.I.	Supersession.
	Capt and Brev. Lt-Col. Temple	12th N.I.	Supersession of his rank for field service.

		APPENDIX I	
		No. 2.	
—	By	Regiments, &c.	Subjects.
<i>Bombay.</i>			
40	Major Kane - - -	Retired List - -	Claim to benefit by changes made subsequent to his retirement. Objections to present system of regimental organization. Regarding altered system of regimental command and the 12-year period
	Brevet Major Walker - - -	Grenadiers - - -	
	Lieut.-Col. Taylor - - -	Light Cavalry - -	
	Lieut. Moore - - -	3rd Light Cavalry - -	
	Lieut.-Gen. Griffith - - -	Royal Artillery - -	The altered condition of the native cavalry under present rules. Claim to rank to which he considers he is entitled; the general question of amalgamation.
	Lieut. Gayer - - -	2nd European Regt ^t - -	Supersession by regimental juniors; claims promotion in place of seniors transferred to other corps; retention of names of retired officers, bonus system.
	Brevet-Major Jessop - - -	2nd E.L.I. - - -	That his petition addressed to the House of Commons may be considered by the Commission.
45	Major J. H. Champion - - -	Staff Corps - - -	Supersession of his brevet rank for field service.
	Major C. Thompson - - -	9th N.I. - - -	Supersession by regimental juniors
	Capt. J. Barras - - -	15th N.I. - - -	Supersession, that he may have brevet rank as major after having served eight years as captain.
	Lieut.-Col McCulloch - - -	Retired List - - -	The bonus system.
	Major Sinclair - - -	26th N.I. - - -	Supersession by regimental juniors.
50	Colonel Eyre - - -	3rd L.C. - - -	
51	Capt. Kettlewell - - -	Staff Corps - - -	The regulations of that corps.

No. 3.

No. 3.

OBSERVATIONS AND EVIDENCE by MAJOR-GENERAL G. BALFOUR, C.B., Royal (Madras) Artillery.

POINT 1.

Retention on Cadres of Native regiments of the names of officers transferred to the new Line Regiments.

1. I cannot but think that there must exist a misconception on the subject of the sufficiency of these five questions to which the inquiry by the present Royal Commission is I understand restricted, in respect to their comprising a full investigation into the whole of the complaints which officers of the Indian army have persistently preferred to the Houses of Parliament, against injuries, as viewed by them, in their service prospects, hopes, or assurances, by the way in which changes have been made since 1861 in the Indian military system.

2. But, after carefully endeavouring to follow out the original measures of 1861, changing the Indian military system, and aided as these inquiries have been by having, when belonging to the Military Finance Commission, reported to the Government of India in May 1860, in conjunction with my colleague, Major-General Jameson, on the objections to the formation of a staff corps, and by experience obtained from sitting on what is known as the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission, which the Viceroy, Earl Canning, assembled to aid in extracting out of the despatches of the 18th January 1861 the Orders to be issued, to give effect to what is popularly known as the amalgamation of the armies, I confess that I think such a result of repeated inquiries,—this being the sixth inquiry,—was fairly to be expected.

3. The complications in the Indian military system from the changes were formidable; the subsequent Orders to correct defects caused all previous measures to become more involved, moreover, rendering it almost impossible for any one mind to grasp all the necessary facts, to prevent further mistakes in applying remedies which the public and individual interests called for. The very measures ordered in the Secretary of State's Despatch, No. 194, of 17th June 1864, to rectify the wrongs as stated in the Report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, create further wrongs, of a character which do not appear to be included in the present inquiry; even several wrongs found or inferred to exist by the former Commission are omitted from the present inquiry; moreover leaving other questions treated of by that former Commission, owing to insufficient information obtained during that investigation.

4. In now laying before the present Commissioners my views on these five questions, I may state that before replying, I have endeavoured to obtain access to all official papers available through the Orders of Parliament, but I am aware of important documents still unpublished, and some, though I believe published in India, are not easily accessible to gentlemen in England. Moreover the papers accessible are so numerous and the matters therein so complicated, that it is difficult for any one person to avoid falling into mistakes. The hope is that many inquiries from many interested officers will lead to correct

information being obtained by the present Commission; I shall now try to aid them in their important investigation, but carefully abstaining from remarking on the principles involved in the 1861 changes, confining my statements to the mode these were ordered to be carried out, with suggestions for remedies for errors which may appear to have been made.

5. This very first question is a fair illustration of the injury which may be done to a body of officers from an insufficient and incomplete inquiry into the real merits of the complaints. Paragraph 55 of despatch 194 of 1864 from the Secretary of State, directs that "the names of the officers who joined the new line regiments from native cavalry and infantry, including the cadres of the 4th and 5th regiments of European cavalry, and of the 4th, 5th, and 6th regiments of European infantry in Bengal, shall be removed from the cadres of their former regiments, and that promotions should be made in their room." "These promotions will bear date from the 18th February 1861." This order was issued to comply with the finding of that part of Lord Cranworth's Commission, that wrong had been done in not removing officers who joined new line regiments from cadres of native troops; and though, according to the finding of that Commission, wrong was equally done in not removing all officers from all cadres, including European cadres, yet promotion therein was withheld, from the erroneous notion that according to the "REASON" of the Commissioners, a large amount of cadre promotion in a few regiments would follow, if all the vacancies occasioned by the removal of officers to the new line regiments were regimentally filled up.

6. The Secretary of State does not define the process to be followed in filling up the vacancies now in part declared to exist, and as I am not aware of any previous order which interfered with the old and well understood practice of the Indian army, of filling up vacancies occasioned by transfers to complete new regiments—and to this character Lord Cranworth's Commission declared these promotions to belong—I presume that the former established service course has been followed in this case, by the Government of India filling up vacancies in cadres occasioned by the transfers of officers to the new line regiments by making army promotions, instead of replacing the removed officers by regimental succession; or, if not so carried out, that the Royal Commissioners will advise an adherence to so excellent a rule and practice. This course, if followed, will prove that the former Commission's notion of extensive promotion taking place in a few regiments need not be the consequence, if acting in accordance with former practice and rule, and that the objection to the European cadres obtaining these vacancies need not be maintained.

7. I may also ask the attention of the Royal Commissioners to the last part of paragraph 5 of the report of Lord Hotham's Committee, dated 31st August 1860, or six months before the despatches of the 18th January 1861 were sent to India, which clearly indicated the course to be followed in filling up all vacancies in regiments, not only

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

those occasioned by transfers to the line regiments, but also those arising from transfers to the staff corps; for the sake of the public interests in the prevention or settlement of claims, it is deeply to be regretted the sound advice which this committee gave, on so many of the references made to them by the Secretary of State, was not much more attended to, before sending out the 1861 despatches. So important and correct do I view the main portion of advice generally given by Lord Hotham's Committee, but especially as bearing on this one question,—the mode of filling up vacancies in cadres,—that I would shall advocate its being practically applied, with retrospective effect from the 18th February 1861; I would also include in its operation the filling up of all vacancies in all cadres, whether of European or native infantry, occasioned by transfers of all officers of all ranks to new line regiments as also to the staff corps, and by all retirements under the 1861 bonus, and that all such vacancies should be filled up by army succession, and promotion dated 18th February 1861.

8. This opportunity might then be taken to apply other measures of a liberal and comprehensive character calculated to supersede the existing grievances, which will continue to rankle in the minds of the injured, until removed.

9. As far as I can judge the best remedy now to be resorted to, under the existing difficulties, is that the whole of the officers of the Indian army of all branches, engineers, artillery, cavalry, and infantry, should be brought into one General Gradation List, with date of rank in that list, of a day prior to that on which the Secretary of State's change took effect, say from the 17th February 1861; the measure being however carried out with great discretion, and a large amount of liberality, so that by mainly benefiting all officers, all may now or hereafter merge their former and more recently acquired rights or claims in this one measure.

10. I would here urge that, though I aided the Government of India in bringing down military expenditure to an amount which the Indian finances could bear, and advocated and enforced economy in all branches and departments, as far as the efficiency of the military service would permit, yet in dealing with these military questions I continue to advise, as I formerly did, that financial considerations be subordinated to others of a higher order than those belonging to the needed amount of money for their execution. I believe that relative economy can be practised even in these measures, but the efficiency of the service should be the primary consideration, and when the military service of India is once placed on a right footing, diminished expenditure will follow, and will be aided from effecting a settlement of the fair claims of servants; for nothing is more wasteful to a State than allowing claimants to exist.

11. This leads me to ask the present Royal Commissioners to peruse the 45th paragraph of the Report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, and to decide whether the first part of the paragraph, when fully filled up with the details of the "fixed rules" alluded to by the Commission as being in force in the Indian army in filling up the vacancies in cadres, is not in opposition to the reasoning in the last part of the paragraph, whereby the officers of the cadres of the old European regiments have been injured.

The Commissioners state, and correctly, "that in all ordinary cases where a new regiment has been formed, in the Indian service, the officers have been appointed according to certain fixed rules, but in every instance promotion has been given in the place of officers transferred."

12. The Commissioners unfortunately do not indicate the nature of these "certain fixed rules," and from this omission they appear to have fallen into an error, in the latter part of the paragraph, of which the following is an extract:—"If the usual rule of giving promotion in the case of all vacancies created by the transfer of officers had been applied to officers remaining on the cadres of the old European regiments, the promotion given would have been to a most extravagant extent. We consider the result to be one forbidden by reason, and therefore not to be one which could have been in the contemplation of Parliament."

13. The same notion as to the extravagant extent of promotion, which some few officers might obtain, is observable in recent speeches of Lords Dufferin and Cranworth in the House of Peers, whereby the nine old European cadres of infantry, and three European cavalry cadres formed from officers of the Bengal native cavalry, (from 1st to 6th regiments,) have been excluded from promotions which army rules and practice entitled them to obtain, whereby injury has been occasioned not only to the officers of those cadres, but to the whole army. I consider this to be solely owing to several members of the former Commission

being unacquainted with those special and peculiar rules of promotion to military rank which apply to all armies, as well as to the Indian army. Had it been explained to the Commission how easily this "unreasonable" amount of regimental promotion could have been prevented by acting on the advice which Lord Hotham's Committee recorded in their report of 30th August 1860, I have no doubt the measures advised by the last Commission would have been more comprehensive and more equitable to the merits of the cases.

14. I am borne out in this view from perusing the minute appended to the report of the former Commission, signed by Lord Cranworth and General Sir Charles Yorke, which states that there is no difference in principle between the cases of the officers of the native regiments and those brought from the old European regiments. Now, if this view had been added to the 45th paragraph of the report, in which the majority of the Commission concurred, and if these two Commissioners, who separately minuted, had been informed that such vacancies, as well as those in the cadres of native troops, ought by existing rules to be filled up by army and not regimental succession, as Lord Hotham's Committee advised, there would have been no ground for excluding officers on the cadres of old European regiments from promotion.

15. In a financial point of view I do not think it could have been of any great moment, in comparison with the contentment which it would have caused, and as the practice of retaining names of officers on cadres from which removed, whilst commissioned in new line regiments, and in the new staff corps, was certainly opposed to all military precedent, it appears to me that the officers had a claim to expect this remedy. All apprehended inequalities and irregularities from giving extensive promotion to a few, would have been found not to arise, if the simple measure of enforcing existing rules had been carried out; I know of no measure which would have proved so effectual in reconciling officers to supersessions by staff corps officers, as this one measure of filling up all vacancies in this wise.

16. There is in connexion with this point one arrangement which has not been, according to my view, correctly carried out, and that is, filling up vacancies occasioned by transfers of colonels to new line regiments.

17. At the time the Secretary of State's orders of 1861 were received in Calcutta from England, I fully understood, and the practice since followed bears out the view then taken, that 12 new line regiments of cavalry and infantry were raised for the British army; the available means in India as to men and officers being used to form the 12 new regiments; and though these were intended to be mainly formed out of the 17 regiments of infantry and cavalry, on the rolls of the Indian army, yet native regiments were also intended to supply officers, and did supply some. By the comprehensive course followed by the Government of India nearly the whole of the non-commissioned officers and men of the 17 European regiments and 24 brigades and battalions of artillery of India were induced, by a fair but liberal bounty, to re-enlist, be re-attested, and volunteer, each soldier selecting, as fully recognized, the particular British regiment he wished to join; the few soldiers who declined to take the bounty remained on the rolls of the Indian army. In like manner the officers of the Indian army were allowed to volunteer for the 12 new line regiments, and although a preference was given, generally, to those who volunteered from 11 of the 17 regiments, yet several volunteer officers, from native infantry, were accepted. The cadres of 176 native infantry and cavalry, and of 9 old European infantry,—all Indian regiments from which officers for 12 new line regiments were obtained,—were left standing, and these remain to this day, on the official lists of the Indian army.

18. The 12 new line regiments were all numbered in succession to, and after the other regiments of the British army; thereby showing that they were newly raised, though it is known or believed that one of the Indian European regiments is the oldest regiment of the whole army; and although the old names of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay are still found blended with the new numbers, affixed to the new line regiments, yet I am confident I am right in stating that this designation was given, as well as the honorary distinction "Royal" under a despatch of May 1859, in order to keep in memory the brave and great services which the excellent field regiments (Europeans) of the Indian army had rendered to the empire.

19. Under this explanation I may add, that inasmuch as no transfer of regiments from the Indian army did take place, and as new regiments were formed or raised for the British service, and as all Indian

cadres were left standing, then all vacancies, in whatever grade occurring, by reason of officers being removed to regiments of the British army should, I submit, be filled up by making promotions according to the finding in Lord Cranworth's Commission report, and with date of rank from the 18th February 1861 as fixed by the Secretary of State.

20. No portion of the report of the Royal Commission, over which Lord Cranworth presided, is more decided in tone and spirit, than the portion comprised in the 45th and 46th paragraphs, and from the minutes appended it is clear that the question to which these two paragraphs refer was very fully considered. Certainly, no words could be used, more decided in conveying a decision, than those set forth in paragraph 46, "that the denial of such promotion is an unnecessary departure from the assurance given by Parliament." This opinion is general in its application to all ranks, that the names of all officers who were brought in from the native infantry and cavalry on to the rolls of the 12 new line regiments, should be removed from their old cadres, and that these vacancies fall under the ordinary rule, under which promotion has always been given on the transfer of an officer to another regiment. Now out of the 12 colonels (as per margin)* transferred to the 12 new line regiments, including Colonel Pattle (since dead). I can only find by the India Office List for January 1861, that five of them belonged to the cadres of the European regiments of India, the other seven being according to that (January 1861) list, all borne on the general regimental list of the native cavalry and infantry, and seeing that the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission states, "no public interest interferes with their promotion, and that it is not contrary to reason;" also, that its "denial is an unnecessary departure from the assurance given by Parliament," I submit that their names should, therefore, according to the finding of the former Commission, be removed from the Indian cadres, and promotions in their room given to the officers from the 18th February 1861.

21. No reservation was made as to any exclusion of particular grades, for all officers who joined the 12 new line regiments, and who were borne on certain specified cadres, were ordered to be removed from the cadres of their former corps, that removal, according to the 55th paragraph of despatch of the Secretary of State of 17th June 1864, to date from 18th February 1861, and promotions made also on that date, in lieu of the Officers so removed. The Secretary of State's orders would doubtless have been carried out by the Government of India, had the instructions given in paragraph 55 of the 1864 Despatch not been neutralised by the issue of very different orders in the 79th paragraph. That order directed the Government of India "to remove from the list of colonels, with colonel's allowances, the several officers who have been transferred to the new line regiments, making promotions in their room;" and had this part of the despatch stopped here, the order would have been in harmony with the instructions given in the preceding paragraph 55, but it goes on to say, "that the promotions to be given in the room of these officers are to be made 'on the principle 'laid down in my despatch No. 320, dated 10th August 1861, paragraphs 17 and 18.'"

22. That despatch will be found as Appendix L., page 151 of the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, but it has, according to my reading, no bearing on the case in question, for it was written six months after the 18th February 1861, and had reference to arrangements which were to have effect six months later, viz. 31st December 1861; it directed certain promotions, to take effect on 1st January 1862, of a description entirely different from promotions consequent on colonels joining new line regiments; and had reference to measures connected with additional inducements to old officers to retire, thoroughly well known to two members of the present Royal Commission, and were consequent on suggestions emanating from the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission, and did not emanate from any direct orders contained in the Secretary of State's despatches of 18th January 1861, to which the colonels question belongs. The two measures are referable to different dates, and entirely distinct in their origin and nature; and as it is practically reduced to one of dates, then in order

* Roberts, Hale, Dyce, Whitlock, Pattle, Vivian, Bell, Capon, Wymer, Wyllie, Carmichael, Hearsey, and perhaps Grant.

to meet this very difficulty about dates of rank the Calcutta Commission specially advised (Addendum No. IX.) that all promotions of every description, from whatever cause arising within the year, should have uniform operation as to rank, from the one date, that of the 18th February 1861. It was, however, and very unfortunately for the effectual adjustment of rank claims (the most troublesome in an army), not adopted at the India Office.

23. I am aware that the names of the 12 colonels brought from the Indian army on to the 12 new line regiments have all been removed from the Indian cadres, and by a process which gives an appearance of liberality; but I believe I could show that the course followed by Government has deprived some officers of that very promotion in regard to which Lord Cranworth's Commission stated, that "the denial was an unnecessary departure from the assurance given by Parliament."

24. Paragraph 55 of the Secretary of State's despatch of 17th June 1864, contains clear instructions to the Government of India to carry out, and apparently with very full effect, the finding of Lord Cranworth's Commission, by directing that "the names of the officers who joined the new line regiments from native infantry and cavalry, including the cadres of the 4th and 5th regiments of European cavalry, and of the 4th, 5th, and 6th regiments of European infantry in Bengal, which have been formed from native regiments, shall be removed from the cadres of their former regiments, and that promotions be made in their places." "These promotions will date from the 18th February 1861."

25. No words could convey more complete, conclusive, and correct instructions than those above stated as to the fair intentions of Government, the appearance of liberality in the measure is, that the 12 Colonels belonging to the 12 line regiments are ordered all to be removed, whereas, by the finding of Lord Cranworth's Commission, those officers who joined from European regiments of the Indian army were excluded. Under this view, as far as I can ascertain, five of the 12 Colonels who joined the 12 line regiments ought not to have been removed from the Indian cadres, under the views recorded in Lord Cranworth's Commission report, seven of the twelve alone being removable, but from the date fixed in the despatch for the removal of the other officers, viz. 18th February 1861, whereas all the 12 were removed, but then the date of removal only had effect by the Secretary of State's special order, on and after 1st January 1862; thereby causing a material difference in the promotion of some officers.

26. This date of promotion, 18th February 1861, is one that has been generally adopted for all promotions consequent on the 1861 changes; the special Commission assembled in Calcutta by general orders of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in council specially in their first and second reports advised the adoption of this date even for those officers who retired on the annuity of 50l from the 1st October 1861, as well as those who were proposed to be induced to retire on the larger bonus, (vide Addend. No. IX) and the Government of India in the 103rd paragraph of the general order of the 10th April 1861, No. 332, directed that "all promotions in the Staff Corps, in the case of officers who may join the Staff Corps within 6 months of the publication of the Royal warrant, will take effect from the 18th February 1861, the date of the receipt of the warrant in India." This date will also be seen to have been generally acted on, such as the lapsing of the appointments of colonels with allowances, by reducing one in three casualties; and even in recently granting the brevet rank, the Secretary of State in his June despatch of 1864 directed it to have retrospective effect for 3½ years, from the 18th February 1861.

27. As this last date is in strict agreement with the former Indian practice for fixing dates for casualties, there can be no question that whether favourable or unfavourable to the State or to the officers, it ought according to all precedent to be enforced and made applicable to all vacancies; indeed I may say that it will be found beneficial to the State and also to officers, if applied to promotion following all retirements on the 31st December 1861, for thereby many existing rank claims will be settled and the desired gradation list more easily formed.

28. The removal of these five colonels may, however, fall under another order of the Secretary of State, as set forth in paragraph 77 of his 1864 Despatch, wherein it is stated, that Government accords to the Indian army

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

" the removal of the names of all officers (of the staff corps as also those who had joined the new line regiments) above the rank of major from the general regimental list of the Indian army."

29. The removal of the five colonels, if made under this order, being in excess of the finding of Lord Cranworth's Commission, is an act distinct from that which affects the seven colonels, and the promotions in the room of these five may be regulated by the Secretary of State, and may fall under the operation of paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Despatch, No. 320, of 10th August 1861; but by blending the case of the seven colonels with that of the five special removals, the promotion justly due from the 18th February 1861, is denied, and by its denial some few officers suffer greatly and the whole army generally, for these 7 colonels would give promotion through all ranks of the cavalry and infantry prior to the retirements in December 1861.

30. If these 5 removals had not taken place as a special boon, the names of the five colonels would have been retained on the Indian cadres as now seen in the case of the officers of the 11 European regiments, and then, in the case of Colonel Pattie, (one of the 5), recently dead whose name would have been on an Indian cadre, promotion would only have been given on his decease, in the same way any officer of any junior rank still kept on one of the old European regiments, though posted to one of the 12 new regiments, will only give on death a promotion to his old cadre.

31. The essential point is, however, that the removal of the names of the seven colonels did not take place on the proper date, 18th February 1861, but on or after 1st January 1862, whereby officers, who retired from the service on the 31st December 1861, were deprived of promotion which was due to them on the 18th February 1861, on which date they were in the service.

32. No doubt the endeavour to give retrospective effect to this removal of seven colonels from 18th February 1861, will cause many important changes, but the case is one of many others, which well illustrates the complicated difficulties which a departure from the well recognized principles of a great public service entails, and too truly proves the well known truth that all changes in a service too often involve expenditure of public money, and bring on individuals much suffering, so that it is often a grave question with a Government whether the reform sought to be attained by the changes, is worth risking the bad consequences which will follow thereon.

33. I cannot too frequently urge, that according to the practice of the Indian service all officers who joined the new line regiments, or the new staff corps, or retired on or before, or after 31st December 1861, ought, by the rules of the service, to be struck off the cadres from the date of transfer or retirement, and prior thereto if absent from India upwards of 2½ years; and that assuming any other date or following any other course only entails on the authorities and officers many anxieties, infinitely beyond any money gain which such courses may bring into the coffers of the State,—a very questionable result.

34. As far as I can judge, the best and only remedy is to declare all transfers of all officers of all ranks to the new Staff Corps, and new Line Corps, and all retirements to be army vacancies, and to make promotions in room throughout the army from one date, that of the 18th February 1861; and if reductions be urgently desired in the numbers of the grades, then it is, I unhesitatingly state, far preferable afterwards to make them; only, if absolutely necessary, after the establishment is made complete, by the advancement of officers, even then cautiously, lapsing vacancies in varying proportions, so as to prevent too great an amount of advancement and too little. The extensive promotions which at first would thus follow justify two or more lapses before a further promotion is made, but these only fall in after the fixed establishment is fully completed; a little inquiry would easily regulate the proportions of lapses to be varied as years pass on; again I earnestly advise, to regard this measure as one step towards a gradation list, and this list when once completed only as a stepping stone for a further change, but then time is gained to consider the nature of further changes, leaving the service to be carried on, as it well may be, with this list.

POINT 2.

ARRANGEMENTS for regulating PROMOTIONS of COLONELS of the INDIAN ARMY, of date subsequent to the 17th February 1861, to the rank of General Officer.

1. I admit my inability to foreshadow the various effects which the several changes connected with this

question of advancement to the rank of general, will produce on the advancement of officers in future years. I do not believe there is any one mind able to predict the probable results with any approach to accuracy, and as it is still more difficult to gather from the Orders the object the authorities had in view in introducing these changes, I can only note down a few points for the consideration of the Royal Commissioners, premising that I have perused the remarks in the Reports of Lord Hotham's Committee, and of Lord Cranworth's Commission, which enter, in a very elaborate manner, into the questions connected with the protection due to the grades of general and colonel of the British army, but not so as respects the supersession which these grades of the Indian army would suffer by their interests not being looked after. In fact, the one system seems to have been well understood, but not the other.

2. For a better understanding of my observations, I may notice that in 1854, following up Royal warrants issued in that year, fixing the establishment of general officers for the line at 234, and of the ordnance corps at 48, and 10 for the marines, the Court of Directors authorized 220 generals to be fixed as the Indian army establishment. But instead of allotting some generals to separate branches, as in the British army, these 220 generals were common to all its branches, the artillery, cavalry, engineers, and infantry of India.

3. It will I hope be borne in mind, that this allotment of generals for the whole army of India was in strict keeping with the principles on which the Indian army organization was based. A common system of regimental organization for all branches may be said to have existed; the proportions of ranks in all branches were equal, even the administrative and tactical organizations were maintained; the artillery battalion had the same number of officers of the like grades as an infantry battalion, the number of companies or batteries being only fewer, and the proportions of colonels with allowances in the artillery and engineers were exactly the same as the infantry had to the officers of that branch.

4. The uniform gradation list throughout the whole Indian army in succession to the 220 generals, was therefore in strict harmony with the regimental organization of each of the four branches of the Indian army, which comprised in 1854 upwards of 5,400 officers, being as nearly as possible one general to 24 officers, and very nearly one general officer to each of the 229 establishments, into which, according to the then scale of officers for native infantry battalions, the whole number of officers in all branches could have been divided. For instance, the Indian artillery had in 1854 an establishment of officers nearly equal in numbers and grades to those allowed for 24 regiments of native infantry, and the engineer corps had officers in grades, also nearly equal to about 11 of these regiments, and the 9 European infantry regiments had officers equal, excepting in one rank, to the numbers and grades of 18 Native infantry regiments; with this uniformity of organization no necessity existed for allotting to any one branch of the Indian service a fixed establishment of generals as in the British service.

5. In mentioning the proportion of generals to officers, I must add that as no addition was made to the establishment of generals after 1854, when and after there were additional officers added to the Indian army, and as the warrant of 1st January 1862 states that one general was allowed for each battalion of artillery, and as there were, in 1854 sufficient officers for 229 battalions, and only 220 generals given, I am a little at a loss to express an opinion, whether the cause of the omission intentionally arose, or from viewing the establishment of Indian generals not as based on data which regulated the allotment in the British army, or from an oversight. If there had been added to the Indian list of 220 generals, the proportion due to the augmented number of officers in and after 1854, on the like proportion which, in 1853, Government followed in granting 26 additional generals to the 234 previously authorized for the line, then the Indian army would also have obtained additional generals in 1853, and more since, on further increases in officers taking place.

6. In this place I may also mention, that if the principles which guided the Royal Commissioners of 1854 on the promotion of the army, in allotting 232 general officers to the infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers of the British army, then comprising about 6,000 combatant officers, the number of generals would, for the 5,400 combatant officers of the Indian army, as fixed in 1854, have

been 254 instead of 220; and having at the time carefully examined the subject, I can have no hesitation in stating that the withholding that fair proportion of generals, on the calculated strength of officers as in the British service, and the mistakes in England in making promotions in 1854, injuriously affected the advancement of the Indian army officers, and in my own case I, and indeed also Major-General Moore, would some time since have given promotion in my regiment by vacating our regimental positions on obtaining the major-general's grade, and would have given about two years earlier promotions to the officers.

7. In 1861, when the last changes were ordered in the Indian army, there was to this establishment of 220 generals a regimental establishment of 5,968 officers of all branches, consequent on an increase since 1854 of European officers to all branches of the service. This establishment of combatant officers was, therefore, only 32 short of the number of combatant officers of the British army, for which 282 generals were, in 1854, fixed; I may also mention that besides the great defect in the total numbers fixed, that if the numbers in each grade of the 220 Indian generals be compared with the totals of generals allowed for the two armies, the proportions by grades allowed for India are seen to be disproportionately below the proportion fixed for the British army grades of generals.

8. But in contrasting the numbers and proportions of grades of Indian generals with those of the British army, I earnestly request particular attention to this very unfavourable state, as it will be seen to be at variance with the assurance in the 12th paragraph of the warrant of the 1st January 1862, as follows:—"But the proportion of generals maintained on account of the Indian establishment shall at all times be governed by the principles adopted in respect to the British forces, both in respect to numbers and grades." Nothing can be more assuring than this order, and all that is needed for a full compliance with its terms is to act on the basis which guided the Promotion Commissioners of 1854 in fixing the numbers of all grades of generals as set forth in the 75th paragraph of their report and to give it retrospective effect.

9. The transfer since 1861 of the 12 colonels from the Indian to the British establishment, and the posting of General Sir P. Grant to the 78th Foot, have caused, I think, 13 generals to be struck off the Indian establishment, consequently reducing it to 207 generals. But with the increase of 12 regiments to the British army, the warrant of 1st January 1862 carefully adds 15 generals to that establishment, a contrast to the omission in 1858 to augment the Indian establishment of generals, when combatant officers had been added to the army above the strength in 1854.

10. The reduction of the establishment of generals bears on the advancement of the colonels. A perusal of the remarks in Lord Hotham's Committee report will show that a comparison was made between the number of colonels of the British army and those on the Indian establishment, and reasons urged for adding to the British establishment of generals, so as to afford the colonels a fair chance of rising to the superior grade, further, nearly one-fourth of the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission is employed to show how to protect the interests of the British army in respect to the colonels rising to the general's grade.

11. The like kind of reasoning may now be applied to protect the colonels of the Indian establishment who, by that rank losing 13 generals, sustain the injury which the reports of Lord Hotham's Committee and Lord Cranworth's Commission stated would be sustained by the British colonels; by not removing colonels with other grades from the Indian list, proportionate to the number of generals withdrawn from the Indian, to be added to the English list, the description of injury enunciated in the reports above quoted, and staved off from the British field officers, is inflicted on the Indian officers, by changes made without, as I think, equally caring for their interests.

12. Further, by the ninth and following rules of the regulations attached to the warrant of the 15th June 1864, the Indian list is further to be decreased by the future transfer of generals to the British list; the rules and their future action are not by any means clear. On a Staff Corps officer who was not a lieutenant-colonel on 18th February 1861, succeeding to the rank of colonel on the Indian list, he is then transferred to the British army list of colonels, on which he rises with the officers of that class; but his name is still kept on the rolls of the Indian colonels and on attaining to a position which would have entitled the Staff Corps officer

to the general's grade on the Indian list, one general is then struck off from the Indian and the British list is increased by one, and the senior colonel on the amalgamated list promoted, but no promotion is made in the Indian succession list; but a condition is made that the junior grades of the Staff Corps of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and major previously retained on the Indian list, and previously expecting advancement from Indian general officers becoming casualties, shall also be removed from the Indian list to the British army succession lists, and in order to protect the British officers from loss of promotion, the whole of the Indian generals promoted from officers of the Staff Corps are to be removed from the Indian to the British list, the former being diminished and the latter increased in the proportion of 1 to 28 combatant officers.

13. On transferring the 13 generals to the British list, on the ground of the transfer of regimental colonels with the Indian regiments, and of Sir Patrick Grant, at least 13 colonels, 13 lieutenant-colonels, and 13 majors ought to have been struck off the Indian list, whereas no colonels, and I believe only one regimental lieutenant-colonel and a few line majors were taken over, whereby a loss in time of promotion of fully one year is entailed on those borne on the Indian rolls by this diminution, supposing that the delay in promotion within a period of 13 years could be calculated as if for one individual. The arrangement for the Staff Corps officers being removed to the British list does, however, obviate the like defect.

14. I have already in another reply indicated an omission in filling up the vacancies of colonels of regiments transferred with the new line regiments, and I think that the regimental promotions of lieutenant-colonels to the colonelcies with allowances withheld under the operation of the 12 years rule will also impede the advancement of officers to the regimental grade of field officers, and eventually to the general's grade.

15. As far as I can at present judge, I am under a strong conviction that if, on the 17th February 1861, the establishment of generals for the Indian army had been re-settled on the principles which regulated the fixing of the general's establishment of 1854 for the British army, and the number of generals previously withheld in 1854 from the Indian army, given as additions in 1861 so as to bring up the arrear promotions from 1854 consequent on the disproportionate allotment thus made, the bad effect on so many individual officers occasioned by the great changes of 18th February 1861 would have been greatly lessened, and at the minimum possible outlay of public money, I would still urge its adoption as still well calculated to smooth away obstructions to the changes ordered by Government in the military system of India; but before applying such a great measure as this, a very careful examination of the effects on the officers, by a careful scrutiny of the rolls of the officers, must be made.

16. I may also advert to the different principle followed in respect to the Staff Corps and Indian artillery officers succeeding to promotion in the general officers' line. The former only being separated from the general Indian list on the officer who was not a lieutenant-colonel on 18th February 1861 arriving on the Indian list to the place of succeeding to the general's grade, whereas the artillery officers are separated from the Indian list, as soon as the colonels made on the 18th February 1861 succeed to be senior on the Indian list, and the senior artillery officers are thereby deprived of the far more favourable chance of rise to the grade of general, which the large list of generals would ensure to them.

17. The artillery and engineer officers appear to me to be sufferers by these changes, as the following explanation will show. When all colonels of 1860 on the Indian gradation list become generals, then those artillery and engineer colonels of 1861 and following years are ordered to be separated from the Indian list, the artillery colonels of India being thrown into one line by themselves, and dependent for obtaining the general's grade on casualties amongst 26 generals, the engineer colonels being also separated and placed on a small list of 12 generals; but if there are artillery officers holding the rank of general, in numbers in excess of 26, then one in three deaths lapses until the number be reduced to 26; the like course is also followed with the engineer generals. The above is a modification of the regulations attached to the warrant of 1st January 1862, which directed that on all the colonels of 1860 of the Indian army becoming generals then the amalgamation of the Indian list of artillery generals, with that of the Royal artillery should take place, raising the amalgamated number of artillery generals from 32 to 58,

APPENDIX B.

No 3.

and the engineer list from 16 to 28, and then bringing the artillery and engineer colonels of the Indian and Royal artillery on the respective amalgamated lists. The regulations of 15th of June 1864 abolish this arrangement and place the Indian colonels of artillery separately on a list by themselves of 26 generals, thereby perpetuating the demarcation, already existing, between artillery officers officially considered to belong to one amalgamated regiment, who are now instantly serving together, even at present on very unequal conditions as to present standing and chance of promotion, and, with the prospect, on the new general's list being formed, of still more inequality in position.

18. I may also call to prominent notice another element of great inequality, that is the relative proportions of general officers granted to the old Royal artillery, and the numbers stated in the warrants of 1st January 1862, and 15th June 1864, as the proportionate number of the Indian artillery; the 5th paragraph of the report of the Royal Commission on Promotion, dated 17th June 1854, states that the old Royal artillery then comprised on the regimental list 692 officers on full pay, and the Royal engineers 336, total 1,028, the full pay officers of these two corps being, by the Royal Commission, also stated to be then in the proportion of about "one to five, or one-sixth of the whole 'army'." This would fix the officers of the line (cavalry and infantry), at 5,000, making with the above officers of the ordnance corps about 6,000 officers for whom the establishment of generals was calculated. Now the warrant dated 3rd November 1854 fixed the establishment of generals for the two ordnance corps at 32 for the 692 artillery officers, and 16 for the 336 engineer officers, or 48 for the 1,028 officers, being one general to 21 officers, and the October 1854 warrant fixed 234 for the line, then about 5,000 combatant officers, also one general to 21 officers. Since these numbers regulated the generals' establishment, the two ordnance corps have been largely increased, without any additions being made to the number of generals, though applied for in 1858 as justly due to the ordnance corps, equally with the augmentation of generals to the line, to which two increases have since 1854 been made, whereby the line generals have been increased from 234 in 1854 to 275 at this date.

19. On the 17th February 1861 the artillery corps of India numbered on their rolls 696 officers, and both the warrants of 1st January 1862 and 15th June 1864 state that whilst 24 general officers is the proportionate number due on or before the 1st January 1862 to the Indian artillery out of the 220 generals of the Indian army, or one general to 29 combatant officers, yet in lieu of these, 26 generals are declared to be the number which ought to be granted on the separation, or one general to 27½ officers; whereas under the above explanations as to the principle on which the establishment of Royal artillery and engineer generals was fixed in 1854, viz., in the proportion of 32 generals to 692 old Royal artillery officers, and 16 to 336 old Royal engineer officers, the Indian artillery were, on or before the 18th February 1861, entitled for their 696 officers to 33 generals, or 1 for 21 officers, and in order that the Indian artillery officers may serve together on an equality with those who have already enjoyed the favourable proportion of generals for 12 years, I urge that the original favourable proportions as allowed to the Royal artillery be given to the Indian artillery, and that with retrospective effect, so as to place all on an equal roll.

20. The existing proportion of generals to officers in the old Royal artillery, which is so elaborately stated in the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, as a plea for refusing to the artillery officers of India that equal consideration which their brother officers of the old Royal artillery had previously derived, appears to me misapplied for regulating the number of generals for the Indian artillery. Whatever may be considered, as to the refusal in 1858 to give to the Royal artillery an increase of generals as granted to the line, still looking at the state of the seniors of the Indian artillery, they are at a disadvantage with the seniors of the old Royal artillery officers, as the higher grades have already derived benefit by having had the number of generals fixed in 1854 in the proportion of 1 to 21 officers, it is with these favoured seniors that the higher grades of Indian artillery officers, so backward in promotion, come more distressingly in contact. Moreover, it is the junior grades of the old Royal artillery who will suffer by the denial of the claim made to the promotion commissioners of 1858 to grant to the ordnance corps of England the like increase, which

was then given to the generals of the line, infantry and cavalry. This denial will hereafter be severely felt, and will have, I anticipate, to be corrected.

21. The great principle to endeavour to apply to the state of the ordnance corps of India is, that for a fair and effective amalgamation with the old Royal ordnance corps, it is essential that the component parts to be amalgamated be first placed as much as possible on a relative equality; no doubt this is very difficult, seeing that the organization of the Indian artillery was, for reasons of general policy, based on the infantry composition of the Indian army, and necessarily on principles very wide from those obtaining in the formation of the regiment of old Royal artillery. But as this very difference was foreseen by a member of the present Commission when he sat as a member of the Calcutta Commission, and as it appears to me to have risen in importance, and will, I believe, become a cause for serious consideration, I append (in Addend. Nos. I. and II.) copies of draft reports which the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission drew up connected with the artillery organization and amalgamation. I believe these useful papers will prove of great interest, and I hope eventually of important public utility. I may remark that, at the time the reports in question were prepared, the unfavourable feature which so markedly exists in the old Royal artillery organization, and then extended to the Indian artillery, without all the compensatory advantages of the old Royal artillery organization, was contemplated to be made more unfavourable to the Indian artillery in order to make that of the old Royal artillery still more favourable, by that branch of the amalgamated corps being augmented at the sacrifice of the Indian artillery, and had the Calcutta reports not arrested the contemplated evil, the difficulties would have been seriously increased in regulating the amalgamation of the Ordnance corps.

22. I would now ask the Royal Commissioners to take up the general gradation list of the Indian colonels turning to page 32 of the 1865 (January) list of the Indian army, where they will see that the four senior colonels of the Indian army promoted on or after January 1861 belong to one corps, the Madras artillery; and if I had not been fortunate in obtaining brevet rank I should have been the fifth colonel. I may also add that there are 11 out of 14 colonels of the Indian army of date 1861 belonging to the artillery and engineers. The present Royal Commission will now realize the vast importance which a right arrangement of the number of generals and of the succession list to that rank, will have on these artillery colonels. For instance, if the warrant of 1862 had remained in force these four colonels would have been put with colonels of the old Royal artillery, and placed below some of half their length of service, and below officers, all senior as colonels, but of far junior service, and then with the chance of succeeding to the general's grade after about 58 colonels; this was objected to, and instead of having their chance of rising by casualties amongst the Indian list of 207 generals, they by the warrant of June 1864 are now ordered to be placed on a separate list with the small chance of succession to the higher grade from casualties amongst 26 generals, and as I think placed in a worse position than before.

23. Now there will, in all probability, judging from the present lists, be at the time of the separation more than 26 artillery officers holding rank as generals, thereby causing one of the four of the senior artillery colonels of 1861 to lose one step by lapse, and I submit whether it can be right to alter the line of promotions so as to throw on these four officers, all senior to me in the service, and senior to every one of the unpromoted colonels of the old Royal artillery, senior to many of the generals of that corps, the unfavourable chance of succeeding to the general's grade, on casualties occurring amongst 26 generals, instead of amongst 207 generals of the whole army. I have no hesitation in saying that at least four years' delay will be occasioned, before these four officers obtain the next step, and as they have no chance of attaining the grade of colonel commandant before that time, consequent on the chances of succession to that valuable grade being also lessened, the regimental promotions which would follow the advancement to the grade of general of these four officers are also delayed four years, as below explained.

24. But, out of the 14 army colonels of 1861, there are 11 belonging to the Indian ordnance corps, and three more in 1862. Now, if left on the general list, taking the chance of succeeding on a list of 207 generals, the whole of the 1861 colonels would become generals in about one year after the first of that class obtains promotion.

Looking at the effect of the change, I think that instead of these 11 senior colonels,—the four senior of whom belong to the Madras artillery,—all becoming generals within the year, thereby vacating their position as regimental colonel, and the four seniors within about four months, the last colonel of 1861 will in all probability not obtain the general's grade for many years.

25. A rough calculation of the money loss sustained in the artillery regiment by this change in the line of rise to general, will show more clearly the serious effect of it. Supposing four years to elapse before all the four senior colonels of 1861 obtain the general's grade, the delay will probably be greater, but taking a very moderate average of only two years on the four officers, then in the regimental advancement in succession to the vacancies occasioned by the four on promotion to general, of the three other regimental ranks below them, each one would lose about rs. 300 monthly; then the loss sustained for the period will be about rs. 20,000 to rs. 30,000 for each rank, or for all the promotions in the four ranks together nearly one lakh, or 10,000*l*, in the delay.

26. This case shows that the question about the succession to the general's grade cannot, I believe, be properly replied to without re-opening numerous other questions, which the inquiry and report of Lord Cranworth's Commission enabled the authorities to set aside. The matter should not, however, in my humble opinion, be thus disposed of; indeed, with the conviction strong in the minds of many officers, that wrong has been inflicted by the mode in which the 1861 changes have been or will be carried out, and that, owing to the nature of the inquiry of the former Commission, redress has been defeated, it does appear to be for the good of the public service to allow expressions as to grievances so severe in their operation as they are believed to be by the individual sufferers.

27. Excepting on one point I believe I am as free as any officer, not of the generals' grade in 1861, from any injurious effects by the 1861 changes; but I may illustrate by my own case, as affecting the rank and position of artillery officers, the injury inflicted on my brother officers, by not carrying out the seconding system as enforced in 1861 in the old Royal artillery, I am, however, not personally affected by the measure which I now describe.

28. On the 18th February 1861 I held a general staff appointment in Calcutta, and having in former years carefully studied the rules passed by the Treasury for seconding, and in force in the Royal ordnance corps in 1861, I have no hesitation in stating that my office was one that would under those rules have been by the Lords of the Treasury considered entitled the holder, if in the Royal artillery, to be seconded; and I believe other officers of my regiment held other offices which, according to the practice of the Royal ordnance corps, should have ensured the holders being seconded, and that in the artillery regiments of Bengal and Bombay officers held such like appointments, but they also were not seconded. The withholding of the seconding, as in my particular case and of others, deprived officers below me of rank and pay for years, and one officer of the rank of colonel, long after the 18th February 1861.

29. Without careful inquiry, I think few can appreciate the beneficial influence on promotion in the old Royal artillery arising out of this seconding system, but in a report on the insuperable obstacles to the formation of a staff corps, which my colleague Major-General Jameson and myself, as Military Finance Commissioners, laid before the Governor-General of India on 26th May 1860 (*vide* P. Paper 240 of 5th May 1863), the present Royal Commission will see that the seconding system was therein fully reported on. The report in question shows that in the last year, 1859, for which the table of seconded officers is given in that report, there were on the average of each month of the year as many as 27 old Royal artillery officers seconded, of whom four were second colonels, 4½ lieutenant-colonels, and 16 captains, all of whom had been replaced by other officers; the effect on promotion is not only from those seconded, but an officer who has been seconded may rejoin his corps on promotion, and continue to be seconded until the supernumerary can be absorbed. Thus when the Indian artillery officers were amalgamated with the old Royal artillery officers, they came in contact with officers who had enjoyed for several years many secondings, besides having had large increases, so that instead of being, as a Parliamentary return of 1848 showed, on an equality as to numbers with the Indian Artillery, they had in 1861 become so numerous as greatly to outnumber the Indian artillery, and to give

them the pass-by in military rise from having enjoyed the advantage of the increases, and of that promotion which a very favourable proportion of generals had ensured, besides having the Treasury orders for seconding most liberally and extensively interpreted, so as to give considerable impulses to the regimental promotion. I may also state that in the first and second reports of the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission this system of seconding was recommended, but not permitted to be given.—(*Vide* Addend. Nos. V. and VI.)

30. There is another part of the new system put in force against the artillery officers which affects in a serious manner the future succession of colonels to the general's grade; but this, as well as the omission to apply the seconding rules, escaped the notice of Lord Cranworth's Commission. The old rule, or rather practice of the Indian army recognized a regimental colonel as an effective regimental officer, on two conditions; these were, provided he had not the rank of general, and did not draw the off-reckonings, either of these two disqualified him from the command of the regiment.

31. It is quite true that few officers of this rank ever did command their regiments, and none for upwards of 30 years, but I have known instances of such command being exercised by regimental colonels, and by one in my own regiment, who was not a general, and who did not draw off-reckonings; I think the last regimental colonel of the Madras army who exercised this right was Colonel L. Wahab, commanding the native regiment of infantry at Bangalore in 1834.

32. I have some recollection of the like question having been raised in the case of Colonel Sale, who, before he became a general, obtained the regimental colonelcy of the 13th Foot, and with this position the off-reckonings of the regiment, but, in his case, and with his services, the command of a brigade easily removed the difficulty in respect to the right to command the regiment. Of late years no officer has obtained the colonelcy of a regiment without at once falling into receipt of the colonel's allowances, and generally all so situated have also been generals, though in some few instances, in the Indian army at present, and formerly in the old Royal artillery, there are, and have formerly been, colonels as well as colonels commandant with the allowances, but without the rank, of general, and, in the Indian artillery, there are now some without the rank of commandant, and without the rank of general, but with the allowances, and also officers with the rank of general, as well as with that of commandant and with the allowances of a colonel, who are kept on the grade of second colonel as effectives, obviously to bar promotion of juniors.

33. Further, in respect to the second colonels of the old Royal artillery, no officer in this grade, or in that of regimental lieutenant-colonel, but holding army rank as colonel, on succeeding to the general's grade, has ever been allowed to remain on as an effective regimental officer. All officers on the regimental roll as second colonels of artillery and lieutenant-colonels of the line are, in the British army, invariably removed on promotion to general; and those who obtain the colonel's allowances, even with or without the general's grade, also vacate their regimental position as second colonel and as lieutenant-colonel; several instances exist in the artillery, but Colonel Sale, and, I believe, Lord Lyndoch, are the only two instances of late years in the British infantry.

34. The former practice of both the British and Indian armies shows clearly that no regimental officer holding (the rank of general or being in receipt of off-reckonings now colonel's allowance) can exercise any regimental command or perform any regimental duties, or be reckoned amongst the grades below that of colonel or colonel commandant, that the drawing of the colonel's allowances by a regimental officer, even though not a general, disqualified for regimental command, and that the succession to the rank of general required an officer, not being the colonel of a regiment of the line or a colonel commandant of artillery, to vacate his regimental position, in order that effective officers might be promoted to the rank in order to exercise its functions; and yet, several officers of Indian artillery and of engineers holding the rank of general, and also those drawing the colonel's allowances, and even some who are colonels commandant, were and are kept on the strength of the subordinate grade of second colonel, and some who are not generals, but yet drawing the colonel's allowance, are still retained as effective on that junior grade.

35. I may here bring to the notice of the Royal Commission, that the Viceroy and Governor General of India

APPENDIX B.

No. 3.

APPENDIX B.

No 3

in Council, by General Orders No. 156, dated 26th February 1861, constituted a Special Commission to consider and report on the arrangements necessary for carrying out the amalgamation of the Indian army with Her Majesty's forces, in accordance with Royal warrant and with the orders of Her Majesty's Government, and in the first and second reports of the Commission, when submitting the revised draft of the General Order No. 332 of 10th April 1861, they pointed out to the Government of India the views they entertained on these important questions.

36. I may state that if the disqualifying causes for rendering artillery officers "non-effective" as existing in the old Royal Artillery as above cited, viz. of officers with general's rank and colonel's allowances being kept as effective second colonels, and staff officers holding staff appointments, such, for instance, as the one I held, requiring to be, but not, seconded, had been respected in carrying out the old Royal Artillery organization of 18th February 1861, for the artillery and engineers of India, an addition would have been made in the Indian ordnance corps to the colonels promoted in 1861. I believe that five officers below me in the Madras artillery would have been made colonels on the 18th February 1861, and from an examination of the other lists, of the Bengal and Bombay artilleries, it appears that the like rule would have increased the number of artillery colonels to a larger proportion.

37. No doubt, all these additions, with the promotions following on them, would have largely increased the expense, already pointed to, as arising out of the new artillery and engineer organization; but as the authorities resolved on the measure of assimilation of the Indian artillery and engineers to that existing in the old Royal ordnance corps, and ordered its adoption in India, the consequences flowing out of the orders must, I submit, have also been expected; and inasmuch as some disadvantages have fallen on officers, especially on the seniors, by this assimilation, then, under a full, fair, and impartial reading of the rules and practice connected with the new organization, the Indian artillery officers may claim the most favourable interpretation that can be placed on the mode of carrying out the Royal artillery system according to rules previously laid down and practically applied by superior authority to a corps whose model organization was adopted. Whereas, it appears from the above explanation, that rules and practices common to both the Indian and English armies have been departed from, and others which are daily practised in the standard artillery organization have been withheld, in carrying out the 1861 organization, in regard to the Indian artillery and engineers, thereby greatly retarding the advancement of officers to the colonel's rank, and in the grades below; and if a remedy be not applied, I apprehend that difficulties connected with the amalgamation of the artilleries may eventually arise, consequent on the regimental advancement of the old Royal artillery officers being more favourable than that of the Indian artillery.

38. A statement of the extent of the injury caused to the Madras artillery, equally applicable, in proportion to the larger strength, to the Bengal and Bombay artilleries, may be useful as an illustration of the injury done to the three corps.

39. The Madras artillery list shows on or about the beginning of 1861 the names of 14 senior officers, ending with my own name. The seven senior officers were generals, all then receiving colonel's allowances; the seven junior were lieutenant-colonels, my name being after the last of the seven. By the organization of the 18th February 1861, the four seniors who were general officers became colonels commandant to complete the establishment, rightly retaining their regimental position, and by the Order of the 10th April the whole of the colonels of artillery drawing colonel's allowances were declared to be colonels commandant. Nevertheless the three other generals, though drawing off- reckonings or colonel's allowances, and five of the senior lieutenant-colonels, were made second colonels to complete the established number (of 8) of this grade; ~~three~~ three general officers being thereby kept effective in a grade for which they would be non-effective in the British army. As two of the five lieutenant-colonels, held staff appointments in the ordnance service and were seconded, I was brought in as one of the eight effective second colonels; but though my office at Calcutta was far more disconnected with the artillery service than the offices held by the two seconded lieutenant-colonels, and was one which the English Treasury rules would have seconded, yet I was

not seconded, but remained effective as the junior of the eight second colonels, and necessarily deprived an officer below me of the colonel's grade. I again repeat that this refusal did not personally affect my interests.

40. Since the 18th February 1861, three of the lieutenant-colonels who became second colonels on that date have obtained the colonel's allowances in succession to three of the seven generals deceased; all three continuing to be even then retained as effectives in the grade of second colonel. The third in rank of these three (Major-General Moore) having, however, recently obtained his general's grade, only then vacates his regimental position as second colonel, and a promotion is only then made instead of from the date of receipt of the colonels' allowances; and now that I have obtained my general's rank, though not the colonel's allowances, being regimentally junior to five of the second colonels above me, I also vacate my regimental position, and promotion is made in my room, but several officers with the rank of major-general are still on the rolls of the Indian artillery as effective second colonels, as also officers in the receipt of colonel's allowances, a retention not in accord with practice or rule of the service, Indian or British.

41. I beg the Royal Commissioners to regard the contradictory action in practice towards the Indian and old Royal artillery colonels who become generals. I have by the aid of Hart's last Annual Army List ascertained the following regarding the 15 officers who are colonels commandant and also generals, and 15 who are generals but not colonels commandant; that 15 are on the strength of the regiment, but the other 15 are seconded, and promotions made in their room; all the 50 generals of old Royal artillery (two on 1st January being wanting) had during their service vacated their regimental position and given regimental promotion to the extent of 160 years; as 15 were on the 1st January last still out of the regiment of artillery, consequent on promotion to the general's grade, their removal continue to give regimental promotion, and they have already given promotion to regimental officers below them, to the extent of 80 years, or each of the 15 has on an average given more than five years' promotion to the regimental second colonels, lieutenant-colonels, first and second captains, by each having on the average been out of the corps for that period. In like manner, the 15 other generals on the strength of the regiment as effectives in the one grade of colonel-commandant, have during their service also given about 80 years' promotion by vacating their regimental position, or each also on an average 5 years. This is ascertainable by comparing the date of rank of the first 15 as major-general with that of their succession to the regimental grade of colonel commandant, on which they again become regimental officers; and the date of rank of major-general shows when the second set of 15 vacated their regimental position, the difference between that date, calculated up to the 1st January 1865, will give the years they were out of the corps. The immense amount of regimental promotion which this has given to the old Royal artillery, will show the vast bearing on the regimental rank of the Indian artillery, which the whole of the artillery organization of England would, if it had been given to the Indian artillery, have had on the artillery officers of India.

42. This favourable result produced on the rise of the old Royal artillery officers has not only been withheld by refusing to fix for the Indian artillery the proportion of generals to officers at 1 to 21, as granted to the old Royal artillery in 1854, but even the fair and legitimate claim to allow the vacancies of these generals who were included amongst the second colonels has been denied, notwithstanding that the grades of the Indian artillery were clearly behind, in promotion, the officers of the old Royal artillery.

43. Further, if the Royal Commissioners will read the 28th paragraph of the G. O. of 10th April 1861, it will be seen that all colonels in the receipt of colonel's allowances were declared by the Governor-General in Council to be "supernumerary colonels commandant;" there were 10 of these supernumeraries in the three regiments of Indian artillery, and holding such rank, they could not be effective in a subordinate grade of regimental second colonel; indeed, they more nearly resembled the old grade of lieutenant-colonel commandant, which invariably allowed of the effective grade of lieutenant-colonel being filled up. The withholding of the 10 promotions to second colonel in succession to the 10 supernumerary colonels commandant, deprived the officers of artillery of rank as colonel in the army from the 18th February 1861, and thereby diminished their probable rise to the general's

grade. In the examination of these and numerous other military questions, I cannot too forcibly express the conviction that there is exceeding difficulty in applying parts of one army system to the system of another army, such as that of India was; disappointment and vexation to the authorities must always result from such attempts; a complete change is alone likely to afford a chance of success, not partial changes, as followed in applying only parts of the old artillery organization.

44. There is another arrangement which will, I think, bear on the advancement of the officers of the ordnance corps of India to the general's grade, and that is, the uncertainty and retardation of the rise to the army colonel's grade. At present, all lieutenant-colonels, majors, and captains of the Indian army, in all branches, roll in one gradation list according to army rank, and the senior in each grade succeeds to the higher step, as casualties occur in the general's grade. Now, the regulations attached to the warrant of 15th June 1864 require that on the separation of the colonels of artillery from those of the Indian army, by the separate advancement of officers of artillery and engineers to the grades of general taking place on the 26th list of generals, then the promotions of the artillery officers to army colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and major will be made on the British lists. According to the army gradation list of 1865, some of the army lieutenant-colonels of 1861 will be promoted to the colonel's rank before the last of the colonels of 1860 will have obtained the general's grade; the other grades not promoted will then depend for army rise on the succession according to the British army lists; now unless the brevet rank for length of service recently granted to artillery officers in India be accepted to regulate the army advancement, the artillery officers will be seriously injured by the transfer, seeing that in the Indian service promotion is slow in the lower ranks, but speedy in the higher. Take my case, for example, nearly 19 years a subaltern, and 32 years in the service before attaining the regimental majority, and if without brevet, I pray of the Commissioners to look at the position I should have been in relatively with British artillery officers, being senior in the service to all colonels of Royal artillery, who are not generals, and senior to several of this grade; and yet my senior brother officers in the artillery show a worse case than mine might have been, for they are and will long continue unpromoted, though all senior in the service to a considerable number of Royal artillery generals. There are officers now in my regiment who were upwards of 24 years in the grade of subaltern, some 10 years as second lieutenant, simply because they had not at the beginning of their service the very favourable gradation of the old Royal artillery of having few second lieutenants, and many first lieutenants, and in having two captains to three subalterns, instead of having, as in the Indian artillery, many second, few first lieutenants, and three subalterns to one captain. I ask, how can officers with long service in subordinate grades enter the lists on the slightest equality with Royal officers, many of whom have obtained the field officer's grade in fewer years than the Indian Artillery officer occupied in passing through the lowest grade an officer can hold.

45. This check in the rise of Indian artillery and engineer officers to the grade of colonel in the army and following thereon to the general's grade, will be the more severely felt, seeing that the rise to the rank of colonel commandant will be greatly diminished by the reduction ordered in the number of colonels with colonel's allowances. Thus, whilst this fair opening to a good position which the Indian artillery formerly possessed has been diminished, the few prospective advantages found in practical application in the new artillery organization are either diminished, withheld, or modified to the injury of the Indian artillery; the few past advantages which the old Royal artillery officers have had during the whole course of service, to compensate them in part for the previously less favourable chances in the grade of colonels commandant than the Indian artillery had, are not allowed to the Indian artillery, and the old artillery officers of India who have risen up without either speedy promotion in their youth or extra advantages during their service, but with hopes of success at the end of their career, are now denied compensation, for advantages taken away, equally with those they have never enjoyed as others have before them.

46. I may allude also to various existing differences, such as the pay allowed to Indian colonels and generals of artillery, being in England less than the rates granted to the like ranks of the old Royal artillery,

for instance, officers carry with them in the grade of general unattached and second colonel the superior pay of Royal horse artillery, of whom I believe there are now six in this position, also a higher rate of pay than the Indian officer, trifling it is true, but that trifle is marked, the money gain to Government is small, but the appearance of injury, great to the officer, also distinguished service allowances granted to the old Royal artillery, but withheld from the Indian artillery; two unattached generals formerly selected for an increase of pay whilst waiting for the rank of commandant, not bestowed; the holding of a few sinecure appointments by Royal Artillery, all in part compensating; these, and other advantages enjoyed in promotion during their entire career, by the old Royal artillery officers, small enough, I allow, but still none of the kind have been created for the Indian artillery. The distribution of staff appointments may also be mentioned, no Indian artillery officer holds any purely artillery appointment at home, but old Royal artillery officers do hold appointments in India, and those of the Ordnance Department have all been opened in India to all the officers as one amalgamated corps, but the like course not granted in England in respect to the appointments at home.

47. In making allusion to all these points, I must refer to para. 11 of despatch 194 of 1864 of the Secretary of State, wherein it is stated that "The assimilation of the Indian artillery and engineers to that of the Royal corps has been greatly beneficial to the former in augmenting the proportion of officers of the higher grades, giving promotion thereby, and increasing the charge on account of their pay and allowances." Undoubtedly the change in organization did give some impulse to promotion, and a few officers benefited by it, but that all derived benefit is not borne out by the records. That some injury might be felt by some officers, may be inferred from the rather vague wording of the 51st para. of Lord Cranworth's Commission Report, and had the para. in question been written on more complete information, the erroneous illustrations in that paragraph would have been avoided, and the unnecessary loss of advantages by some Indian Artillery officers without any compensatory gain, would also have been ascertained. But that some officers were injured by the 1861 changes, the Secretary of State has on occasions admitted, and in proof of this it may be sufficient to refer to para. 12 of the 1864 despatch, where it is stated that the cases of certain officers so injured were proposed to be met by granting special annuities for those "whose prospects might be affected directly or indirectly by the reduction." Unhappily, these annuities were fixed on a principle at variance with that stated to have been followed (vide para. 44 of the 1864 despatch) for the officers of the cavalry and infantry who were likely to be injured by the reduction of the number of officers drawing colonel's allowances, viz., of additional annuities, calculated generally "at the value of the prospective colonel's allowance;" the highest rate of annuity for the infantry and cavalry officer being on this principle fixed at nearly three times the amount fixed for each artillery annuity. The result has been that only one-fourth of the number of the annuities offered to the artillery were accepted by the second colonels of the Indian artillery, most of these few having been taken by junior second colonels, who really, it may be said, did derive some benefit in promotion from the change, but losing in their bonuses from the corps, whilst all seniors did not, though having had their former future hopes lessened. As an illustration, I may mention that none of the four officers of the Madras artillery above me, not drawing colonel's allowances, did accept the annuity, such compensation for the reduction of the number of colonel's allowances being, I suppose, insufficient compensation for the hopes and expectations which during a long service had been entertained, of succeeding to the prize of the service, to allow of the closing years of life being passed in some degree of comfort.

48. The next casualty amongst the colonels of the Madras artillery, drawing colonel's allowances, will lapse, no promotion being made in lieu thereof, and this, besides depriving a lieutenant-colonel and captain of the succession to the higher grade, will deprive an officer of, at present, 43 years' service of his succession to the great prize of the service. His succession will now depend on casualties amongst six seniors instead of seven, owing to one being made to lapse, and when I succeed, I must, as far as I can now see, depend on casualties amongst five seniors instead of seven, as before the

APPENDIX B.

No. 3.

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

change, and it is in omitting to specify this serious diminution that the 51st para. of the Report of Lord Cranworth's Commission is erroneous. There are a few such cases of old officers in the artillery of India thus suffering; men who have performed their duty to the State, and in their old age now see the prize postponed for which they had long struggled, and which but for these changes, they would, before this, have probably obtained; then ending their long exile by a few years of peace and quiet and in some degree of comfort in their native country.

49. I may be permitted here again to introduce my own case as one that may throw some light on the cases of my brother officers of the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay regiments of artillery, and I the more readily make mention of it because the Secretary of State has already, in a despatch laid before Parliament (in Parliamentary Paper 263, of 13th May 1863), referred to me by name as one who has benefited by the 1861 changes; but as the official report I submitted to the Viceroy of India as a portion of the duty belonging to my office as chief of the Military Finance Department of India, and on which the mention of my name and case is based, has not been laid before Parliament, I think that the correspondence is not quite complete. I admit I may be reckoned amongst those who are looked on as one of the "fortunates of the service," and whilst I allow this, I equally assert that during my whole career I laboured zealously and heartily in my vocation to promote the service of Government, and though remunerated, yet have not been enriched from the allowance paid me. I am allowed to have done some service to the State, and confided, as all good servants ought, in the hope that Government would continue to me, in return for good service which I have endeavoured to render, some certainty of securing the prize of the service—now hopelessly postponed—before I am too old to enjoy it. I would again add that my case is far less hard than that of a few other deserving officers, but it is quite bad enough.

50. In the Secretary of State's despatch above alluded to, dated 15th October 1862, to the Government of India, it is stated that even "Colonel Balfour, though the ninth on the list of regimental lieutenant-colonels, obtained in consequence of the assimilation the rank of full colonel regimentally on the 18th February 1861, or eight years earlier than he otherwise would have obtained it." The Royal Commission will judge from the following explanation as to the bearing of this promotion on my hopes and expectations. I was an army colonel five years before I became regimental colonel; I am now a major-general; the benefit I have received from the change in 1861 can only be from the pay of the rank since 1861. Now, for many years, say up to November, 1862, I mainly held offices of which the pay was mainly consolidated, and for a few years drew no pay from the Government of India, being under the foreign office. I therefore had but little benefit from regimental promotion, and I am quite willing to refund all I have drawn consequent on the 1861 changes for the purpose of getting my colonel's allowances. Since then I have drawn in England the pay of colonel, or 100*l.* a year above that of lieutenant-colonel, by my recent promotion to major-general, my artillery promotion benefits have now ceased. I have contributed money to buy out seniors, and paid, it is stated from first to last, more than 2,000*l.* for that purpose; the object of this outlay of late years specially in view was to increase the chance of obtaining my colonel's allowances. I submit that whilst the 1861 changes appear to me to have greatly retarded my future chance of obtaining that prize, my advantages have been so trifling from the change in organization, that no one would say I was justified in viewing them as compensatory for the great loss I shall sustain. I am now of 40 years' service, with less chance of that prize than before the amalgamation, for the India Office List of January 1861, shows that I was, before the change, fifteenth from the top of my regimental list, then requiring only eight steps to give me my colonel's allowances; I have already had four steps, including one who retired on a bonus from the regiment, but before I can obtain the prize of the service, I must still look to five more casualties amongst those senior to me, and these casualties must occur amongst a lessened number of officers consequent on the lapses. If I live so long I shall be, as far as I can now judge, nearer 70 than 60 on receiving the prize. Is it then of any worth? I would ask the Commissioners to read the remarks of the Calcutta Commission as to the lessened value of the colonel's allowances as years

pass over before the officers receive the grant. (*Vide* Addend. No. VIII.)

51. I think the remark in paragraph 59 of the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission is worth quoting, it may as well be entered in connexion with my own case:—"The great object of officers in the Indian army, at all events of the great majority of them, has always been to reach a position which may enable them in their declining years to return to England with a competency." I think an honourable and useful career from service in India might also have been added to the objects of an officer's service in India, and whilst I hear much said about other objects than money, being in the minds of servants of the state, I find, practically, in all official situations at home and the colonies that the amount of money received for services performed is a high consideration in the minds of servers; but I am quite ready to accept the dictum of the former commission, that the desire of obtaining money for old age was the sole object of an officer in devoting himself to a long eastern service, and when I state that that object has not been attained in my case from savings out of money drawn from the Government of India, that the hopes I had formed of obtaining the prize of the service, have been destroyed, postponed, or rendered useless by the changes of 1861, I think I have given a good commentary on the incompleteness and insufficiency of the former report to meet my case, and that of many other officers.

52. Having therefore been referred to by name in the Secretary of State's despatch, as having benefited from the amalgamation by eight years' promotion, whereas I maintain that after having largely contributed out of my pay to obtain promotion, I have actually lost my chances of succession to the colonel's allowances, the only form in which I could derive benefit, I may pray the Royal Commissioners to advise cases of injury to senior officers of the artillery being taken into consideration, by granting that inquiry and redress which good servants undoubtedly are entitled to expect from the State.

53. I may here call special attention to the important fact that the governor-general of India in Council favourably submitted to the Secretary of State the recommendation of the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission to grant artillery officers some compensation for their subscriptions to maintain regimental efficiency by buying out old officers, and the present Royal Commission will see from the refusal in paragraph 27 of the Secretary of State's despatch of 10th August 1861 (Appendix L. to Lord Cranworth's Report), that it rests on a plea of such practices never having been officially recognized by the Court of Directors; looking at all the official documents, I certainly always joined with my brother officers in subscribing to buy out my seniors, believing that the act was one as fully recognized and authorized as that of the Duke of Wellington, who permitted old Royal artillery officers to retire from the army on receiving from infantry officers the value placed by the authorities on the artillery commission in return for the rank sold to the buyer; a boon extended to both the marines and engineer officers, without any act being specially passed by Parliament to authorize the sales of non-saleable commissions.

54. I can only add my belief of the great good to the public service from Indian officers using private funds for this public purpose of contributing to facilitate the retirement of old officers; I believe that a special inquiry into the good effects of these payments will bring to light the large amount of efficiency which the officers of India aided in securing for the Government by buying out the old, sickly, and even inefficient; and that the Government have been spared a large outlay to ensure this efficiency, would not be doubted if an inquiry into the additions made to the Royal Ordnance Corps, to see how these were given to provide openings for old officers to obtain advancement in rank, were fully entered upon. I have always held that the official recognition by the Court of Directors so completely given to the Medical and Civil Funds in the three Presidencies for buying out the senior officers of these branches was fully, as plainly given to the Military Funds; and as no despatches could be sent to India without the approval of the Commissioners for the affairs of India, all the authoritative sanctions needed under the Acts of Parliament to permit the buying out of seniors were, I thought, accorded to the military bonuses, as fully as to the other funds; I may also observe that no legal objection was taken by the English civil courts in the late trials about refunds of subscriptions paid in excess of the amounts needed for buying out seniors of the Civil Service. And

yet one Act of Parliament refers, as I am informed, to the buying of both military and civil offices. The evidence of Mr. Melvill before the Purchase Commission, over which the Duke of Somerset presided, then showed that the propriety of passing an Act of Parliament to legalize the practice of such purchases in the military service of India was then under the consideration of the Directors, but doubtless not proceeded with, on finding that the prohibition in the old Act was in the opinion of their law officers neutralized by the power vested in the Government to allow the payments to be proceeded with, as given by a cabinet minister in the case of the Royal artillery, engineer, and marine officers for the sale of their commissions.

55. I submit as a solution of the question of the colonels' allowances, that as the organization of the artillery of India has always been based on the scheme of organization suited for the infantry, the measures which may be followed for this, the main body of the service, should be applicable to the artillery, until such time as the Royal artillery organization has had its full effect on the present race of Indian artillery officers. Indeed, unless the old artillery officers be placed on an equality with the native infantry officers in succeeding to the colonel's allowances, I see no prospect of any fair settlement of their case being effected.

56. This course is the more feasible, seeing that in another part of my replies I have shown that in the total service of the Madras colonels of regiments, of artillery, engineers, cavalry, and infantry, as these stood on 1st January 1861, there was a marked uniformity of rise in all these branches of the Madras army in obtaining the grade of regimental colonel with the allowances. Now this could only be due to the uniform organization which prevailed in all branches of the Indian army, thereby entitling the present race of artillery officers to succeed thereto under the same law as may be formed for the infantry.

57. Now the original order affecting the reduction of the colonel's allowances was alike for all, the Indian artillery and Bengal cavalry and infantry, that the succession to the colonel's allowances should be regulated so that "three only should be promoted for four vacancies." All officers, cavalry, infantry, artillery, and engineers, complained of this rule, which deprived them of the rank of colonel as well as of the colonel's allowances, but the Government only listened to complaints of cavalry and infantry officers, and apparently restricted the inquiry to the effect which the modified rule will have on the succession of infantry and cavalry officers to the colonels' allowances.

57. To remedy this grievance, paragraph 45 of the 1864 despatch states, that "the rule was adopted of giving the colonel's allowances after 12 years to all officers (promoted before 1862) who might not have attained that position in the ordinary course at an earlier period," and for "all officers promoted after 1862, the 12 years' rule was declared absolute."

58. Since then complaints have alone been made as to the length of the average—12 years' service in the grade of regimental lieutenant-colonel—so that whilst the principle of a fixed period of service in that grade may be considered acceptable, the average will probably be reduced to 10 years, and then under the orders in the despatch of 15th September 1861, the officers of infantry and cavalry will be advanced to the grade of colonel with colonel's allowances, and will give promotion to all below; thus after 10 years' service in the regimental grade of lieutenant-colonel, an infantry officer will secure the prize which officers in the artillery will not secure, as far as I can judge, in 20 years' service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and general; the strange fact will also be noticed, that the succession to the colonel's allowance renders an infantry and cavalry regimental lieutenant-colonel non-effective in that grade, but the like law does not apply to a regimental second colonel of artillery kept as effective through drawing the allowance.

59. This remedy for retarded promotion to the prize of the service is, however, only provided for the officers of cavalry and infantry, and has not been extended to the artillery and engineers, although the reason assigned in paragraph 42 of the 1864 despatch for reducing the number of colonel's allowances in the cavalry and infantry, viz.:—"the reductions of strength of these branches,"—cannot apply to the artillery, (for this branch has actually been increased in strength,) and larger means thereby exist for paying colonels of artillery out of the off reckonings which Government commuted into an allowance, and it has not been admitted so fully in the case of the cavalry and infantry, that

injury has been done to the lieutenant-colonels, as in the case of the colonels of the artillery and engineers.

60. As far as I can judge, I would advise the application of the following remedies as likely to overcome many of the serious complications at present existing. Raise the Indian list of general officers in 1861 to the establishment due to the proportion of one general to 21 combatant officers of the army fixed strength as existing in 1861; provide for the previous denial of promotion occasioned between 1854 and 1861 consequent on the insufficient establishment of generals, by declaring in 1861 an extra number of generals, say 100, as supernumerary to the proper proportion; put in force on the 17th February 1861, one day before the orders for the changes came into operation, this increased establishment of generals; keep all officers of all branches, including staff corps officers of the Indian army, as also the officers who joined the new line corps, on the succession list to that establishment until the old Indian service is exhausted. Second all the artillery and engineer officers entitled to be seconded under the Treasury orders, and strike off from the effective grades of second colonel all generals and all colonels who are in the receipt of the colonel's allowances, fix the right of succession of the present race of artillery officers to the colonel's allowances on the rules which will be passed for the infantry; finally endeavour by this and other measures to bring all officers of all branches of the Indian army into one gradation, on terms which will preserve both the regimental and army seniority, and after throwing all officers of all branches into the gradation list, carefully arranged, let the succession to the colonels' allowances follow by that list; the Government may view this course as an expensive one, but they may rely with certainty that economy in the State's funds will result from ensuring a settlement of all those jarring claims which invariably lead to State expenditure.

POINT 3

The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieutenant-Colonels upon the increased rates of pensions.

1. This question also appears to involve several other very complicated questions. It is impossible, I think, to disconnect the one raised by the Royal Commissioners from the influence which the high rank of lieutenant-colonel exercises on all grades and from the considerations connected with these grades.

2. For a clear understanding of the other questions involved in this one question, it is necessary to state that the Viceroy and Governor General of India in Council constituted a Commission by General Order 156, dated 26th February 1861, to consider and report on the measures necessary for carrying out the amalgamation, and in the course of their inquiry it became apparent that, under the altered system of the army from the 1861 changes, a large number of officers of all grades would, under the measures ordered from home, be no longer needed, and they prepared and laid before Government, in their 3rd report, a scheme (*vide Addenda*, Nos. X., XI., XII.), for inducing the seniors to retire on special pensions, thereby clearing off the supernumerary officers from the top, and effecting economy by not replacing them by young officers at the bottom of the list; it will be seen by the Secretary of State's despatch of 10th August 1861, No. 320 (Appendix L. of Lord Cranworth's Commission Report), that the Government of India in their military despatch No. 66, dated 4th May 1861, laid this report of the Calcutta Commission before the Secretary of State, by whom it was only partially acted on, so far as to modify in an important manner the principle on which the scale of pensions of the Calcutta Commission was framed, and only partly recognized as correct in respect to the number of the supernumeraries; special pensions were, however, granted, and under the 19th paragraph of the despatch of 10th August, the Secretary of State directed that steps, occasioned by retirements on the approved scale of pensions, should only be given, in succession to the lieutenant-colonels who retire, in the proportion of one to two of such retirements, striking off one-half of the number of lieutenant-colonels who accepted the retirement, and as 134 lieutenant-colonels retired, the reduction in this grade was 67 out of 134, or more than one-third of all the regimental lieutenant-colonels of the Indian cavalry and infantry. The date of retirement was, however, the 31st December 1861, fixed by the Secretary of State for the vacancies, and the promotions were ordered to date from 1st January 1862, instead of 18th February 1861, as the Special Commission (*vide Addend.* No. IX.), after very careful consideration, advised Government to

APPENDIX B.
No. 8.

adopt, as the one date for all promotions consequent on the army changes on or after 18th February 1861. It was a cause of complication not acting on this advice.

3. There can be no doubt that, limited even as this promotion was, the promotion of the seniors in the several ranks of infantry and cavalry was, on 1st January 1862, accelerated by the retirement, on the 31st December 1861, on these special bonuses, given to a number of regimental lieut.-colonels, but unfortunately the immediate spurt in the advancement is erroneously viewed as the future measure of the army rise.

4. Some majors did, as Lord Dufferin asserted in his speech in the House of Lords, then run through the grade of major in a much shorter period than usual, and some captains and some lieutenants, also, attained to the higher step sooner than they expected.

5. Another cause for further augmented advancement is the recent removal under the 1864 despatch of all staff corps officers from the regimental cadres, on attaining to the cadre rank of lieut.-colonel. There will, occasionally, under this order, be a rush, so to say, of vacancies in the grade of substantive lieut.-colonelcies when several officers of the staff corps, holding the cadre grade of major, at once meet in the grade of lieut.-colonel, and are bodily struck off, so as to give promotion to a major several removes from the top of the list.

6. There are, however, I believe, great impeding causes in operation to retard promotion in the future, and I shall now endeavour to state them.

7. Many of the special retirements on the 31st December 1861, merely anticipated, by a few years, the ordinary number of retirements, and the point now to ascertain is, whether all or a greater portion of the retirements in 1861 would, in ordinary course, have taken place by this date, and if no diminution in the numbers of lieut.-colonels had taken place, the effect thereby of leaving the number of ordinary death casualties to occur in full amongst a larger number of officers than there are at present. I believe I am borne out in placing this point in a prominent light from examining the able report of the Madras Military Fund which shows that between 1808 and 1857, there were 181 retirements of officers above the age of 45, against 211 death casualties of officers above that age, in fact between the ages of 45 and 60 the retirements were more numerous than the deaths below those ages. The retirements between the ages 45 and 55 are, however, shown to be far more numerous than at the higher ages, for the Madras report shows that the age 52 is that at which on the average an officer obtained his colonel's grade, retirements then necessarily ceased; but after that age, the deaths exceeded the retirements.

8. I have constructed from the India Office Red Books a list of retirements in the years following 1854, and shown the numbers by grades as entered in each year's list in the following Table. I do not put it forward as absolutely correct, but it is useful as an approximate illustration. As all officers obtained a step on retirement, the grades are one step in advance of the rank in which each retired; and as officers may have held in the regimental rank a grade below that in the army, this table will also have to be modified in this point of view.

Years.	Lieutenant Generals.	Major Generals.	Colonels.	Lieutenant Colonels.	Majors.	Total.
1855	0	0	12	34	4	50
1856	0	7	19	33	6	65
1857	0	2	17	20	9	48
1858	0	10	8	21	12	51
1859	0	20	15	16	7	58
1860	0	19	12	15	8	45
1861	4	90	68	62	24	248
1862	0	9	18	34	28	89
1863	0	18	3	7	3	31
1864	0	2	6	7	6	21
Total -	4	168	178	249	107	726

9. The retirements in 1854 and prior thereto would have been useful, but the Red Books printed since 1855 do not afford the means of selecting the retirements in 1854, and in each year before.

10. The following extract from the introductory letter by Colonel Smith, affixed to the report on the Madras Military Fund (page xv.) may be useful as showing the retirements in the army of Madras:—

"In regard to the increased number of retirements of officers, the number of regimental lieut.-colonels who retired annually on the average of the last five years is 16, and the numbers who retired in the year follow-

ing the grant of additional pensions is 59, making a difference of 43. In the same way, while the average annual retirement of majors has been about 13, the number who have lately retired is 37, leaving an excess of 24, attributable to the amalgamation; in addition to these about 23 extra captains have retired." The Madras army may be considered to have given off about one-third of the retirements from the Indian army, and in this ratio, as the lieut.-colonels and majors who retired prior to the grant of the special bonus averaged annually 29 in both grades, the total for all India may be calculated at 87, a larger number than the table shows, but still useful in approximately proving that the great number of retrivings in 1861 were only anticipatory of those which would have naturally taken place, and that the great extent of promotion was only temporary.

11. The above Table shows that since the 1861 special bonus ceased, the retirements in 1863 and 1864 have fallen off. The retirements in 1863 and 1864 may, however, still be increased by a few officers leaving the service with retirements dating in these years. The retirements in the year immediately prior to the grant of the bonus in 1861 diminished from various causes, and the fewer numbers retired therefore lessen the contrast as to the number of retirements since the bonus operation ceased, but still these have so fallen off as to show that those retirements in 1861 merely anticipated those falling in, in after years; the inference is that the clearing off of officers by the grant of the 1861 bonus, though then giving immediate steps, will hereafter retard promotion; indeed, all experience proves that such spurts, whilst benefiting at the moment, eventually retard advancement.

12. I may here remark that an army system of rise in rank requires for its efficiency a constant and almost certain flow of promotion; a regular drain from off the top of the list by seniors leaving the service is the most suitable form, and its efficiency depends on the extent of the drain; in this view the bonus payments of India from the private subscriptions of the officers, to effect the permanent removal of old officers from the army, may fairly be urged as having fully aided in promoting efficiency and in maintaining a flow of promotion. But the operation of the Indian civil and medical funds, which the Court of Directors so wisely encouraged in order to buy out old officers of these services, afford numerous illustrations of the great amount of good which may be effected by a combination of the servants with the Government to ensure efficiency; the interests and influence of both servants and masters were, by these funds, brought to bear on the retirement of old officers, and as it is the inefficiency of servants which in Asia is so expensive for the State, I cannot but view the payments which the servants of India so liberally made out of the salaries drawn from Government, in order to maintain that efficiency which the Government of England are constrained to secure by large State outlays, as well entitling the Indian servants, civil, medical, and military, to the highest praise for the sacrifices they readily made for the public good; these good measures have now ceased, except with respect to the civil officers, and I hope for the good government of India to see the funds for that branch of the Indian service long in operation; for an inefficient civil officer, in India, is one of the most costly of all the State possessions.

13. Another cause for future retardation is the diminution in the numbers in the senior grade of colonel; the reduced number of regimental colonels must therefore be allowed as a retarding cause; for instance, the 13 colonels abstracted to fill up the new line regiments and 78th Foot diminish the numbers in this grade; the chances of rise are also fewer by the diminished deaths amongst the retired lieut.-colonels, and as these on coming into the grade of colonel disappear from the list, the future casualties amongst them are cut off, with, I think, a serious effect on advancement. I may mention that the Government of India in the 2nd para. of their despatch to the Secretary of State of 3rd March 1862, No. 60, clearly pointed out the injurious effect which the diminished casualties amongst the lieutenant-colonels living at home would have on the advancement of officers; I think the objection of special moment.

14. The operation of the 12 years' rule entitling a lieut.-colonel to the colonel's allowance, then only vacating the grade of lieut.-colonel, must largely diminish the chances of promotion from major, and necessarily that of all other grades, in proportion as the average of 12 years exceeds the average at which officers formerly obtained this rank; inasmuch as the total service of the 74 Madras regimental colonels on 1st January 1861 was, as I afterwards show, exactly 39 years on the average of all branches, artillery, cavalry, engineers, and infantry, and as this length of total service must inevitably be increased under the 12 years' rule, as I fully expect will be proved by at least one-sixth, that proportionate increase will be the measure of

retardation in the future rise to the colonel's grade. Nay more, the retardation at the top will extend through all grades to the bottom, and thus react with double force, in further delaying advancement through all grades.

15. I have above mentioned that under the Secretary of State's despatch of 10th August, 1861 one-half or 67 lieutenant-colonels were struck off the establishment consequent on the retirements from the 1861 bonus, but by the 1864 despatch this was altered, and the diminution instead of being 67 was only made to be 50. Even this reduction in the number of substantive lieutenant-colonels from 194 to 144 under the orders in the 51 and 52 paragraphs of the 1864 despatch must largely reduce the number of casualties, and necessarily impede promotion of those below them, the 12 years' rule of service in this grade before being made colonel also acting on the retarding causes.

16. The diminution of the number of general officers by 13 must also slightly affect the chance of promotion, by fewer lieutenant-colonels vacating their position on attaining to the general's grade; the more steady rise of Staff Corps officers to the colonel's grade will also prevent regimental officers from reaching the top of the list, and then prevent them from obtaining the general's rank. The present cessation of paying bonuses to induce officers to retire, will also affect the rise in regimental rank; whether as Sir W. Mansfield stated in his minute of 7th January 1862, "That the rising generation of officers will prove altogether different in genius and invention from their predecessors, if they do not devise some scheme of purchase for the purpose of accelerating promotions and hastening retirements," is a question for the future,—desirable certainly, seeing by past experience, that the former Indian army bonus payments did, as the report of the Duke of Somerset's Commission stated, greatly benefit the public service by removing old officers; that kind of acceleration is, however, for the present at an end, and the distrust sprung up will long prevent its resumption in any shape.

17. Under the impressions which the above details leave on my mind, I come to the conclusion that as soon as the influence of the recent orders cease to operate, I have no doubt that greater retardation of promotion will eventually be felt by many officers not within the influence of the recent retirements than under the former constitution of the service; I admit that some few officers close to the retirements may yet benefit by the immediate action of the orders; and as respects the removal of the Staff Corps officers on reaching the cadre grade of lieutenant-colonel, I anticipate occasional spurts in the rise of officers, which may for the moment partially equalize in a few cases the future rise with the average of a few of the past;—but on the whole I think that great slowness in advancement will be felt, and, in my opinion, that which is a very objectionable evil in an army, great uncertainty as to future rise will spring up in the minds of the officers.

18. Before the full effect of the reduction in the number of lieutenant-colonels can be reported on, there are a few questions requiring solution.

I. *Viz.*, shall advancement to the colonel's allowances and grade be dependent on a fixed establishment of colonels, and on what number?

II. Or, on a certain period, of 8 or 10 years' or 12 years' service, in the regimental grade of lieutenant-colonel?

III. Or, shall a total period of service from first commission, say 38½ years, as the Madras infantry colonels averaged on 1st January 1861, or 39 years as General Sir W. Mansfield stated to be the service of the Bombay infantry colonels, or 39 years as the 74 colonels of Madras averaged in 1861, be fixed as the qualifying period for succeeding to the colonel's allowances and colonel's grade; or 41 years of the Bengal colonels' as the Calcutta commission stated in their report (*vide Addend.*, No. VII.)

IV. Or, shall a combined period of service in the one grade of lieutenant-colonel, and of total army service, be fixed, in order to entitle an officer to the grade of regimental colonel with colonel's allowances?

V. Or, shall another rate of pension be granted for service between 32 years as at present, and 39 years as above with a rate of pension being a mean, betwixt 450*l.* a year for 32 years' service, 28 of these in India, and the total receipts of a colonel with allowances after 39 years; *viz.*, 1,124*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

19. This one question as now proposed by the Royal Commission, like all the other questions cannot, I think, be considered separately, neither can the career of an officer in any one grade, as Sir C. Wood in his recent speech rightly asserted, be accepted as any guide; it is the whole career of an officer from his first commission, which should be studied.

20. Indeed on the like reasoning, the whole military system, with compensating advantages to officers in different grades must, I think, be considered as a whole and not in

detail; very few military systems will stand inquiry into their component parts, neither can any one of these parts be scrutinized without seeing objections; the whole of the parts, as in the case of an officer's whole service, should be taken into scrutiny; the gains to individuals ought not to be set off against the losses sustained by other individuals, but the promotion advantages an individual has had through his service may be considered in connection with disadvantages; but from the difficulty in correctly balancing losses and gains, all reforms are expensive, for Government must liberally compensate the old servers and pay the new class needed for the new duty.

21. I am also of opinion that the effect which will eventually be produced by the removal of staff corps officers on becoming cadre lieutenant-colonels, giving promotion to all officers on the regimental cadres should be more fully investigated. I doubt if any one can, without minute examination, judge as to the exact bearing on the future rise of regimental officers from this rule as to this rank vacating their cadre position.

22. I specially distrust the effect which must be caused by officers of the same army having intimate official relations, such as all in India have with each other, rising to rank by two conditions so totally opposed to each other, the one the staff corps officer, having a certainty of rank from fixed periods of service, and the other class having to depend on rank from casualties of officers whose proportions by grades are far more unfavourable than under the organization prior to 1861, and whose promotion, with all the then acceleration from bonus payments, was then too slow for efficiency. It appears to me that the fact of the organization of the Indian artillery for 70 years and more being from considerations of public policy kept uniform with the infantry in order to ensure agreement in the expectations of all officers of all branches of the Indian service, is a useful lesson to be remembered in our future arrangements regarding the Indian army, and it may be wisely applied even now so as to place all in India on an equality. Service in Asia of a like character imperatively requires all servers to start on the race of life on equal conditions, and to win the prizes which Government for their own interests bestow on those who best serve the State.

23. The removal of this one grade of officers belonging to the Staff Corps from the regimental cadre is a strong precedent in favour of the claims of the officers to obtain the removal from the regimental cadres of all other grades who entered the new Line Corps and new Staff Corps.

24. In the light in which the India Office view the question this removal of staff corps officers is given as a boon to the army. I believe, however, that if the money which it will cost the Government had been appropriated in a way more in harmony with the previous system of organization it would have been more fully appreciated, and, as far as I can judge, more advantageous to the public service. I believe that if the casualties in cadres occasioned by the removals of officers to these two new corps and from the retirements in 1861 had been disposed of in a way more in harmony with the practice which the Court of Directors strictly enforced since the 1796 organization, *viz.*, that all officers on transfer to another corps or accepting pensions were struck off the strength of the regimental lists and promotions made in their room, that the difficulties arising out of the 1861 changes would have been diminished without material expenditure to the State.

25. I even think that this course might still be followed; promotions in lieu of all officers who entered the Staff Corps and Line regiments, and retired, being given as vacancies to the army, not in regiments, and all dating as to the right to rank, not to allowances, only from one date, 18th February 1861, as the Calcutta Commission wisely advised, *vide Addend.*, No. IX. The economy which might have been enforced, if absolutely necessary, was by first giving all promotions in lieu of these retirements and transfers, to complete the fixed establishment, then all after vacancies being afterwards filled up in that establishment, at first, say about one promotion to 4, 3, or 2, deaths; gradually increasing the proportions as promotion returned to the former average. But these diminished promotions require to be very carefully considered, in order to prevent much injury to individuals. I may, however, point to one of the many useful recommendations of Lord Hotham's Commission report as having been directed to this end.

POINT 4.

Rule under which Lieutenant-Colonels are to become Colonels and to be entitled to Colonel's allowance, after holding the rank of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel for 12 years.

1. The Royal Commission over which Lord Cranworth presided did not, judging from the papers in the appen-

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

dix of the report, verify the accuracy of the details of the calculations on which the course followed by Government was based when fixing 12 years' service in the grade of regimental lieutenant-colonel as the qualifying period for an officer in future to obtain the grade of colonel with the colonel's allowances; even the Commissioners appear to have had doubts as to the propriety of the period, but these could easily have been solved by an inspection of the rolls of the army, a measure not resorted to as far as the Report shows.

2. Accepting the 12 years' qualifying period as accurately representing the fair average of the past,—which I doubt,—still I submit that the conditions of future service in India being very different from those of the past Indian service, owing to various changes in the gradations of rank in the numbers, organization, and bonus payments, it appears that a 12 years' rule, even if justly calculated, on the past experience of a service differently organized, is not the only consideration that is suited for the Indian service as now or about to be constituted.

3. This one question of the present Royal Commissioners is therefore incomplete, and, in my opinion, not capable of just consideration, without taking into account, as Sir C. Wood in his recent speech stated ought to be done, "the whole career of an officer." Then, as far as the Government is concerned, in showing respect for the claims which officers in all grades have, by their past services, established for fair consideration on the part of the governing authorities, the rules for future service can only be rightly based on the expectations to be formed as to the future average rise from the service, as in future, to be constituted. The results deduced from the previous service of the whole body of officers, not alone from the services of those in the army at a given period, and of only one rank, but from the services of many officers extending over a long period of years and in different grades should be ascertained and strictly applied to the officers who have earned the rewards of long service under the organization from which these results are drawn; hence the fixing of the 12 years' period of service for all Indian substantive lieutenant-colonels, whether of the staff corps or of regiments, and on a 15 years' average of the Madras army scale of rise in the one grade of lieutenant-colonel to become colonel, has always looked to me as singularly objectionable, even if it were right first to adopt the Madras army as the standard for the three armies, seeing that the infantry lieutenant-colonels were as 58 to 173 of the three armies, and then to fix this period as common to the lieutenant-colonels of the staff corps who obtain the grade of substantive lieutenant colonel in 26 years, and to the regimental officer who has no certainty, and I may add, no chance of obtaining it for 30 or 34 years or more.

4. I observe in the recent report on the Madras Military Fund, as below quoted, that the average ages of officers who have attained to the grade of colonel, during half a century, were, from three separate calculations, ascertained to be only 50 to 52 years, and, taking 16 or 18 years as the average age on entering the service, the total army service in obtaining the grade of colonel must, therefore, have been only on an average about 34 years, or from 32 to 36 years; and if 12 years' service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel was a correct average, as stated from the India Office, then the length of service of an officer of the Madras army in attaining the grade of lieutenant-colonel must have been from 20 to 24 years; now this deduction is notoriously either too short or the 12 years is too long an average, and the latter supposition is undoubtedly the reality.

5. The excellent and very elaborate report on the state of the Madras Military Fund affords such valuable data for showing the length of service of officers in attaining promotion to different ranks, and it being a document of the highest official utility from the reputation of the actuaries who drew it up, I venture to give the substance as nearly as possible in the words of the report. The experience of the fund from 1808 to 1857 has been employed to ascertain the financial state of the fund by determining the ages of officers in reaching the grades from ensign to colonel; and as the results arrived at have been derived from dividing the available data into two periods, one from 1808 to 1822, during which time it was optional with the officers of the Madras army to subscribe, and from 1823 to 1857, during which it was obligatory on all officers entering the service (after 1822) to subscribe to the fund, there are great and well founded reasons for placing reliance on the results.

6. Mr. Griffith Davies', second report in 1845, on the Madras Fund, is also quoted in the late Madras report as an authority on which to rely for the average age of officers on entering each rank. Now, as the data used by him for his

calculations was obtained by extracting from the Dodswell and Miles' List 1,000 officers, then finding their average of promotion, and assuming 19 as the average age on joining the service, the age at promotion to each new rank has been thereby determined. The average age of officers entering each rank of the Bengal army, as ascertained by Mr. Neison in 1846, is also quoted in the report of the Madras Fund.

7. The following table of the above results is now shown:—

RANKS.	From the experience of the Madras Military Fund, from 1808 to 1857.		Mr Davies' Second Report of 1845.	Mr Neison's Report of 1846 on Bengal Fund.
	Number of entries in the several grades or promotions.	Average age of Officers on entering each rank.	Average age of Officers on promotion, derived from a list of 1,000 Officers.	Average age of Bengal Officers on promotion.
Ensign -	3,537	18 7	19	
Lieutenant -	2,828	22·4	22	24 5
Captain -	1,936	31·8	32	32 9
Major -	677	40 9	41	41 5
Lt.-colonel -	388	44 5	45	46 6
Colonel -	151	52	51	50 5

8. The experience of the fund from 1808 to 1857 agreeing precisely in all but the last with the ages ascertained by Mr. Davies in 1845 from a different source, is in the late Madras report rightly viewed as satisfactory; and Mr. Neison's average age for the Bengal army, though differing to the extent of one or two years of a more advanced age in all except the ages of colonels which are shown to be a year and a half younger, may also be accepted as satisfactory.

9. The evidence of Mr. Melvill before the Royal Commissioners on army purchase, on 30 May 1856, is entitled to considerable weight, as he was then in the important office of Military Secretary of the India House, and besides referring to recently compiled tables of ages and services of officers of artillery, cavalry, and infantry, distinctly stated that the then 30 junior colonels averaged in age only 50 years, agreeing with Mr. Neison's average as deduced from the Bengal experience.

10. I may also refer to General Sir W. Mansfield's minute of November 1861, which states the then average service of the colonels of the Bombay infantry at 39 years' service on succeeding to the colonel's allowances.

11. I have also taken out the services of the 74 colonels of all branches of the Madras army in the receipt of colonel's allowances, according to Pharoah's Army List of January 1861, as the colonels stood immediately before the change on the 18th February following.

12. The total length of service of the 74 colonels I find to be 2,871 years, taking the year of first appointment and year of succession to the colonel's allowances as the years for deducing the total years each had served on obtaining the prize of the service, and the service average of each of the 74 is therefore exactly 39 years.

13. The aggregate service of the colonels of the four branches, cavalry, artillery, engineers, and infantry, and the average service of the colonels of each branch was found to be as follows:—

	Total.	Average.
8 cavalry colonels -	316	39½
7 artillery " -	278	39½
3 engineer " -	109	36½
56 infantry " -	2163	38½
74 Total years -	2871	39

14. The average service of colonels of artillery and engineers, 10 in number, singularly agreed with the average service of the 64 colonels of infantry and cavalry; the average service of the colonels of both ordnance corps being under 39 years, showing how uniformly the former system of the Indian army operated over all branches of the service; and this uniformity so carefully enforced by the Directors of the East India Company should, I submit, be maintained, and instead of throwing the Artillery and Engineer Officers of India on the organization of the old Royal Ordnance Corps, so very unfavourable in respect to succession to the one rank of colonel-commandant, and which rank was the only favourable part of the Indian scheme, these old Indian ordnance officers who have not been beneficially affected during their previous long service in India by the favourable parts of the old Royal Artillery gradation in the grades below the colonel-commandant, should have their rights respected of succeeding to the colonel's allowances according to the experience of the pre-

vious service in which they have risen, and which agreed with the infantry scale of rise.

15. I would also urge that all future claims for past services of officers of all branches of the Indian service be adjusted on total army service, combined, where officers have been fortunate in early promotion, with an average period of service passed in the grade of field officer; these averages being struck from the services of all grades since 1824; I do think that where a remedy can be applied to remove an injury sustained by servants who suffer from measures of state policy, such as the 1861 changes really were, that that remedy ought to be ascertained, and when ascertained applied to the case of the sufferers. The Government will not eventually lose by following this just and easy course.

16. I may here mention that it would have afforded me great pleasure to have taken out the average service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel, but the Army List does not accurately show the regimental dates of promotion to the grade of lieutenant-colonel of all regimental colonels; the date of army rank of lieutenant-colonel is shown, but not that of the regimental rank. I could not separate the dates of army and regimental rank.

17. The average age and length of service may however have been increasing of late years, for, as before stated, on 30th May 1856, Mr. Melville, the Secretary in the Military Department of the India Office, gave evidence before the Commissioners on Army Purchase that the age of the 30 junior colonels was only then 50 years, and if these had averaged 12 years' service as regimental lieutenant-colonel, and had been 18 years of age on entering the army, then the 30 colonels must have attained their regimental rank of lieutenant-colonel at the close of 20 years' service. I think that this will be admitted to be far too short a period of service, or that the recent 12 years' service of the India Office in this grade was longer than found in former practice; at all events after 20 years' service, the obtaining a lieutenant-colonelcy does not now take place.

15. I may here mention, that in the draft copy of the fourth report of the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission, the suggestion was made to the Government of India that the promise held out to the officers of the staff corps by the government of India in the general order 332 of 10th April, 1861, of succeeding to the colonel's allowances should be definitely stated, and in aid of this the Commission reported that "the average of service as lieutenant-colonel before coming into receipt of colonel's allowances may be fixed at 10 years. The proposal of the Commission is, that every Staff Corps officer, from the date of his promotion to substantive lieutenant-colonel, should be required to serve 10 years before obtaining a title to colonel's allowance." The very accurate information, on which the Calcutta Commission based their advice, was then easily available, the Commission had all the records of government at their command, and the powerful aid of efficient officers and office establishments to compile the data for ascertaining the 10 years average; the importance of this advice is to be further kept in view, seeing that the Commission had in mind the fact of 26 years' service, entitling a Staff Corps officer to the rank of substantive lieutenant-colonel, and therefore establishing his right to the prize after 36 years' service in the army.

16. But the present qualifying period of service of 12 years for an officer not belonging to the Staff Corps is made to depend on service in the one grade, that of lieutenant-colonel, the most uncertain and difficult grade to which an officer of a seniority service can rise; and, in future, will operate very unequally in different branches of the army, especially under the great changes in the system of promotion, owing to the new conditions as to relative proportions of grades.

17. Nothing can be more important to the seniors of an army than an adherence to the rules and practices under which these senior officers rose to their present rank, as in the Indian army. The heavy penalties to which officers and soldiers are liable for violating or departing from the "custom of war" may here be referred to. This rather indefinite expression embraces the unwritten law of every army, and entails on all who depart therefrom severe penal consequences; then, how much more necessary it is that all should respect well-established rules and thoroughly understand the rules of a service when benefits and not punishments may be depending on such respect. Now all branches of the Indian service were organized, as I cannot too frequently mention, on a like principle—the officers for a battalion of artillery were alike in ranks and numbers to those of the infantry battalion, and even the artillery organization was assimilated in the administrative division to a battalion of infantry, and the result was a singularly uniform rise in the senior officers of all branches,

all on an average of years, equally succeeding to the great prize of the service, the colonel's allowances; and yet in 1861 important alterations were made suddenly in the Indian artillery system, which entirely destroyed not alone the expectations formed from past experience, but departed from that conservative system of uniformity which had for nearly three quarters of a century made an artillery officer rank and vie in all respects with an infantry officer.

18. The 12 years' service rule in the one grade of lieutenant-colonel, applied to the infantry and cavalry officers without regard to total army service, as ordered for officers who have not joined the Staff Corps, is at variance with the very useful condition of total service of 38 years, as fixed for the officers of the Staff Corps, and it violates Sir C. Wood's excellent principle, that the whole career of an officer, should be considered, and not that passed in any one grade. This is a just principle to apply to the seniority service of India, it is one which is in accord with previous practice, it has been applied to the Staff Corps, and its right use now affords an opening for solving many of the difficulties still to be overcome in settling the claims which officers have established by past service to the rank, pay, and pension which, under the old constitution of the army, they would have obtained, within a fair average of total service.

19. The justice of the 12 years' rule being dependent on the way it was ascertained, and the fairness of the average being from the statements in the appendix to the former report of Lord Cranworth's Commission justly doubted, its future applicability to the officers of a service previously governed by very different conditions is thereby rendered more questionable. The 15 years experience of one of the three services of India, the Madras army, from which it was deduced, is in itself a very limited period indeed; then this average was struck after the scale of rise had been subjected to various influences which during that limited period of 15 years were at work in Madras specially, in making the 12 years' average longer in that army than if the average had been extended over a longer period; as it is based on the Madras experience of rise through the one grade of lieutenant-colonel it has always appeared to me open to this objection, that the average of the Bengal army was shorter, that of the Bombay average also less than this period of 12 years, that a less period, say 10 years, might have been fixed, even supposing this grade of lieutenant-colonel being considered the one standard rank; but which I do not admit.

20. Amongst a large body, the averages of service in particular grades for a long period may be safely relied on, but it is dangerous to apply the averages deduced from a large class on a short period to the services of small bodies, and with varying influences to vitiate the regularity of the averages during the period, it is most dangerous to deduce general results; for instance, in the small cavalry corps of India, a very slight impediment will long retard officers in particular grades when succeeding to the colonel's grade, and a slight change greatly improves the rise to this grade. Some of the present regimental lieutenant-colonels of the Madras cavalry will, in all probability, succeed, under the 12 years' rule, to the colonel's allowances many years before the average total service of 38 years, as fixed for the staff corps; this is due to the accidental impulse occasioned by the retirement of one officer in a way unexpected, so as to bring young officers up to this one qualifying grade of lieutenant-colonel, after a short service.

21. The three recently promoted officers, in the late Madras artillery, to the grade of colonel with colonel's allowances, have not 12 years service in the grades of lieutenant-colonel, and of 2nd colonel, yet all three have more than 40 years' total army service, and this period of total service in obtaining the prize nearly agrees in their cases with the average total service in which officers of infantry had in 1861 advanced to the like position. But under the changes of 1861 there will be a great stagnation in the rise of other officers of the artillery, consequent on the reduction in the number of the artillery colonels with colonel's allowances, and the cessation of the bonus system, which operated in the Ordnance Corps of India so usefully in aiding the rise of officers to the prize of the service, will so seriously affect the future prospects of officers already of 43 years' service and upwards, that I earnestly hope some alleviation of the injurious pressure will take place.

22. I close my 40th year of service at the end of this year, and as I must obtain six steps on a decreasing number of colonels with allowances I see no prospect for many years of my colonel's allowances, for which I have largely paid money, and yet my case is far from equaling in severity that of my brother officers. I believe that by this time I would have obtained my colonel's allowances had the 1861 changes not taken place, whereby the system of bonus con-

APPEN
—
No
—

APPENDIX B.

No. 3.

tributions was destroyed, and yet I am farther off from them as compared with the probable openings than I was in 1861.

23. Many of the Madras lieutenant-colonels of infantry, also the second colonels of the three Indian artilleries will, unless the present rules be modified to suit their position, have probably attained the age of from 62 to 70 years, before they benefit by the colonel's allowance, and its then diminished value may be seen by a reference to Addend. No. VIII.; whereas under the former excellent system of bonus payments in the Madras infantry to buy out lieutenant-colonels, the succession to the colonels' allowances became rapid for a time, and slow after the cessation of purchases; it is over this slower period that the 12 years' average has been struck; the average since 1824 would have shown it to be less.

24. A new rule more general in its application to the varying conditions of service occurring during the whole career of an officer would be far more just than this one condition, which, partial in its mode of fixing, is not adapted for the unexpected changes which spring out of the special rules now enforced for the different branches of the Indian services. The total service should be carefully ascertained on an average, not of a few colonels, but of many; not of one army, but on the past calculations, of all three armies; not for one year, but for many years; not for one branch, but for each separate branch, and on the aggregate of all branches, and during a long period, and with conflicting variations carefully regarded during the periods. I would, therefore, submit for consideration, that the 12 years' rule of service in one rank should be modified so as to take in "the whole career of an officer," and that all branches be made subject to these averages.

25. This recommendation is justified on the past practice of the India Office, seeing that the rules issued during the last 30 years in respect to pensions for the officers of the Indian army, have all been based on years of service in India, and of total years' service in the army, irrespective of that most uncertain of all conditions as recently fixed, the attainment of a particular rank, and 12 years' service therein.

26. These pensionary rules have, therefore, necessarily been based on the ages of officers, the safest standard for a government to fix.

27. An officer may, at present, attain to the highest certain pension at the age of 48, by having 32 years' army service, and 23 of these in India; then, with 16 years of age on entering the army, he would be 48 on obtaining the pension. This is the minimum age at which an officer could obtain the present maximum service pension of 456*l.* per annum.

28. Considering the colonel's allowance as merely a pensionary provision for the old age of good officers, as it really now is under the rules laid down for the staff corps, then, with 38 years' army service, an officer of the staff corps may obtain the prize of the service at the age of 54. This is the minimum age at which an officer of the Staff Corps can attain the maximum pension of 1,124*l.* per annum; between these two scales of pensions, only a difference of 6 years' service is seen, and yet the rate of pension is nearly trebled.

29. As a question of good and sound policy, the combined system of total army service and total Indian service is, from its nature, commended to favourable consideration; for army officers dearly love a certainty as to their old age provision, and above all it places the far distant Indian service on a fixed basis as to what an officer has to expect at the end of his career.

30. These pensionary rules as to service (virtually by age) would determine the average ages of officers, on the Pension List, and any actuary could calculate the relative value of a pensionary provision, for officers of longer service than 32 years, either by taking the 456*l.* pension for that period, as the basis of calculation, or the 1,124*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* which colonels of the staff corps are entitled to draw, after 38 years' total army service, and then graduate the scale so as to adapt it to the falling health of officers after 28 years Indian service. The question might then be fairly raised whether the graduation of pensions should not entail the right to forced retirements, but the exercise of such a policy requires to be carefully considered; its exercise would, comparatively, be quite safe if the reasons for enforcing retirements were publicly stated in general orders.

31. The further general remedy I would apply to meet this case of succession to the grade of colonel with colonel's allowance, is to form, under date 17th February 1861, the 223 colonels with allowances of all branches of the Indian army into one gradation list, and then endeavour to place all the lieutenant-colonels and majors and other grades in fair succession to these 223 colonels; this operation requires careful manipulation, still it would prove most useful when rightly carried into effect.

POINT 5.

Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotions of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.

1. It is useless to disguise the fact, that the replies to the points involved in this question must comprise many very complicated considerations. The remedy applied by the Secretary of State in his 1864 Despatch is to give rank without pay to the superseded, and to give the superseders pay as well as rank. I do not believe it possible to reconcile large bodies of officers of any service to the obtaining of rank without pay. The question of keeping officers with brevet rank in India without pay was raised by the late Commander-in-Chief of India whilst I was chief of the military finance department of India, and the bestowal of pay applied for on the ground that officers with rank in the army higher than that held in the regiment did perform extra duties connected with this brevet rank, and did incur some extra expenses for the right performance of those duties. Further, the claim to extra pay which an officer had when performing extra regimental duty in the absence of the regimental major was also raised. I then felt great difficulty in advising the Government to dispose in the negative of these questions, even with a few brevets; how much more would I have felt difficulty in unfavourably reporting on the cases, if nearly all officers had then been as they will be holders of brevet rank, all performing duties of an unremunerated rank. I do not believe it easy for any Government to resist the claims of a large number of brevetted officers for the payment of allowances for duties appertaining to rank,—all who know India are well aware that rank entails outlay in household expenses as well as for the government service, such as a horse for a brevet field officer. In this case rank has been forced on some officers in a form which the conditions of service on entering the army did not lead them to expect, and it is given in the worst possible form, as one needed for the sake of Government interests, and not as hitherto in the form of a boon to the individual officer.

2. The remedy in the 1864 despatch of the Secretary of State to the Government of India of granting brevet rank according to total years of service, now stated to have been applied to meet a wrong, previously inflicted, of supersession in substantive rank, is not only, in my view, totally insufficient, but certain of causing injury to many officers who partially escaped former suffering; the very great extension of the brevet, and the fact of its being so common, is alone sufficient to lower the value, if any, of the grant of rank, and added thereto as it is given to please the Government and not the officer, to whom it must be distasteful to be called colonel in India, and captain in his club in London, the consequences may readily be supposed, of demands on Government for money; and as I lately saw in one of the influential military newspapers a demand for the extension throughout the army of rank by length of service, the complications of Indian service are extending to home service.

3. I shall take up the remedy stated to have been applied to rectify the admitted supersession of regimental officers, in the order in which set forth; but I must ask the Royal Commissioners to remember that I do not believe any partial remedy of this character will ensure solid satisfaction; indeed it must, judging from former experience, cause dissatisfaction, and of a kind not before felt.

4. The remedy stated in the 1864 despatch from the Secretary of State consists in adopting as a principle "the extension of the system which has for many years existed in India of giving brevet rank by a length of service, heretofore applicable only to the promotion of subalterns." New custom and rules of Indian service have partially defined the nature of this rank of brevet-captain, but being entirely unknown in the British army, its extension to other grades is bearing out in a singular manner the prophetic remark which a statesman at the time made to me, that the 1861 measures was calculated to Indianize the whole British army. It may be assumed that by the great extension of this brevet principle to all grades, all officers, whether of the Indian army, staff corps, artillery, engineers, cavalry, and infantry of the line, will probably, during some portion of their service, obtain brevet rank, if they have served 12, 20, 26, and 31 years from date of first commission, even if on half pay (excepting as respects the 31 years), some one of the brevet grades, respectively appertaining thereto, of captain, major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel, will be earned by one or other of these several periods of service; the colonel's grade, requiring five years full pay service as lieutenant-colonel, will alone work in a peculiar way in causing supersession in the very grade which has usually been protected from such injury.

5. The first and most prominent point is the vast number

of brevet promotions already made, both in the British and Indian service, in order, as stated, to place all officers on an equality as to relative rank; I fear that these promotions must shortly occasion an amount of difficulty in carrying on the ordinary routine duties of the army, which must be felt in a serious form.

6. With few officers, and many duties requiring their attendance at times close to one another, but in places far apart, the clashing of general with regimental duties—the necessity of often relieving an officer from regimental duty, in order to take an unexpected call for superior army duty,—the many overslaughts that regimental officers will claim on account of performing superior army duties,—the right to be absent from regimental parades, and other regimental assemblies, on the plea of general duty,—will all give rise to a degree of embarrassment which must, I fear, produce grave consequences. I write with reference to the experience of real difficulties springing out of disputes formerly occasioned by brevet rank, when the number of officers holding superior army rank were small compared to those now holding brevet rank in India, and when the unfortunate officers holding brevets as captains were fewer in number, and of little influence, as compared with the number and influence of those now holding brevet rank in all grades.

7. Moreover, if the present stagnation of promotion continue in the British service, then, as the effect of the recent impulse on the rise of officers of the Indian service diminishes, the length of service of officers in both armies will increase, and the extension of brevet rank will become necessary to a greater extent. It may be expected, that half of the officers of each grade will in a short time hold rank by brevet superior, certainly, by one step—often by two steps—sometimes even by three steps—to the regimental grade. I believe that there are at present more than one Indian subaltern with the brevet of major, and I have the fullest expectation of seeing many captains of the British regiments holding rank as colonels, anomalies not usually arising, but more will follow of such anomalies. I have seen a captain of a company fall out and take command of a brigade over his own regimental commanding officer, the lieutenant-colonel. I do not advise its extension. The arrangement of duties by roster, the right to take command of troops on general parade, when the appointed commanding officer is absent, will be very difficult to determine with such numerous brevets, the very delay in announcing the promotions in the London Gazette will be no slight cause for evil. Indeed, if the whole military scheme of due and prompt subordination be not shaken by differences which will eventually be created by this largely extended brevet rank, it can only be by means of an amount of care and devotion of time on the part of general and staff officers, which must render command and office duty most trying to the holders.

8. The very withdrawal from officers of the British army, of the brevet rank they held in India, on leaving that country, must give rise to feelings, which, for the good of the public service, ought to be prevented.

9. The reports from Royal commissions on promotion, have advised, and Royal warrants have declared, general brevets to be at an end, but the practice is revived in India in a form more extensive than that arising from the abolished scheme of general brevets, and in a form never before paralleled in any army.

10. The object is not even attained of placing officers on equality as to rank from length of service.

11. The officers promoted to be brevet lieutenant-colonels on the 18th February 1861, as also majors and captains, according to length of service, with this one date assigned to one brevet commission of that month, may still rank junior to other officers of shorter service, owing to so many commissions of the same date for the like rank, necessitating a reference to prior commissions, then on comparison, one of an older date is then found to be in possession of the officer of shorter service; the rule of brevets by length of service in order to be universally operative and just in action, ought to have had retrospective effect, to all former Commissions; the whole army would then have become a purely seniority service by years of service, virtually abolishing all gradations of rank; for rank is relative, and in the past century, officers of the Indian army with the rank of lieutenant and captain were officers holding extensive commands, equally as much, nay more regarded than generals, now are, holding high commands. In the East, it is the power exercised and not the designation which gives real rank, and there is no mistake as to the amount of pay, drawn by the exerciser of power, indicating position in Asia. An army major, with the pay of a lieutenant, is a great anomaly in the East.

12. Further, the effect of this brevet would, however, otherwise be very startling. For officers of the Indian army who have been lucky in regimental rise, many who have largely

contributed to bonuses, in order to rise in the service, and have taken a position in the field officer's grade superior to many far less fortunate, now find themselves superseded by their former juniors obtaining rank superior to that held at the date of the order, the 18th February 1861. Other officers who having attained to the grade of lieutenant-colonel, looking forward to the army colonelcy, now find themselves displaced in the scale of rank by their juniors of longer service, being by seniority placed above them; and even lieutenant-colonels in command have seen captains of longer service than themselves suddenly jump over their heads. The five years full pay service in the lieutenant-colonel's grade, entitling an officer to the colonel's brevet, involves a description of service but little understood in India, and if strictly applied, as in the case of an officer falling sick, and being obliged to return to Europe, must tell with terrible severity on many.

13. The equality on which officers of the Indian army will stand as contemplated, by this length of service brevet, cannot be in full operation until the position of officers with native regiments is defined, as to whether officers shall roll in regiments according to regimental or substantive rank, or with each other by army or brevet rank, or whether the dates of appointment to regiments, as to departments, shall be the guiding rule for officers to be in subordination to each other.

14. I am writing with the full knowledge that orders have been issued for forming all the regiments of the Bengal and Bombay native armies into "irregulars," but I have not been able to ascertain how the position of the officers with these regiments will be settled, although I have heard that the gradation from the brevet rank will be the one to regulate the relative right to command.

15. This irregular system is entitled to the highest consideration, from the fact of officers of note having advocated it, and the Secretary of State in his place in Parliament stated,—and this statement so delivered is the highest evidence which can be given as to the opinions of Government,—that the irregular system as advised by Sir John Lawrence is now the Indian military system; but a careful perusal of the published documents connected with this question shows that that system involved the formation of the whole of the officers of the army into one gradation. The only public scheme for this gradation, publicly available, emanating as from Sir John Lawrence, is the one at page 41 of the Supplementary Papers on the Army Organization of India; but on examination, the new brevet rank appears to be singularly opposed to that plan and to contravene its most valuable qualities. I admit that I do not agree in the possibility of carrying out in real practice the important principles essential for an efficient irregular system for all native troops of India; I attach far too high a value to the good resulting from having a regimental feeling amongst officers and men, to give assent to the system; still I allow that Sir John Lawrence's plan, known as the Punjab scheme, is, if rightly applied, capable of effecting much good, but it requires great and peculiar qualities, such as General Jacob, its originator, possessed, to apply the scheme rightly, even if the officers can be obtained with the high qualities which Jacob's system requires them to possess. There are, however, many great and noble views set forth in Jacob's scheme, and in the Punjab modified plan, all worthy of remembrance when again reforming the Indian military system, but all or much of the good contained in the two plans may be applied to a sound regimental organization.

16. Until this irregular system is definitely arranged I cannot but fear that clashing of claims to command must arise in the native army to an extent as great and serious as in the army of the line, from attempting to form a gradation list from length of service. There is only one way of effecting the object of a general and equal gradation of all in the service; that is by extensive promotions, so as to ensure army and regimental rise to all officers before bringing them into this one gradation, but the mode of successfully operating requires careful manipulation, and it must be done on conditions previously well understood and recognized as sound. It is not too late to resort to this remedy, but it would require the skilled experience of India's best officers to apply it rightly.

17. A supplementary advantage is stated to have been granted to the officers, by the removal from the cadres of the native infantry and cavalry of the Indian army, of all officers who have joined the new line regiments and staff corps, when they reach the grade of cadre lieutenant-colonels.

18. I have in another reply pointed out the strange rush which will occasionally result from staff officers, now seen to be rolling in immediate succession, reaching the top of the major's grades and on becoming cadre lieutenant-colonels at once vacating their cadre position, and giving occasionally very extensive promotion.

APPENDIX B
No. 8.

19. I confess myself unable at this time to indicate with any clearness the effect on local officers of such a culmination of casualties. In the Madras cavalry I believe a partial illustration of the effect of striking off the staff corps officers on reaching the grade of cadre lieutenant-colonel, may be seen, and in the cavalry of the other presidencies I believe that other like cases will soon follow; I cannot, however, think that such wild racing of military advancement can be based on sound principles of army organization.

20. I alluded in another reply to this striking off as rendering it difficult to judge of the effect of the 12 years' rule in obtaining the colonel's allowances, consequent on the uncertainty as to the total service an officer would have on attaining the rank of cadre lieutenant-colonel, in which the 12 years' service must then be passed; if an officer's total service in the army exceeds the average service of 38½ years, which the colonels of the Madras infantry had in 1861 on attaining the colonel's grade, then the excess will be the measure of injury and of delay in the advancement of officers consequent on the promotion to the rank of colonel; until this average of 12 years is settled, it will be very difficult to offer an opinion as to the relative amount of supersession by staff corps officers over regimental officers; the question of rank cannot, however, stand alone, the pecuniary advantages accompanying rank in every country, army, and position of life must be taken into consideration, and this has been entirely excluded from the brevet rank.

21. But I was lately rather struck with an opinion expressed as to the little difference existing between the past rise of the regimental officers and that of the future rise of the staff corps officers; this opinion is in the prefatory letter from Colonel Smith on the Report of the Madras Military Fund, and as I think the following extract at page xvii. of Report on Madras Military Fund, par. 32, may be of use to the present Commissioners I now record it, in the hope that if found to be correct, the extra expenditure which this increased rise to rank might occasion need be no bar to the pay accompanying brevet rank in India.

"4th and lastly. We come to the effect of the regulations of the staff corps upon the financial prosperity of the fund, and I think I may venture to dismiss the question as not being one of material importance. It is true that, assuming the same average age of entrance into the service in either case, the times of promotion to the various ranks are accelerated by the staff corps rules, in the earlier ranks, by a year, and for the majors and colonels rank, two years, which latter fact may have a prejudicial influence by giving rise to somewhat earlier retirements; but on the other hand, the fact of the promotion being accelerated a year or more increases the present value of the donations and subscriptions, while it has a smaller influence on the value of the contingent liabilities to be covered by them."

22. The 52nd paragraph of the 194th despatch of 17th June 1864, from the Secretary of State, fixes the establishment of regimental lieutenant-colonels at 144 for the old infantry and cavalry of the Indian army, in lieu of 194 as previously allowed; this decrease of nearly one-third of the number of this grade must greatly diminish regimental rise to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and consequently largely extend the total service of an officer before obtaining the prize of the service, and also necessarily retarding promotion, and will seriously cause supersession by the staff corps officers.

23. As this change appears to be likely to cause the largest amount of supersession by staff corps officers over regimental officers, I have endeavoured to ascertain the grounds for such a reduced establishment; the accidental circumstances set forth in the 52nd paragraph of the despatch, as regards the casual acceptance of the 1861 annuities by a few officers of one army in excess of those of the other army, cannot I think be sufficient grounds for forming such an army establishment of lieutenant-colonels; indeed, the argument used in favour of a fixed establishment of this grade, if of any value, must tell with far greater reason in favour of a fixed establishment of colonels, for either the 12 years' rule of service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel is favourable to the advancement of regimental officers or unfavourable, if the former, then the pensionary provision of 1,124l. 17s. 6d., which an officer would earlier obtain would tell heavily against the finances; there can be no doubt, however, that it is unfavourable to the officer, and the diminution of the number in this grade also unfavourable, and the 12 years' rule still more so.

24. A very slight modification at the India office of the Calcutta plan for special bonuses, as set forth in the 3rd report of the Special Commission assembled by the Viceroy and Governor-General by general orders No. 156 of 26th February 1861, to report on the measures necessary for carrying out the amalgamation, would have induced many more officers to retire; the carrying out of the Calcutta measure in its entirety would have had a greater effect, and therefore, to base a fixed establishment of lieutenant-

colonels on such accidents, is not, I consider, a true military measure.

25. I may also add that the 144 regimental lieutenant-colonels fixed by the 1864 despatch, do not agree with the number of cavalry and infantry regiments, for, as far as I can ascertain, there are at present about 189 regiments of native infantry and cavalry in the Indian army.

26. Further, the numbers of cadre majors of native infantry and cavalry are in excess of the new establishment of lieutenant-colonels, but included therein are the officers belonging to the staff corps. Now, the number of majors, effective (not belonging to the staff corps), may even now be taken to be below the number of effective lieutenant-colonels, but unequal in the three armies, and likely to vary as captains rise to the major's grade, indeed, judging from the relative rise of officers under the staff corps rules as compared with that of officers not on the staff corps, the tendency will be to largely swell the grades of lieutenant-colonel and major with officers of the staff corps. And as under the former system of bonus payments, the retirements of majors will no longer be practicable, the retardation of rise in the cadres will be greatly caused.

27. Moreover, whilst the two grades of major and lieutenant-colonel are in fixed numbers, the number of colonels, usually fixed in reference to the number of regiments, are not fixed, and are at present considerably below the number of 189 regiments of native infantry and cavalry at present maintained in India. The rule of the staff corps which entitles an officer belonging to it to obtain the colonel's allowances at the close of 38 years' service, will doubtless maintain in time the total number of officers drawing the prize of the service, at the number previously existing; indeed I am confident that the number of staff corps officers drawing 1,124l. 17s. 6d. will largely swell the public expenditure, for few officers of the staff corps will retire as many formerly did after the age of 45, seeing that they are close to the prize of the service, whereas the experience of the Madras Fund shows that many who did not expect to obtain this prize until extreme old age, did retire.

28. One strange anomaly may arise of an officer of the staff corps obtaining his colonel's allowance after 38 years service and yet being only a cadre captain or major; there is the rule removing from the cadre list a staff corps officer with the cadre rank of lieutenant-colonel, yet there is none for removing from the cadre list a staff corps officer with the rank of colonel and colonel's allowance. It is quite true that an officer may be a staff corps lieutenant-colonel or major or captain and only a subaltern in the cadre, but it is by extending the case to the highest rank that the anomaly is more apparent.

29. These all appear to be serious anomalies not consistent with the recognized principles of military organization, and until cleared up, I doubt whether any one can rightly form an opinion as to the extent of supersession which staff corps officers will cause, but that it will be extensive, there can be but little doubt.

30. The reason for removing the names of officers of the staff corps from their former cadres, on reaching in these the cadre rank of lieutenant-colonel, is stated in the 76th paragraph of the 1864 report, and the objection to remove the name of officers of the staff corps below the rank of lieutenant-colonel from the cadres is stated in the 75th paragraph of the same despatch.

31. The vacancies occasioned by the removal of the lieutenant-colonels are stated in the 77th paragraph, to give promotion which will be "equally distributed," and the objection to the removal of officers below the grade of lieutenant-colonel is stated to be "a serious objection in the very unequal promotion that would have been given in different regiments." This latter objection has been urged in various forms in despatches of the Secretary of State, in speeches in the House of Commons, in the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, and in speeches of Lord Dufferin and Lord Cranworth, and yet all acquainted with Indian regulations well know that no insuperable difficulty existed for preventing this inequality.

32. Indeed, this very difficulty was anticipated and effectually met in the last clause of the 5th paragraph of the report of Lord Hotham's committee by urging in a few clear words that the vacancies be given in general and not in regimental succession; to which, I would call the attention of the Royal Commissioners, in order that the objection to remove all officers transferred to the new staff corps, and to the new regiments of the line, from all cadres, may not have any further apparent justification of an extravagant amount of promotion, to a few officers in a few regiments, again urged for persevering in this objection. I cannot but think that remedies might be applied without much expense, by simply carrying out the old rules of the service by removing all officers from cadres to which they do not belong.

33. There can be no doubt that the following Table of removals and retirements shows that the numbers by grades removed to new line regiments and staff corps, and those who retired, are serious removals to dispose of by giving promotions in lieu; but the question may openly be discussed as to whether any remedy can be devised for preventing an undue amount of military advancement and if absolutely necessary even of expense; I am of opinion that the problem could be solved, and that in its mode of solution the feelings and interests of the officers may be respected without grave injury to the State; but I would here repeat that in advising this outlay, I have, from the day I took my seat as one of the 1861 Commission appointed by Earl Canning to advise on the measures for carrying out the amalgamation, never looked on the changes of 1861 in a financial point of view. They did not appear to me to be based on military conditions, and I accepted them as great acts of State to be carried out without regard to cost; in this light I continue to regard them.

	Removed to Line.			Removed to Staff Corps.			Retired on 31st Dec. 1861 on Extra Annuities.				Grand Total.
	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Total.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Bengal.	Madras.	Bombay.	Total.	
Colonels - -	8	9	17	17
Lieut.-Colonels - -	3	3	6	8	8	11	56	55	22	134	153
Majors - -	3	7	10	15	15	24	40	33	14	82	127
Captains - -	26	64	90	318	163	128	669	51	4	77	776
Second Captains - -	3	3	3	3
Lieutenants - -	34	173	212	331	184	134	648	860
Ensigns & Cornets - -	16	73	89	1	..	1	90
Total - -	85	336	421	669	356	269	1296	133	131	40	2021

34. A number of the officers above shown to have been removed to the "line corps" are still retained on the nine European infantry cadres, and of the 1st to the 6th regiments of Bengal cavalry, whilst those transferred from other Indian cadres have been struck off, and regimental promotions made in their room; but all might be removed and by army promotions being made, the objection to extensive promotions in any one regiment would cease.

35. A few of the staff corps officers who held the rank or have become lieutenant-colonels in their old cadres have also been removed, but on the same principle, all grades might be removed and promotions made, as Lord Hotham's committee advised, in the whole army, and if necessary, supernumeraries might be declared to exist in particular grades and gradually absorbed, only however, after the fixed establishment is completed, by promotions being first made.

36. Practically all officers who retired have been removed from cadres of native troops, excepting as respects the effect on the colonels' grade, and the retention of the lieutenant-colonels to regulate succession to the colonelcy, has in effect diminished the rise of the officers to the grade of lieutenant-colonels and to that position.

37. Further, the steps of the 12 colonels removed with the 12 line regiments have been disposed of in a form different from that ordered for the other officers of the line regiments, whose removal from cadres bears date 18th February 1861, whereas all the colonels are removed practically after 1st January 1862, instead of seven of them bearing date 18th February 1861. No doubt the removal of these seven regimental colonels with retrospective effect from the 18th February 1861, will cause changes in the three armies, but a resort to the older date appears to me inevitable, and as delay only aggravates the evil, the sooner it is obviated the more easily will claims be settled.

38. No doubt the cadre advancements from all officers being struck off old cadres will give a great rise to officers on cadre lists, but I doubt if it will equal that already liberally given to the staff corps officers; the extent of that promotion to officers in the staff corps from the 18th February 1861, up to about July 1863, may be judged of from the following table, as extracted from Parliamentary return 522 of 1863:—

	As they stood on 18th Feb 1861	Increased between 19th Feb 1861, and about July 1863	Total about July 1863.
Majors made Lieut.-colonels - -	25	24	49
Captains made Majors - -	192	161	353
Lieutenants made Captains - -	162	137	299
Total - -	379	322	701

39. It should be remembered that fewer than 1,300 officers originally joined the staff corps, and this table shows that more than one half of the officers of the staff corps obtained within two years such advancement to superior rank that the like can hardly be paralleled by the extensive regimental promotion in the war with Russia. The House of Lords return 103 of 1865 shows that 483 staff corps officers of the three armies then continued to hold, through the operation of the staff corps rules, substantive rank superior to that of officers heretofore senior to them in their respective cadres, that is more than one-third of the whole number of the staff corps officers had, even in 1865 after all the promotions given to the regimental cadres, continued to supersede the regimental officers. This is an amount of promotion far more beyond reason than that which could have followed, if army transfers had been made to fill all vacancies.

40. In order to enable the Royal Commissioners to judge of the relative cost to the state from the pay of the officers when transferred to the staff corps from the regimental cadres on the 18th February 1861, and the cost of the same officers in the staff corps as the same stood about July 1863, I enter the following table, with cost of numbers before and since being promoted; it is merely given as an approximate statement. A more accurate one can easily be obtained if necessary from an official source; and I mention this from noticing discrepancies in the data as obtained from the returns.

Approximate Monthly cost of one of each.	RANKS.	Before being advanced, as transferred on 18th Feb. 1861.		As the same stood about July 1863, after being advanced.	
		No.	Annual cost.	No.	Annual cost.
Rs.			Rs.		Rs.
840	Lieut.-Colonels - -	11	1,10,880	32	3,22,560
640	Major - - -	24	1,84,320	342	25,26,560
430	{ Captain - - -	609	32,37,920	589	30,89,240
	{ Second Captain - -	3			
250	Lieutenant - - -	648	19,44,000	376	11,28,000
200	Ensign - - -	1	2,400
	Total - -	1,296	54,79,520	1,339	70,16,360

41. The above table shows that an extra cost of rs. 15,36,840 in the form of increase of pay to the higher ranks of the staff corps, was incurred within the space of little more than two years, or upwards of 153,000%. By the promotion of officers who joined the staff corps. As more officers of the staff corps have been advanced since 1863, to the superior grades, whilst the total numbers in the staff corps have not greatly increased, this extra expense must have been greatly enhanced, and will, year by year, increase. This large expense is I suspect mainly that said to have been incurred by Government for promotions to the Indian army generally.

42. Some deduction must however be made from the above charge as several of the officers are in the superior grades in the cadres, of equal rank in the staff corps

43. But this calculation may be better checked by the House of Lords' return 103 of 1865, which shows that after all the recent promotions in the grades of officers of the Indian army there were, in 1865, so many as 488 officers of the staff corps, superior in rank to that of officers heretofore their seniors in their respective cadres. Now, whilst this number is an indication of the extent of supercession still prevailing, it enables a calculation to be approximately made of the extra cost incurred for the superior rank bestowed on these 488 officers, and this amounts, at the rate of rs. 200 per mensem per head, to about 117,000L. per annum; the difference between this and 153,000L. as above may be attributed to the rise lately given to officers not of the staff corps, and partly to the staff corps officers holding equality of rank both in the cadre and staff corps lists. I place these calculations in the present state before the Commission, with the assurance that I believe them to be sufficiently close to give an idea of the cost of these changes; but if entire accuracy be needed it would be easy to make precise calculations from official documents available in the India Office.

44. The Government are also incurring further expenditure, for they are at present paying 410 unemployed officers in India, the sum of about 196,000L. per annum, as below shown, whereas, the extra annuities granted to the 304 officers who retired on the 31st December 1861, amounted only to 56,020L., and their ordinary pensions to 100,808L., making a total of 156,828L.

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

45. The following statement of officers at each Presidency unemployed or placed on general duty, and their charge for Indian pay, extracted from Parliamentary Returns 213 of 1865, of House of Commons, and 103 of 1865, of House of Lords, may be useful.

	Monthly		Total Monthly	
	Rs.	As. P.	Rs.	As. P.
7 { 6 Brevet Colonels, each on	1,032	4 0	6,193	8 0
1 " " " "	1,157	0 0	1,157	0 0
22 { 17 Lieut.-Colonels, each on	1,032	4 0	17,548	0 0
5 " " " "	1,157	0 0	5,785	0 0
12 Majors, each on	789	3 0	9,470	4 0
41) Field officers.	Total monthly Rs. 40,153 12 0			
119 Captains	" " " " Rs. 1,23,765 0 7			
247 Lieutenants				
3 Ensigns				
410 Total.	Total monthly Rs. 1,63,918 12 7			
Total for a year	- £196,702, or Rs. 19,67,025 0 0			

46. In addition to the above the return presented to the House of Lords, shows the following ranks unemployed.

	In India.	Furlough.	Total.
Lieut.-Colonels - - -	38	5	43
Majors - - - - -	50	22	72
Captains - - - - -	88	64	152
Lieutenants - - - -	209	47	256
Ensigns - - - - -	3	—	3
	388	138	526

47. I suspect the two returns apply in part to the same class of officers, but as I cannot separate the details I cite the facts as rendered to the Houses of Parliament.

48. I beg however to draw attention to the closeness of the estimate of the Calcutta Commission as to the probable number of supernumeraries which would exist in the Indian army as set forth in their third report, extract from which is given in Addendum No. X., and which is shown by adding the existing number of supernumeraries to those who retired in 1861. This is the more important as the despatch of 10th August 1861 to the Government of India distinctly doubted the accuracy of the estimate of the Calcutta Commission, and the existence of so many supernumeraries after four years proves how far-seeing the Calcutta Commissioners were in advocating the removal of officers not wanted for the duty of the State.

49. Now, supposing all the unemployed officers were induced to retire on receipt of pensions equal to those granted to the 304 who retired on 31st December 1861, (but which need not be granted to the full extent), there would be a surplus of about 50,000*l.* as compared with the present cost for the unemployed officers in India; this excess added to the extra pay of 117,000*l.* given to the 488 staff corps officers of superior rank will make a total excess of about 170,000*l.* now paid by the State.

50. The Royal Commissioners will see from these remarks that there is great room for improvement in existing measures, even in an economical point of view; some portion of the existing supersession, as well as the grievance about the bonus monies and colonels' allowances, might by proper measures of economy be effectually removed.

CONCLUSION.

1. I have thus endeavoured to furnish materials to enable the Commissioners to advise on the measures needed to carry out the principles on which the 1861 changes were made, in the hopes that the measures in detail may be so planned as to place the Indian service in that high state of efficiency which the great interests of the empire so vitally call for. But as I may seem to advise measures to attain this end which may entail on Government a large expenditure, and thereby appear to depart from the principles of economy which as chief of the military finance department of India I aided the Government in enforcing, I may be allowed to state, that in the exercise of my former functions, the Government enjoined, and I, as a servant of the State and as a soldier, cordially obeyed the order, to regard military efficiency before mere money saving; no doubt most military measures can be carried out, in one less expensive form than in another, but I have very generally observed that the best military measures will not be incompatible with real and true economy.

2. I may also add that, as a member of the Calcutta

Amalgamation Commission, I cordially concurred in all those measures which my colleagues advised to carry out the Secretary of State's measures in the way most consistent with his instructions; and though I saw that these measures would then seriously affect the economical measures I was then aiding Government to carry out in the then vast military expenditure of India, yet not only did I not raise any objection, but Major-General Sir W. Coghlan will bear testimony that I earnestly advised an apparently large expenditure to induce the European soldiers of the Indian army to transfer their services to the British regiments.

3. Now all concerned in advising this outlay must look back with great pleasure to the success of a high order attending a great public measure which resulted from the Government of India adopting the suggestion of the Calcutta Commission, for in this one instance it brought about in one part of the 1861 scheme a most complete and effectual amalgamation, and of all the many changes the Government have been freed, as respects this one, the most important of all, in a political point of view, from the anxiety attendant on the other far less successful measures.

4. The economy resulting from this expenditure of about 160,000*l.*, whereby the services of 17,600 European soldiers out of 18,000 were obtained for the general service of the Crown, is the kind of economy which I maintain is so properly applicable in testing the goodness of military measures; mistaken advice to the Government of India in this part of the amalgamation scheme in respect to the transfer of the soldiers' services by the men refusing to re-enlist might have entailed on Government a direct outlay of ten times the sum thus successfully paid.

5. These remarks are prefatory to a suggestion which I now offer, which may also appear to lead to further expenditure; that after having endeavoured carefully to make myself acquainted with all the detailed measures connected with the Indian army ordered since 1861, and having in 1859 taken part, as a member of the Military Finance Commission, in considering the question referred to us by the Government of India, of forming a staff corps, which in our report of 26th May 1860 we advised the Governor-General of India to reject as calculated to lead the Government into serious complications, I believe that the most economical measure which could now be applied would be to endeavour to supersede all of the past details of the 1861 changes by one great and comprehensive arrangement, which would enable all officers to merge their claims, as existing before 1861 or since then acquired, into the one proposed arrangement.

6. I would base this one comprehensive plan on a scrupulous respect for all rights originally existing or created since 1861, for nothing is more expensive to a State than an appearance even of a disregard for the fair and just claims of their servants; a far greater loss from such disregard, even if erroneously entertained, is sustained by the State indirectly, than any expense the State would have to meet, by an open and fair recognition of the requests of their servants. I fear that this result is now seen in India.

7. I do not believe that the measure I am contemplating could completely meet the case of all officers, for the complication of promotions, on various conditions strange in character, and from the recent brevets, is at present far greater than before 1861; but I do believe that some good arrangements can be made for at once removing a large portion of the existing difficulties, and I hope providing for those remaining unsettled being gradually but certainly overcome; and money should not, in my opinion, be spared to attain an end which considerations of military and public policy so imperatively require.

8. The plan would not be final in its character, for though the past five years of changes are fruitful in useful lessons, yet the experience acquired is insufficient to justify the formation of final plans for the military system of India; it would, however, harmonize with the advice already recorded of experienced officers. It would afford time for statesmen of all parties to apply their thoughts to effect a settlement of the great, and yet unsolved, State problem, of a sound military system for India; still difficult to determine, for it is at present blended with the grievances, interests, and passions of individuals, so as to prevent that calm and impartial consideration being given to the right organization of a great branch of the Indian service, on which the peace, and security of our administration, and happiness of the people of that great empire mainly depends.

G. BALFOUR, Major-General.

Note.—The Addenda referred to by Major-General Balfour, being extracts of an unpublished Report of a Commission assembled at Calcutta in 1861, are omitted.

Major-General G. BALFOUR, C.B. (Royal (Madras) Artillery), examined.

APPENDIX

No. 5

1. (*Chairman.*) In regard to the arrangements proposed for the succession of officers of the Indian Ordnance Corps to the rank of general officer, the Commissioners of 1863 stated that they had found it impossible to say what "the effect of the amalgamation had been on the prospects of field officers of the Artillery and Engineers of the Indian army who were not colonels before the amalgamation, with reference to their becoming general officers," and that they therefore were unable to say whether on this head of complaint there has or has not been a violation of the Parliamentary "assurance." Consequent upon this report, the warrant of 1st January 1862 has been revised, and we now wish to receive your observations upon the following:—As regards colonels of the Indian Ordnance promoted prior to the 17th of February 1861, do you consider that there is now any ground for complaint, such colonels continuing, as before, to rise to the rank of general officers in the general list for the Indian army?

Answer. There is no complaint whatever to be made as to the advancement of colonels to the grade of general continuing exactly as under the conditions of service existing prior to the 1861 changes. The colonels who were promoted before the 17th of February 1861 have in fact, in respect to rising to the rank of general officer, remained on the Indian list, and will succeed to the general's grade as casualties occur amongst the 220 generals.

You may, if you please, say that there is a slight ground of complaint, inasmuch as that number of general officers, amongst whom the casualties were likely to take place, has been diminished by the withdrawal of 13 general officers from the Indian list on account of transfers of colonels to the line regiments, including Sir P. Grant to the 78th foot; but I do not view this of consequence. The Government might very easily rectify any slight loss which the Indian colonels, promoted before 1861, would sustain from this decrease of the number of generals.

There is also a loss occasioned by the withdrawal of those 13 generals, inasmuch as Lord Hotham's Committee advised that the number of generals and the number of colonels of the British service should be in keeping with each other, and that unless those two ranks were kept in keeping (and you might say also lieutenant-colonels and majors, because the same reasoning applies to lieutenant-colonels and majors as to the colonels), then, for the like reasons, the Indian grades below the general's rank do suffer by the withdrawal of those 13 generals without a fair proportion of colonels and other ranks being also withdrawn, but the extent of this kind of suffering is slight; the remedy which is necessary would I hope be accorded by the Government; an extra promotion every now and then through the generals' grades, down to the promotion of a captain to be a brevet-major, would compensate for the loss. That reply refers to the period before 1861, and which I think answers all with regard to the colonels promoted before 18th February 1861.

2. As regards colonels promoted on and after the 18th February 1861, who are to rise to the rank of general officer upon a separate list for the Indian Ordnance, what remarks have you to make?

A. I have already, in my statement, endeavoured to make that sufficiently clear, and when I receive a printed copy of my written statement I can add some additional information connected with that case, which I have, since drawing it up, put together; but I may now add that, inasmuch as all the senior Artillery colonels are, by their standing, of very considerable service, and as it so happens that 11 out of the 14 Indian army colonels who were promoted in 1861 belong to the Ordnance Corps of India, it is quite evident that with regard to the chances of these 11 rising to the general's grade, their promotion will be very slow, as those 11 officers of that one year must depend on casualties from amongst the separate respective lists of 26 and 12 general officers, which would then be the establishment for the two Ordnance Corps of India; instead, therefore, of obtaining their promotion to the grade of general, which they might safely expect within one year if they had remained on the old Indian list of 220 generals, they can hardly expect to obtain that promotion on the very small lists of 26 and 12 generals, within five years. I think, therefore, that the change to the officers of the Ordnance Corps from the large list of 220 to the small one of 26 and 12 generals will be most disastrous, and especially so to the regiment I rose in—the Madras Artillery—for in that regiment from accidental circumstances, which would

occupy the time of the Commission too long to enter into, out of the 14 colonels promoted in 1861, there are four in number at the top who belong to my regiment of artillery, and happen to be of the extended service of 43 years, and would have no prospect in three years of succeeding to the rank of general, even if kept in succession to the 220 generals, and necessarily much longer, depending after the separation for advancement on casualties amongst 26 generals.

I may ask your attention to the consequences of this delay; these four senior army colonels, first, after those of 1860 are promoted, for promotion to the grade of general, will certainly occupy at the very least three years, instead of only about six months when they would obtain the general's grade if on the succession list of the 220 generals. That period of three years tells upon the regimental ranks of the officers of my regiment very seriously. This effect on regimental advancement by officers attaining to the grade of general, may be practically seen, if you refer to the old Royal Artillery lists; you will find a very marked influence indeed on the rise of officers to regimental rank by vacancies caused by officers being removed out of the regiment on obtaining the general's grade. I have looked over the annual Army Lists of Hart, and I was struck with the remarkable fact that the 30 general officers belonging to the Royal Artillery on 1st January 1865, two being wanting, comprise between them a total of 160 years in which they have vacated their regimental position by reason of promotion to the rank of general; that is to say, looking at the date of rank of each as major-general, and calculating the years of service each has been out of the regiment, the total completes the period of years as above stated.

Thus, it may be said 160 colonels, 160 lieutenant-colonels, 160 first captains, 160 second captains, and 160 first lieutenants have each held accelerated rank for one year in the regiment, and consequently have drawn the pay of the advanced regimental rank, by reason of the 30 general officers vacating their position in the regiment on their promotion to the rank of general officers; or in other words, each of the 30 generals was out of the regiment on an average of $5\frac{1}{2}$ years, during which period an effective officer in all the grades below that of general filled the vacancy. Now no such example as this can be adduced at all like this in the Indian Artillery Corps, or in the Indian Army, where the vacation of the regimental position, by reason of an officer being promoted to be a general was of infrequent instead of frequent occurrence, as in the British service.

This illustration will, therefore, serve to give some idea as to the injury which the Ordnance Corps of India will sustain by the delay in the promotion to the general's grade of those 11 officers promoted to the rank of colonel immediately after the amalgamation—on or after the 18th of February 1861—and that delay telling injuriously upon the regimental rise of these corps. For instance, I should have been fifth officer of my regiment, standing next for promotion after the 18th of February 1861, that is to say, five senior colonels of the army of that year would have been the five senior colonels of the Madras Artillery, and had I not obtained by former brevets advancement to my general's grade, I must have been delayed in obtaining rank as general until the four above me succeeded from casualties amongst 26 generals—a hopeless prospect. By recently vacating my position in my regiment, I give my brother officers at least five years regimental rise, and yet I am senior to all the unpromoted colonels of Royal Artillery, and to some of the promoted generals.

3. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan.*) But it was accidental; it did not arise from the system that they occupied that position?

A. It was accidental from a variety of things, special to the Artillery Corps of India, and unfortunate in rise as the artillery officers were, relatively, with the old Royal Artillery officers, this measure will make them far more so.

4. It might, for instance, happen under the present system of rising by the general list, that we should have ten or any number of full generals of the Indian Artillery or Engineers if they happened to stand on the list of lieutenant-generals for promotion, or they might all be made major-generals, if they happened to be men whose rank was low?

A. That question has reference, as I understand it to, the numbers in the different grades of general officers.

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

5. Yes, and it has particular reference to a case with which you are familiar, General Griffiths' claim which is before this Commission?

A. I have looked more attentively into that question since I was spoken to last week on the subject. On carefully looking over the two warrants of 1st January 1862 and 15th of June 1864, I think that the first warrant has inaccurately stated that there were, at the date of the warrant, 24 general officers actually existing, and in different grades allowed to the Indian Artillery. I am not aware of any published document existing which justifies the assertion that there were 24 generals in grades specially set apart as an establishment for the Indian Artillery. All that was ever published, as far as my memory serves, was that the Court of Directors announced in a despatch of 1854 that there was an establishment of 220 generals given to the Indian army in all its branches,—Artillery, Engineers, Cavalry, and Infantry,—without specifying the numbers allotted to each branch of the army. But the warrant of January 1862 states that four general officers, eight lieutenant-generals, and 12 major-generals comprised the different grades of those 24 artillery generals. In the 1864 warrant only 24 artillery generals are stated, without naming the grades, as the total number, composing the then existing total establishment asserted to exist. The engineers of India are also stated to have an establishment of 11 generals, the numbers of the grades being alone enumerated in the 1862 warrant as 2 generals, 3 lieutenant-generals, and 6 major-generals. The total for the two ordnance corps of India, stated to exist, being 35 generals, divided into 6 generals, 11 lieutenant-generals, and 18 major-generals, and that these are to be taken out of the Indian list of 220 generals, and a slight addition to be made eventually when the separation takes place.

6. Does not the warrant say that that arrangement was to be prospective; is not the word "eventually" used?

A. That word applies to another establishment of 26 generals, named in the two warrants of 1862 and 1864 as to be the new establishment after the separation takes place, that is, on all the colonels of the Indian army of date of rank in 1860 being promoted to the grade of general.

I may also observe that in the 1854 warrant, fixing 220 generals as the Indian establishment, there is no authority for the statement that the Artillery of India had either a present establishment of 24 or a future one of 26 generals. The claim which I understand has been put forward by one general officer of the Indian artillery, General Griffiths, is, that he is entitled to be promoted to the rank of full general to complete the establishment to five generals. I do not think as I read the warrant of 1862, that he has a right to claim promotion to complete that establishment to five; the word "eventually," which is introduced into the last sentence of the 7th paragraph of the 1862 warrant, clearly refers to the separation of the lists after the promotion of the colonels of 1860; then on that being carried out, the Artillery establishment of generals ought to be completed to five full generals out of a total of 26. However I do think there is some appearance of justice in General Griffiths claiming the rank of a full general officer to complete (if wanting) the Artillery establishment to four full generals; this is the consequence of the inaccurate wording of the first sentence of paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862, which specifies 24 generals as the then Artillery establishment, and that four of them are full generals.

I may mention one point to this Commission, which I think is of importance. It is the very small proportion which the superior grades of the 220 general officers in the Indian army bear to the total number, in reference to the proportions which those higher grades in the British army bear to the total number. The Indian army, for a total of 220 general officers, as fixed in 1854, were allowed 25 generals, 50 lieutenant-generals, and 145 major-generals, whereas if they bore the same proportion to the 234 generals of the British Infantry and Cavalry as first granted in 1854, the Indian grades would have been about 45 generals, 72 lieutenant-generals, and 120 major-generals.

In elucidation of the great disproportions I give in a table showing the grades of generals as fixed for the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, the Line, (Cavalry and Infantry), the Royal Marines, and Indian army, which will at a glance make the disparity in the ranks of the generals for the several services very apparent,

and show the inferiority of the establishment fixed for India.

	Generals	Lieut-Generals.	Major-Generals	Total.
Royal Artillery } in	6	10	16	32
" Engineers } 1854	8	5	8	16
Total - - -	9	15	24	48
Line: in 1854 - -	50	70	114	234
Total fixed in 1854 for } the British Army -	59	85	138	232
Line in 1858 - - -	50	80	130	260
" at present - - -	3	3	7	275
Indian Army in 1854 -	25	50	145	220
Royal Marines in 1854	2	3	5	10

The above table shows that the numbers in the grades of general and lieutenant-general are in the three Royal services, the Ordnance, Line, and Marines, equal to the numbers in the one grade of major-general, whereas in Her Majesty's Indian army, the number of generals and lieutenant-generals is only half the number of major-generals; and when the establishment of 35 generals is withdrawn from the 220 for the separate lists of the two Indian Ordnance Corps, the Indian establishment of generals will be reduced to 19 generals, 39 lieutenant-generals, and 127 major-generals, thereby still further causing the higher grades of this rank to be in greater disproportion to the grades of the British army, and yet the 12th paragraph of the 1862 warrant clearly states that "the proportion of generals maintained on account of the Indian establishment shall all times be governed by the principles adopted in respect to the British forces, both as to numbers and gradation."

7. (Major-Gen. Browne) Referring to what you have now stated in connexion with General Griffiths' case. General Griffiths, being a colonel prior to the date of amalgamation in 1861, holds at present rank as lieutenant-general under the old regulations, which, for all those officers, remains still in force. Under those regulations he succeeded to his present rank as lieutenant-general; under the same regulations he must succeed to his rank as general. Has he any case therefore to make in connexion with the present question, observing that the allotment spoken of in paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862 has to do only with officers of the Ordnance Corps promoted on and after the date of amalgamation?

A. General Griffiths rose to his present rank of general officer under the 1854 establishment of generals for the Indian army, viz, 220 in number; and had the first sentence of paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862 not been worded as it is, I should have said that General Griffiths had not a shadow of a claim to be promoted to the rank of full general to complete any artillery establishment of generals; but there are 24 generals named for the artillery in that first part of the warrant, 4 being full generals. The establishments, however, mentioned in paragraph 7 are two in number; the one referring to the eventual establishment of 26 after the separation of the lists of artillery and line generals, and that one states five full generals as the future number out of 26; the other establishment of 24 generals is stated to exist at the time of the writing of the warrant, and it states that the 24 generals then forming the artillery establishment comprise four full general officers.

I think it was most unfortunate indeed that such an expression was used, because I do not allow that any such artillery establishment as four generals, eight lieutenant-generals, and 12 major-generals did exist on or before the 1st of January 1862, the date of that warrant. In fact there was by the 1854 order, no separate establishment fixed for the Indian Artillery or for any one branch of the army, for the 220 generals were allowed for the Indian army as a whole. I may say that number of 24 generals, is proved to be incorrect from the unequal proportions assigned to the grades of generals, as stated in the 1862 warrant to belong to the artillery and engineers of India; the generals for both corps is 35, in the proportion of one half of the grades of general and lieutenant-general to the total number; whereas these grades of the 220 establishment are only one third of the total number. The expression having been made

use of in an official document of the highest character, only shows the complications which arise out of regulations which are incorrectly drawn.

I think however that the Commission, if they have an opportunity of doing so, might call attention to the deficient proportion of the higher grades of general officers in the Indian army, as compared with the allotment of general officers for the British army, and that an assimilation of grades on the 18th February 1861, as assured in the 12th paragraph of the warrant of 1862, would at once remove all claims to rank, such as the one claim of General Griffiths.

I would also remark that in this paragraph 7 of the same warrant a statement is made, that the allotment of general officers for the artillery was at the rate of one general officer for each battalion. As far as I remember the regulations of 1854, no such allotment was stated. The basis on which the establishment of 220 generals for the Indian army was fixed rests on the proportion, as far as I can make out the 1854 regulation, of one general officer to about 24 officers of the Indian army. At that date there were about 5,400 officers of the Indian army, and 220 generals were given. That was the allotment which I believe was made, but it was never officially announced, and certainly not one for each battalion, as stated in the warrant of 1st January 1862. I am borne out in this idea from the 1854 establishments of generals for the Royal Ordnance Corps and Line having been based on the number of combatant officers, as stated in the report of the Army Promotion Commission of 1854, in the proportion of 1 general to 21 combatant officers.

8. Is it not the case that the former establishment of general officers for the whole Indian army comprised all branches of the service, including consequently the proportion for the Ordnance Corps, and that the establishment of the Ordnance Corps referred to in paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862 is noticed simply as having been a component part of the aggregate. But that total establishment so comprised constituted the general list for the entire Indian army. The officers rose indiscriminately in the order of seniority, the allotment for the eventual establishment in paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862 having to do only with the Ordnance Corps on and after the 17th of February 1861?

A. There are several points in the question to which I do not think attention has been given. That 220 general officers were given to the Indian army in 1854 is a fact, but I am not aware that the order itself which emanated from the Court of Directors, though sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government, ever specified on what basis that allotment was fixed, excepting that a reference to the recent allotment of the general officers for the British army,—viz., 234 for the line and cavalry, and 48 for the Ordnance Corps of the British army,—was, I think, made in the despatch of the Court of Directors, fixing the 220 generals for the army of India.

The Report of the Royal Commission of 1854, which Her Majesty assembled to advise as to the number of general officers to be fixed for the Ordnance Corps and Line, advises that 32 general officers should be given to the Royal Artillery for their then complement of 692 officers, and 16 for the 336 Engineer officers, the number of officers of these two corps being specifically named in the report at these figures. The two warrants of 1854 issued by Her Majesty to give effect to the recommendations contained in that Report carried out the recommendation by fixing 234 for the line and 48 as the establishment for both the Ordnance Corps, that is by giving 32 generals for the Artillery and 16 for Engineers, but it limited the unattached number, as far as my reading goes; the maximum number of general officers of the Artillery and Engineers who could be unattached, not being colonels commandant of regiments, being limited to 27 in number, that is to say, that if all the colonels commandant of the Royal Artillery and Engineers were junior in army rank to the second colonels of the regiments, only 27 second colonels could be unattached general officers, in whose room promotions would be made, and in that case 21 of the establishment of 48 generals allowed for the two Ordnance Corps would then remain unfilled up.

In like manner for the cavalry and infantry of the line, the Commission did refer to the number of combatant officers composing the line and cavalry of the British army, but the Report does not distinctly specify the exact number of those combatant officers, but by reference to the official documents of that year, viz., the army estimates for 1854-5, laid before Parliament, I find the number to have been 4,833 effective

regimental combatant officers of the line and cavalry of the British army. Further, in fixing the establishment of generals for the Ordnance Corps, the 75th paragraph of the Promotion Report of 1854 states that the full pay or combatant officers of the two Ordnance Corps are in the proportion "of about one to five of the line and cavalry, and one-sixth of the whole army," thereby showing that the total combatant officers of the whole army were nearly 6,000, for whom 282 officers were given, of whom 234 generals belonged to the 5,000 infantry and cavalry officers, and 48 to the 1,028 Ordnance full-pay officers. According to this number, there were 21 officers to 1 general officer of the line alone; the whole British army, including the ordnance and line, being thereby supplied with generals in the same proportion of 1 to 21 combatant officers. Following upon that, the Court of Directors then fixed the establishment of 220 generals for the Indian army, and I believe on the like principle, though in unfavourable proportions, to the Indian army. If any portion of the half-pay officers of the British army who then were entitled to look to the right to succeed to the grade of general (and many were not) were included in the army strength of line officers for which general officers were allowed, then the establishment which the Court of Directors fixed for the Indian army may be more nearly in the same proportion as that fixed for the British line, otherwise it is below the proportion fixed for the seniority services, the Royal Artillery and Engineers; but as the despatch of the Court of Directors does not enter into details, as far as my memory serves, I am unable to do more than state my views as to the basis on which the Court fixed 220 generals for the whole Indian army.

Under this explanation I cannot allow that I am aware of any authority for saying that 24 general officers is the proportion which was due to the artillery of India in 1862, and I equally do not know that, following the example of the British service, which we are bound to do because it is the standard by which we best keep to any correct military organization, the eventual establishment of 26 general officers, in reference to the number of 696 artillery officers existing at the time of the amalgamation, is the fair proportion which ought in future to have been allowed to the Indian artillery; for in 1861 I think the 696 artillery officers belonging to the Indian artillery in the three presidencies were entitled to be placed on an equality with the old Royal Artillery, and to have had assigned an establishment of 1 general to 21 combatant officers, the same proportion as allowed in 1854, when the Royal Artillery got their establishment of 32 general officers for their then 692 artillery officers on the full pay of the Royal Artillery list.

9. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan.*) Do you consider it any grievance that the old officers of artillery service should rise by the general Indian gradation list instead of by the fixed establishment?

A. Being now a major-general myself I think that my chance of rise to the superior grades, say to the next grade of lieutenant-general, is more favourable on the future list of 26 generals than it will be by rising on the general list of the whole Indian army. The proportion of superior grades proposed to be eventually given to the Indian artillery comprises five generals, eight lieutenant-generals, and 13 major-generals, and in that same proportion the grades of the 220 general officers of the Indian army would be 42 generals, 68 lieutenant-generals, and 110 major-generals, being a far more favourable gradation than is now allowed; viz., 25 generals, 50 lieutenant-generals, and 145 major-generals. The new artillery gradation shows the generals and lieutenant-generals as one-half of the total number of generals, whereas these grades in the Indian army are only one-third of the total number of generals.

It is in this point of view that I have more than once mentioned that I have thought the numbers and gradation of the generals of the Indian army not in keeping with the numbers and gradation in the British service, either as respects the total number of generals allowed, or the proportions which the respective grades bear to the total of generals.

10 (*Sir R. Napier*) The general officers of the Indian Army having been borne on one common gradation list previous to the amalgamation, and General Griffiths having become a general officer previous to the amalgamation, have the measures of amalgamation made any change in the conditions which regulated his promotion?

A. I would distinctly reply to that by saying that the parties who make regulations are bound to give

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

to the parties, who are to be obedient to those regulations, the fullest advantage that can be given by an interpretation according to the plain reading of those regulations. I do not think that that favourable interpretation which the stronger party ought to give, has been accorded to the officers of the Indian army. I speak with reference to the question now put to me, that if the simple order had existed, without change, as issued in 1854 on the subject of the 220 general officers, General Griffiths' claim could not arise until the separation of the artillery list from that of the Indian army. But inasmuch as the authorities thought fit upon the 1st of January 1862, and again on the 15th of June 1864, to issue warrants and regulations wherein those specified certain things as existing different from those which I believe myself actually to be the case, I think that trifling as General Griffiths' case really is, that officer has as an individual a fair right to come forward and claim, under the first clause of paragraph 7, any advantage by promotion to the superior grade of general which the scale of artillery establishment of generals there stated to exist can give him. I am aware that the regulations attached to the warrant of 1862 in its different paragraphs are not in keeping. One paragraph alludes to an establishment of generals differing from that specified in another paragraph. But I also maintain that paragraph 7 contains two words "present" and "eventually"; that the word "eventually" refers to the future establishment under which General Griffiths has I consider no claim until the separation of lists takes place, but under the first part of paragraph 7, wherein the present establishment is spoken of as then existing, and in certain fixed numbers by grades, I submit with all deference that General Griffiths has a claim, provided there are not four full generals of artillery. I may also add that inasmuch as paragraph 7 of the warrant of 1862 did alter the establishment of general officers, by which General Griffiths had obtained his grade of general, to a fixed establishment of four generals stated to belong to the artillery of India, then in the case of any vacancy amongst the four generals, General Griffiths would have a claim to be promoted to that rank. I should myself say, however, that the promotion of all artillery colonels to the generals grade under the previous practice is maintained until 1860. But when all the colonels prior to that date have been promoted,—then the artillery list of 26 generals becomes separated from the Indian list, and colonels of date of 1861 then rise to the general's grade in succession to the casualties amongst these 26

11. Is it not the fact that paragraph 7 of the warrant of the 1st of January 1862 applies only to colonels promoted on and after the 17th of February 1861?

A It may be considered to apply to the colonels promoted on or after the 18th of February 1861, so far as the latter clause of paragraph 7 expresses, but the first clause of paragraph 7 appears to me to apply to an establishment of general officers then stated to exist in the Indian artillery, in so far as General Griffiths' case is concerned, it states that 24 generals in different grades is the artillery establishment then existing, but of this I had no knowledge until I saw it so stated for the first time in the regulations attached to this warrant

12. (Major-General Browne.) Paragraph 2 of the regulations connected with the warrant of the 1st of January 1862 runs thus "All colonels of either army who attained that rank prior to the 17th February 1861, shall be continued on separate lists as at present, and shall succeed on separate lists to the rank of major-general, lieutenant-general, major-general, and general under the regulations now in force for each army respectively." Does not that rule render paragraph 7 entirely inapplicable to the case of General Griffiths?

A I think that we all thoroughly incline to this important point that it is not on one part of a regulation or order, but it is the whole order or orders upon the case, to which you ought to look. On turning to paragraph 1 of the regulation attached to the warrant of the 15th of June 1864, that rule and paragraph 2 of the regulations of the 1st of January 1862 are strictly in keeping with each other; but when I compare paragraph 7 of the regulations of the warrant of the 1st of January 1862 with paragraph 3 of the regulations under the warrant of the 15th of June 1864, I see that a very material difference exists between the wording of those two respective paragraphs. Paragraph 3 of the regulations of 1864 is clear and distinct as to the

future establishment of generals to be on the artillery list. Paragraph 6 of the 1864 regulations, though still specifying as previously in 1862 that 24 generals is the proportion then and before allowed for the artillery, yet the grades comprising the 24 generals are in the 1864 rules not stated as in the 7th paragraph of the 1862 regulations; it appears to me therefore that between 1862 and 1864 the mistake was discovered, which I think was made in paragraph 7 of the regulations of the 1st of January 1862 and partly corrected; and again, the last clause of paragraph 7 of the regulation of 1862 is however in strict keeping with paragraph 3 of the regulation of 1864, which strictly refers to the future establishment of 26 generals; that is to say, after the separation of the Indian list. I look upon it that a mistake has been made in stating four full generals as a portion of the 24, but under that mistake General Griffiths has the appearance of a claim to the higher rank, provided a vacancy exists in the number of generals of the artillery, since the amalgamation.

13. (Sir W. M. Coghlan) You say that clause 1 of paragraph 7 distinctly states that to be the proportion; do not you think that it is rather inferential than positive?

A I am open to correction; it is a mere reading of the words; but I think it is more than an inference. The words appear to me to be specific and clear. The regulation talks of the present establishment as an actual fact, the number is named, 24, and the grades composing the number also stated, and the proportions far more favourable than those of the generals of the whole Indian army, and the proportion by which that 24 is obtained is stated to be one to each artillery battalion. It is known that there were 24 brigades or battalions of the Indian artillery on the 1st of January 1861, but I am not aware that the generals were fixed on this process, and therefore I used the expression "distinctly," because I think that is to be seen from the common and ordinary reading which one would give to that portion of the regulation, that the artillery are then stated to have 24 generals and to obtain two more on separation.

14. (Major-Gen. Browne.) Referring to previous statements, from the 17th of February 1861 the Indian artillery had been amalgamated with the Royal artillery, do you consider, setting aside all consideration of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the separate allotment for the Indian ordnance, that the colonels promoted on and after that date could continue to be borne upon the general list of the Indian army, to which they no longer belong?

A First of all I deny that the Indian and Royal artilleries have been amalgamated in the sense in which it is implied, that both corps have been united together on fair and equal terms. I may state this as no new opinion, because it is one that was expressed in 1861. In that year General Sir William Coghlan, having come to Calcutta on a special mission to the Viceroy, was selected for a Commission which Lord Canning assembled at Calcutta, to report on the arrangements necessary for carrying out the amalgamation of the Indian army with Her Majesty's forces in accordance with the Royal warrant and orders conveyed in despatches dated 18th January 1861 of Her Majesty's government. To that Commission I was also appointed, and amongst the various other difficulties which were then foreseen General Coghlan pointed out that the amalgamation of the Indian artilleries, although spoken of, was very far from being possible under the orders which had been received, and he then foresaw, and foreseeing it prepared a minute in which he strongly advised that the amalgamation should be really and effectually carried out, and that the two corps, the old Royal artillery and the Indian artillery, should be effectually amalgamated, and that any measure which stopped short of that great result would end in failure and disappointment to the government. I concurred in the minute of Sir William Coghlan, and signed it, and therefore I do not admit that amalgamation has been carried out. I may mention that that recorded minute did form a part of the proceedings of the Calcutta Special Commission. I would wish to lay before the Commission as a very valuable document in connexion with my statements here; the extracts from the draft reports of the Calcutta Commission on the artillery organization, which I have added (Vide Addend. Nos. I. and II.) to my statements, and these documents fully bear me out therefore in not admitting in its full force the word "amalgamation."

As to the question, I reply that I see at the present moment, so far as the immediate question is concerned, that, for five years until now, the Indian artillery and engineer officers have been kept on the Indian list of generals without any inconvenience, as far as I am aware, and, until the whole of the colonels with rank before 1861 are promoted to be generals, they must be kept on that list, and probably for three or four years more. I do not myself see, therefore, what difficulty there is in keeping the artillery officers on one list like the Indian army, seeing that there are four other lists of generals in the British service which are separately kept. The more important bearing of this question is the effect which the separation will have on the Indian artillery colonels promoted on or after the 18th of February 1861. It is as respects those officers that I advocate mainly their retention on the general list of the Indian army; but I have no hesitation in saying that if any measure can be contrived by which those old artillery officers who were promoted to be colonels only in 1861 can obtain their rank of general officer on an equality with the infantry and cavalry officers, and if any military measure of the slightest importance be dependent on the separation, but which I cannot perceive, then there is no reason why the lists should not be separated; it is simply in respect to the claims which all the officers of the Indian army have established under the regulations of 1854 to succeed to the grade of general officers that I advocate the continuance of that system unless a more favourable one for them can be found; so as to effectually bar complaints as to loss of rank which must arise and embarrass the authorities in after years. It is quite clear that the senior artillery colonels of 1861 will be, as I have before stated, long in obtaining their general's grade if separated from the general list of the Indian army, and undoubtedly they will complain.

15. Failing any other arrangement, would you recommend a retention of Indian Ordnance officers upon the general Indian list until all the officers of the late Indian Artillery and Engineers respectively shall have risen to the rank of major-general?

A. Yes; and the effect of my suggestion of keeping the artillery and engineer officers on the Indian list, after the promotion of those colonels of 1860, virtually abolishes the intermediate stage of the separate gradation of 26 artillery generals.

The last stage as stated in the regulations of June 1864, provide for the artillery officers rise to the general's grade in succession on the Indian list until the whole of the artillery and engineer officers of the Indian army had been promoted to the rank of general officers, when the amalgamation of the lists of 26 and 32 generals for the Indian and Royal Artillery takes place, as provided for in 4th paragraph of the 1864 regulations.

It is a long time to look forward to, when the three Indian artilleries will be entirely exhausted, probably not under 35 years, and in that time the Indian artillery will so dwindle down, consequent upon no appointments being made to the bottom of the list, that it will appear in a very short time to be an absurd arrangement—to have probably 100 officers remaining in the Indian Artillery, all looking to the promotion which 26 general officers will give. I think, speaking from past experience, seeing the bad effect of all these kinds of partial amalgamations, that the separation of 26 generals from the Indian list to provide for the Indian artillery officers is not advisable.

I may partly illustrate my meaning as to the question of amalgamating regiments, and still keeping the rise of officers to regimental rank on different lines, by referring to the case of the European regiments of India. In 1824 the European infantry of the Indian army were formed into six regiments, and in 1829 they were amalgamated by being formed into three regiments, but when they were amalgamated the officers continued to rise separately in their original cadres, exactly as in the case of the Indian and Royal Artillery, but in a few years other orders became necessary, owing to the serious difficulties from the strange changes in rank amongst the officers of the same regiment, so as to ensure the working of those regiments being carried on in order to diminish the rivalry and jealousies which existed consequent upon one regiment having officers serving together rising by gradations in different lines, one being senior one day and one junior another day.

That is one of the difficulties which General Sir William Coghlan pointed out in 1861 in a minute, to the effect that with the exhaustive system going on in the Indian Artillery, the public service could not in a short

time be possibly conducted, consequent on the officers of the regiment of Royal Artillery serving in the same battery, as they are now doing, with officers of the regiments of the Indian Artillery, being at present very unequal in promotion, and rising in separate lines.

I hope, therefore, that this Commission will consider the serious effect which the present partial system of amalgamation will have upon the public service. I think there are difficulties now springing out of the very brevet rank which has lately been given, which will cause a further separation of interests and feelings between the Indian Artillery officers and the old Royal Artillery officers, exceedingly detrimental to the military service. I do not believe that the ablest general existing could possibly prevent those collisions, those heartburnings, and those jealousies, which I look upon to be fatal to an army, and which I believe to be inevitable from the partial system of amalgamation combined with brevet rank as now existing in the two Artilleries.

16. (Sir W. M. Coghlan) You think then that to regulate promotion fairly, as well as for other reasons, a thorough incorporation of the British and Indian corps of artillery and engineers is desirable?

A. Yes; I think that any measures which can be contrived to effect a thorough incorporation of the two corps, would be infinitely preferable to allowing the consequences which I fear cannot but result from the present separation of interests, antagonistic in a high degree to those good feelings which should exist between officers of the same regiment; but then it must be a thorough incorporation, not a partial one. It must not be one which will place the officers of one service in a degrading and inferior position to the officers of another service. A fair and just incorporation of the officers of the two services would, I think, be a great benefit to the public interests, and as it must eventually, I think, be carried out, I advise its early adoption before great differences really arise.

17. (Major-Gen Russell.) Would that thorough incorporation remove those difficulties which you state are springing out of the recent brevet for length of service of June 1864, as regards the artillery?

A. Yes; I think that many—indeed most of the evils—which I fear will arise, would be prevented by the incorporation to which I allude; the public service would be essentially benefited, in my opinion, by the officers when working together, having a common object. The incorporation might be so liberally effected as to mitigate, if not entirely do away with, all individual sufferings which officers may be likely to sustain by this incorporation. I think that even as a question of mere money, the Government would be wise in not looking to it as a money question at all, the one under consideration is purely a military question, and the question should be decided for military reasons; it is not a question of finance.

18. What are those difficulties which you stated are springing up?

A. I refer to the longer service of the Indian Artillery officers, in comparison with the service of the old Royal Artillery officers, with less favourable chances of rise; you will have a larger proportion of Indian artillery officers, holding brevet rank, considerably superior to that of their regimental rank. Then, as to the regimental rank of the two services, the old Royal Artillery and the Indian Artillery, the former will have the superiority, and the latter the inferiority; the brevet ranks of the Indian Artillery officers being far more extensive than those of the old Royal Artillery officers, will also mark more decidedly their inferior regimental rise.

19. Will not that brevet rank only affect them on general duties?

A. The decision of that question turns upon whether the amalgamation of the two artilleries has been so carried out that they are considered now as one entire regiment, but I cannot think, judging from the Indian experience derived from amalgamating the European regiments of India, that good can result from having officers serving in one battery or brigade, with promotion depending on two distinct lines; a sound regimental organization is essentially based on a regular and uniform gradation in rank from the top to the bottom.

20. Are not all the brigades and batteries numbered and lettered in succession as one entire regiment;

APPENDIX B
No. 3.

are not all the men enlisted on the same form of attestation, and liable to be transferred without bounty from any one battery to another ?

A. I am very happy to say that, by the measures adopted in Calcutta by the government of Lord Canning, the amalgamation or incorporation of the non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the two armies may be considered thorough. Measures were then taken by which all distinctions as to terms of enlistment between the English soldier of the Indian service and those of Her Majesty's proper British service were entirely put an end to by 17,600 out of 18,000 European soldiers then belonging to the Indian Army, being induced by a fair, but liberal bounty to be re-attested upon the same terms as the non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the Infantry, Cavalry, and Royal Artillery. That measure of incorporation was therefore thoroughly effectual, so far as the men are concerned; but the measures adopted for the incorporation of the officers have not been thorough, and have not been effectual, and never will be effectual until such time as the amalgamation is carried out upon those terms which will secure a community of interests between the officers of the old Royal Artillery and those of the Indian Artillery.

I may also point out that the incorporation as to the number of brigades, battalions, and batteries is not effectual, and never has been effectual. The Indian artillery brigades and battalions, of much older date than those of the old Royal Artillery, were, upon the same principle of an equal amalgamation, numbered with a higher number than the younger battalions and brigades of the old Royal Artillery, and immediately that the Government required reductions in strength to take place, although the Indian batteries had been in existence for 40 years and upwards, they are forthwith broken up, and younger batteries of the old Royal Artillery, which had not been in existence for eight years, are preserved instead.

Nay more, I have referred to the army estimates laid before Parliament, one of the most important of all official documents, and I see that in the army estimates for 1862-63, the artillery brigades of India are, for the first time shown along with those of the old Royal Artillery. The estimate at page 56 of that year shows the old Royal artillery horse brigade as formed into one brigade, and is designated as the 1st brigade, then follow the four Indian horse artillery brigades after the 1st, and numbered from 2 to 5. The like arrangement will be seen to exist at page 116 of the army estimates for 1863-64. But at page 114 of the estimates for 1864-65, a change has taken place, the 1st or old Royal Artillery horse brigade is divided into two brigades, and the new brigade so formed is placed after the four Indian horse brigades, and numbered as the 6th brigade. But on examining this year's estimates, 1865-66, it will be seen that (at page 116) an altered arrangement has taken place, the former year's 6th horse brigade is now placed above the four Indian horse brigades, and stands as the second on the list, being designated by the letter B, and the Indian horse brigade, which was designated by the number 2, is now designated by the letter C, the third letter of the alphabet, therefore for one year the new horse brigade appears placed below the four Indian horse brigades, but in this year's army estimates the two, old and new horse brigades of Royal Artillery, are placed above the four Indian horse brigades and lettered A and B, and the four others, C to F, giving the last-formed brigade the priority over the four old horse brigades of India. It may be a small matter, but the mere transposition is an indication of superiority and inferiority. I therefore maintain that although the non-commissioned officers and men had, by the wise measure of 1861, been thoroughly incorporated, yet the measures for the numbering of the brigades and batteries, and also for the thorough incorporation of the officers, were not, in my opinion, carried out in such an effectual manner as to ensure that entire harmony in the military system which the more complete measures as regards the soldiers have effected.

I may also allude to advantages enjoyed by the old Royal Artillery officers, but not allowed to the Indian officers, such as the rewards for distinguished services, and I give in the following table showing the names of officers of the old Royal Artillery who have enjoyed these rewards since the amalgamation:—

	According to Hart's Annual Army List for				
	1861.	1862.	1863.	1864.	1865.
Gen. J. W. Tobin -	1	1	1	0	0
" T. J. Forbes -	0	0	0	1	1
" Sir H. D. Ross -	1	1	1	1	1
" Sir R. Gardiner -	1	1	1	1	0
" Robert Douglas -	1	1	1	1	1
Lieut.-Gen. A. C. Mercer	1	1	1	0	0
Mjr.-Gen H. W. Gordon -	1	1	1	0	0
" " W. Brereton -	1	1	1	1	0
" " J. E. Dupuis -	1	1	1	1	1
" " Sir R. J. Dacres -	1	1	1	1	0
" " W. Bell -	1	1	1	1	1
" " P. V. England -	1	1	1	1	1
" " R. Hardinge -	1	1	1	1	0
" " T. G. Higgins -	1	1	1	1	1
" " W. C. Anderson -	1	1	1	1	1
" " Imgobby -	0	0	0	1	1
" " H. Pester -	0	0	0	0	1
" " Bloomfield -	0	0	0	0	1
Colonel C. Dickson -	1	1	1	1	1
Lieut.-Colonel A. A. Dyce -	1	1	1	1	1
Total - - -	16	16	16	15	13

The senior artillery officer's pay of 456*l.* was granted in 1863 to General Forbes, for being the senior artillery officer, and other marks of distinction were accorded to the old and not to the new Royal Artillery officers.

This special allowance of artillery pay is, I think, a fair illustration of the distinction still kept up between the officers of the regiment of Royal Artillery and those of the Indian Artillery. General Thomas John Forbes is entered in page 74 of the army estimates for 1864-65 to receive, from 1863, as senior officer of artillery, the sum of 456*l.* 5*s.* Now this grant dated from the previous year, immediately after General Tobin's death, but as General Forbes entered the artillery in 1795, and General Ahmuty entered the Bengal Artillery in 1790, this officer was, if the artillery be an amalgamated regiment, the senior artillery officer; he was alive up to 13th January 1864, and consequently senior officer of artillery both before and after the grant to General Forbes. But further, the date of General Forbes' rank as full general being 16th January 1859, and that of General Ahmuty 15th September 1855, the latter is senior as general as well as an artillery officer. Before General Forbes obtained the allowance, General Tobin, of the Royal Artillery, enjoyed it, but General Ahmuty was also senior as an artillery officer to General Tobin, who only entered the artillery in 1794, although as a full general he was a year senior to General Ahmuty in this one rank. The grant was made to General Tobin in the army estimates of 1860-61, and he obtained it the year before the amalgamation of the Artillery, but General Forbes obtained it two years after the union of the two Corps. I do not desire to see any advantage withdrawn from the old Royal Artillery, for they are few, only that whilst amalgamation and assimilation have been extended to the Indian artillery, equalization has not been made by creating advantages for the Indian Artillery officers corresponding with those now named.

21. (*Sir E. Napier.*) The particular point upon which we have to report is, whether the establishment of a separate list for the Indian Ordnance as ordered by the revised warrant of 1864 has proved an effectual remedy for the grievance noticed by the Commission of 1863 as caused by the warrant of 1862, under which the officers of the Indian Ordnance Corps, being colonels on and after the 17th February 1861, were to rise upon the amalgamated list, with the Royal Artillery. Will you state your opinion distinctly upon this particular point ?

A. The answer to that question is a mere calculation as to the probabilities of a rise on the respective lists. Assuming that when the colonels, prior to the 17th February 1861, had become general officers, then, whether the senior colonels of the Indian army, and the four seniors are artillery officers, would have the better chance of the general's grade from 26 generals instead of from a list of 207 generals.

22. Will you be good enough first to state distinctly whether you have formed any opinion as to whether

it is a compensation or not. After that we shall be happy to receive any explanation you may wish to offer?

A. But it is not easy to give specific replies to indeterminate problems. I would answer the question in this way, that I would much rather have seen the amalgamated Royal Artillery list of 58 generals than the present separate list of 26 generals for the Indian Artillery. I state this, however, for reasons entirely different from the relative chances of promotion which the amalgamated list of 58 or the separate list of 26 would give to the Indian Artillery officers. I may add, that to draw any approximate contrast as to the chance of promotion which they will have under the new arrangement of being upon the list in succession to 26 general officers is an impossibility, the calculation is based on too small a number, and the conditions as to age, service, &c. in eight years, are unknown quantities. I believe that by putting the Indian Artillery colonels of date on or since the 18th February 1861 in the 58 or amalgamated list with the colonels of the old Royal Artillery, they, on an average of future years, but far beyond, a good influence being in operation, on the promotion of the present few seniors, would perhaps have the better chance of advancement amongst 58 general officers, which the amalgamated list would then have contained, than upon the small list of 26 generals. But this great advantage would I think have been gained by the Indian Artillery officers, that the mere fact of putting the present senior officers of the Indian Artillery of 45 years' service, below a colonel of Royal Artillery, of probably 25 years' service, would have had such a startling effect upon the minds of the authorities that remedial measures would at once have been resorted to, to prevent such a glaring disparity of service existing between officers supposed to belong to the same regiment. It is for that reason I think that neither list should be adopted, and that until measures can be devised for thoroughly incorporating the Indian and Royal Artillery officers, the Indian Artillery colonels should remain on the Indian general list in preference to either measure.

23. Upon what Indian List?

A. The list of 220 generals.

24. (*Major-Gen. Russell.*) Regarding the amalgamation of the Ordnance branches of India with those of the British service, the correctness of which term you dispute, and further state that what has been done was not done on fair and equitable terms, and likewise that many captains of the Indian service are of much longer total army service as compared with those of similar rank in the British service; is it not the case that a large number of those officers benefited greatly by the augmentation or change of rank which was permitted to take effect in those services before the amalgamation?

A. There can be no doubt as to the absolute fact, that consequent on the changes in the Artillery and Engineers of India in August 1858, and on the 18th February 1861, many officers of the Indian Artilleries and Engineers did obtain advancement in military rank and did receive increased pay and allowances from that rank. But it is also equally certain that a number of the old officers of the Indian Artillery did sustain a great deprivation of hope of advantages which the former system had offered, and that by the change in the Indian Artillery organization to that of the Royal Artillery, the chance of rise is, by the altered numbers in grades, likely to ensure more rapid promotion to junior grades than formerly, yet as those higher up in the corps have not had the benefits in their youth of that favourable chance, and have now been injured in their old age in their chance of rise to the colonel's allowances, and by the loss of the bonus payments which the old system allowed of, I think that some consideration is due to their case. As far as the public service is concerned, I admit that a large expense was apparently incurred in the pay and allowances of the Indian Artilleries and Engineers by increased rank given, but I equally know that there were other advantages, in the form of allowances for commands and staff appointments, which, by the custom and practice of the service, did more or less compensate for the diminished pay with the former lower rank, and that part of these advantages, on the promotion being given, were taken away from the officers. Upon the whole, when I was at the head of the Military Finance Department of India, I was, owing to the very different organization of the artillery of India, under some doubt upon the subject of relative gain or loss in a money point of view on the whole Artillery, but I believe that the Government outlay on account of the organized artillery is, upon the whole service, now less relatively for the service than it was before the

amalgamation took place. I allow however that owing to the far greater charge incurred for increased strength of men and officers with batteries, substituting Europeans for natives, and a variety of other new measures which the assimilation of the Indian with the Royal Artillery services has constrained Government to adopt, the total expenditure for the artillery service is larger, though the money advantages enjoyed by the officers may be lessened.

25. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan.*) Are there any further observations which you are desirous of submitting to the Commission with reference to the subject under inquiry?

A. Yes. With reference to a portion of the written statement which I have given in, and which the Commission have suggested to me to consider, I hope I may be allowed to explain that it appears to me, with reference to that part which relates to the promotion on the cadres of native regiments in lieu of the colonels of regiments transferred from the Indian army to the 12 new line regiments of the British army, that whilst the Commission is quite correct in saying that promotions have been made in lieu of the 12 colonels, I think I am also correct in stating that those promotions were made from a wrong date. A careful perusal of paragraphs 45 and 46 of Lord Cranworth's Commission report shows that the views of that Commission refer to all officers of all ranks who went over to the British army with the 12 line regiments; that there is no distinction as to whether it was a colonel, a lieutenant-colonel, major, or captain, that the Secretary of State's despatch, paragraph 55, distinctly recognizes and accepts the finding which Lord Cranworth's Commission came to, and ordered that all officers on the cadres of native regiments who went over with the 12 line regiments should be removed from those cadres from the 18th February 1861. We all know perfectly well that those 12 regiments were not formed in India until long after the 18th February 1861, that, practically speaking, neither the Artillery nor the line regiments were, in an official sense, formed until the middle of 1862; that is to say, until Her Majesty commanded the Commander-in-Chief of Her forces to prepare the lists of officers for publication in the Gazette, which appeared in the London Gazette, bearing date July 1862, and yet all those officers, although only appearing in the British army with the date of rank from July 1862, are by the Secretary of State's despatch, paragraph 55, ordered to vacate their position in the Indian regimental cadres from the 18th of February 1861. It is quite true that the regimental colonels of the 12 regiments were appointed subsequently to the other officers in the month of September 1862, but that difference, as we all know, arose from the delay in fixing upon the officers who were to be appointed. I submit therefore that the 79th paragraph of the Secretary of State's despatch of 1864, wherein he orders promotions to be made in lieu of colonels, &c., but directs the succession to be made under the regulations contained in the despatch 320 of the 10th of August 1861, paragraphs 17 and 18, is at variance with his previous orders contained in paragraph 55, because, as ordered, those promotions are made 12 months after the 18th of February 1861, the date which he had in the 55th paragraph previously enjoined should be the date when officers joining the new regiments should give up their position in the old cadres.

Under the strictest interpretation, so as to limit the operation of the finding of Lord Cranworth's Commission to all officers only on the cadres of native regiments after joining the new regiments vacating their cadre position, that this limited finding entitles officers of the Indian army to those promotions on the 18th of February 1861, in lieu of seven of the 12 colonels who, in September 1862, were appointed to those new regiments; and that by the withholding of those promotions the finding of Lord Cranworth's Commission has not been effectually carried out.

I would go further than that, and specify that as the objections which are considered sufficient to bar promotions, in lieu of all officers who join the new regiments, from whatever cadres they come, whether from the old European or the native regiments, do not apply in the case of colonels and lieutenant-colonels, for the promotions are made in general succession throughout the whole army; and therefore as the unreasonable amount of promotion which any one regiment would obtain is nullified at once by that general scheme of promotion, it appears to me that not only all the 12 colonels ought therefore to be removed from the Indian army from the 18th of February 1861, but all other

APPENDIX B.

No. 3.

grades of all cadres and promotions made in the above way followed for the colonels.

26. You have stated that seven out of the 12 colonels transferred to new line regiments came from the native army, and that the native army has a claim to their vacancies?

A. Yes.

27. Were not those officers replaced by others who had previously occupied a position in the new line regiments?

A. The original principle was this, that inasmuch as there were 9 old and 3 new infantry European regiments of the Indian army, and five European cavalry regiments, making a total of 17 then under the regulations as issued, the whole of the officers belonging to 11 of those 17 regiments could have gone over to the new line regiments, if they had so wished, bodily with the 11 regiments to the British army. That every officer of them did not go over we all know; the orders expressly excluded, one regiment of European cavalry from being officered by the Bengal cavalry, and that the native cavalry of Madras and Bombay should supply officers to fill up that third European regiment of cavalry. The officers who went over from the 11 European regiments of cavalry and infantry were not struck off but retained upon the cadres of their former regiments; a very large portion of the numbers who went over to the new line regiments did belong to the old European regiments of India, but their original cadres remain to this day. A considerable number however were drafted from the cadres of native regiments, and those who joined the 12 European regiments were not struck off until the memorials were made against the retention of the names of those officers on the cadres of their regiments, and the Report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, paragraphs 45 and 46, recorded that the retention of the names of the officers who had joined the new line regiments from the cadres of the native regiments was at variance with the assurances which the Indian army had received. The Secretary of State consequently ordered that their removal from the cadres should have effect from the 18th of February 1861. The reason why Lord Cranworth's Commission did not also order the removal from the cadres of the old European regiments the names of those who joined the new regiments was simply owing to a misapprehension as to the amount of promotion that would be given to those regiments if the promotions were all given regimentally. A mode of filling up such vacancies was previously shown in the Report of Lord Hotham's Committee, which would have prevented such extensive regimental promotion being given to any one regiment, and with this facility existing for equalizing promotion throughout all grades, and as all vacancies in the grade of colonel must be filled up in this general succession, I therefore do not see any difference between the colonel of a regiment and the lieutenant-colonel, major, or captain of a corps, in that light I view them as a whole, and the general expression which was made use of by Lord Cranworth's Commission, "all officers," applies equally to the colonels as well as to the majors and subalterns.

28. (*Major-Gen. Russell*) Had a full colonel the option of joining the new line regiments?

A. I do not know that there was any positive exclusion, but I have heard by report that officers of this rank volunteered to be placed in the new European regiments.

29. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan*) Taking the Bombay army, is it not a fact that General Robertson, the colonel of the 1st Fusiliers, Major-General Parr, colonel of the 2nd, and General Forbes, colonel of the 3rd, were replaced by officers from native regiments, viz., Hale from the 22nd, Capon from the 23rd, and Wylie from the 12th Native Infantry?

A. That is exactly the case, but it is on that very ground that I say the officers who remained in the Indian army, are entitled to promotion in lieu of the colonels who went over to the British service. The idea is this, that 12 new regiments were formed for the British service, it may be allowed out of the 17 regiments of European cavalry and infantry existing in 1861 in the Indian army, and that as this measure left behind all the cadres of the Indian regiments with such officers as did not go over to the 12 new regiments, and as the whole of the cadres are still standing, the vacancies in all ranks occasioned by these going over to the new regiments ought to be filled up. The Horse Guards take this view, as may be seen from General Hall, of the Household Cavalry, suc-

ceeding General Pattle as colonel of one of the new cavalry regiments.

30. But was it not a mere exchange of three colonels, being general officers, from the native army, with three who were borne on the rolls of the European regiments, all of them being of the Indian service?

A. I have examined the India Office official lists of the military services of India since 1861, and I find that on 1st January 1861, the month before the change in system, the three European regiments of the Bombay army bore on their rolls, as colonels, the names of Hale, Parr, and Forbes; the names of the same officers appear as colonels of the three European regiments of Bombay on 1st January and 1st July 1862; but by the official list of 1st January 1863, Col. Hale's name no longer appears on the rolls of any of the Bombay European regiments, this officer having been removed to the new line regiment, the 103rd; but the names of Colonels Parr and Forbes are left on the cadres of the 2nd and 3rd European regiments of Bombay; now here there was no replacing, before the supposed transfer of the regiments, by native infantry colonels for colonels of European regiments, for Colonels Capon and Wylie, who are now colonels of two of the new line regiments, were, as far as I can judge, removed direct from Bombay native infantry to the two new line regiments, and were never posted to the Bombay European regiments. Since the publication of the official list of July 1863, in this and in all the after lists, including those for July of each year, the names of the former colonels of the three cadres of the three Bombay European regiments are no longer found on their lists, for after Colonel Hale joined the new line regiment, Colonel Forbes I believe died, and was not replaced, and Colonel Parr was transferred as colonel of a native infantry regiment, and no officers of the rank of regimental colonel stand posted, but the names of officers of all other grades are, however, borne on these European cadres, this one rank of colonel being alone vacant. In Bengal the cadres of the three old European regiments show on the 1st January 1861, the names of two colonels, Roberts and Warren, for the 1st European regiment; Matthie for the 2nd, and Huyshe for the 3rd, as colonels for these three regiments; and by the rolls of 1st January 1865, the same names appear as colonels, excepting that of Roberts, who was appointed colonel of the 101st regiment, then leaving only one colonel on the cadres of the 1st Bengal Fusiliers, who with the two others still remain. The two colonels appointed to the two new line regiments were selected from the Bengal native infantry, and posted at once in the London Gazette, without being previously borne on the rolls of the Bengal European cadres. The Madras lists show the names of Colonels Steel and Laurie, Dyce and Whitlock, as the colonels of the Madras three European regiments on 1st January 1861; the same names appear on the lists on 1st January 1862, with the exception that Colonel Vivian's name replaces that of Colonel Steel on the 1st regiment of Madras Fusiliers; but in the lists of 1st January 1863, and following years, there is only one colonel, Hitchins, on the cadre of the 1st European Madras Infantry, the three other names disappeared from these European cadres, consequent on their appointment to the new regiments. Colonel Laurie died, and Colonel Hitchins was appointed to the cadre of the Fusiliers from a native regiment after the other colonels were posted to the new line regiments. These cases show clearly that uniformity of action has not existed in disposing of the vacancies in the colonelcies. In Bengal the names and grades of three of the colonels have remained on the European regiment cadres as before the changes, one of the four colonels was posted to one of the new regiments; Madras has appointed one colonel from the native cadres to the 1st European regiment since the new line regiments were formed, and thereby replaced one of the three colonels posted to the new line regiments; and Bombay has removed one colonel from the cadre of one of the regiments of European cadres, for I believe one died; on the whole I find that at least four colonels of native infantry were posted direct to new line regiments from native infantry cadres.

31. May it not be put thus? Three regiments of European infantry were removed from and lost to the Bombay army; the men were transferred to the British line; the officers remained some time longer, and when the arrangement for their transfer was complete, three colonels being general officers who had thus become supernumerary, followed the regiments and were struck off the rolls of the Indian army?

A. The conditions on which this question rests are such that I do not think that I could give a sufficient reply without previously showing that I look at the

arrangements actually made in a way differing from that set forth in the question, and therefore I hope the Royal Commission will allow me to state that by a reference to the January 1861 despatches of the Secretary of State, also to the reports of the Calcutta Amalgamation Commissioners, by whom the General Order of 10th April 1861, No. 332, was compiled and submitted to the Viceroy and Governor General of India in Council for approval, and to the General Order itself, it will be seen that the European soldiers of the 17 regiments of the Indian military forces were induced by a bounty to enlist into Her Majesty's British service, and were re-attested as soldiers, in fact re-enlisted, and were then formed into 12 new regiments, which Her Majesty raised and added to the regular home army; the great success which attended this one portion of the measure connected with the amalgamation scheme, as regards the soldiers, whereby the old European regiments of India were left without any men, so to say, is strongly calculated to mislead the judgment, by leading the mind to consider that as a very important portion of the regiments, the soldiers, appeared to go over bodily, so to speak, to the 12 new line regiments, that the whole of the old European regiments of India also went over, as completely formed and regular regiments formerly transferred their services from the German States to England.

In considering the circumstances connected with the 1861 changes, it is of great assistance for forming a right judgment to keep the question connected with the soldiers distinct from that affecting the officers. The Act of Parliament of 1860, on which this change was based, only extended to Government the power to discontinue recruiting European soldiers for the rolls of the Indian forces, and did not by its provisions affect the organization of that army; indeed the guarantee added to the Act did, as respects the officers, more strongly maintain the Indian organization, and the avowals in Parliament fully bear out this view.

The soldiers' question was, however, fully, completely, and successfully settled by the payment of the liberal bounty which the Government of India offered to all the European soldiers of the Indian forces, in order to change their enlistment from that of India to the general one of the British army. If the soldiers had not agreed to be re-attested on re-enlistment for the British service, arrangements were made in the despatches of the Secretary of State for maintaining them in local Indian regiments until they died out or their periods of service expired; but the success of the bounty, inducing 17,600 out of 18,000 to accept the new service, rendered this formation unnecessary; the report of the Calcutta Commission, anticipating this great success, is in existence and can be referred to; that Commission advised the Governor-General to provide in the General Order for the men at once to enlist into particular and chosen regiments, according to the practice of Her Majesty's service, instead of being enlisted for general service, as in the Indian army, also advised the Viceroy not to form any local regiments until failure in inducing the men to re-enlist for the British service was proved; this failure was, however, not expected by the Commission. Indeed no one can, as I believe, fail to take the view I entertain and endeavour to convey to the present Commission, after perusing the reports of the Calcutta Commission, which clearly explains the exact bearing of all the intentions of the Government, as set forth in official documents of very difficult construction.

An examination of the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission will also bear me out in the view I have taken, that there were no regiments, formed and organized as regular military bodies, transferred from the Indian forces to the British army; that Commission mentions additions of 12 regiments to the British army as entirely new regiments, and in respect to the filling up of vacancies in cadres of native regiments occasioned by officers joining the 12 new regiments, the report spoke of the vacancies as of the same character as those which would have been occasioned if augmentation had been made of new regiments to the Indian army. In principle this Commission also recognized the vacancies in the cadres of the European regiments, by officers joining the new line regiments, as like in character to those in the native cadres by officers joining the new line regiments, but made an objection to these being filled up, for a reason which would not, I hope, have been put forward had the Commission been informed of the ease with which it could be set aside.

The despatches of January and General Order of April 1861 provided however for the retention of the cadres of the European regiments on the rolls of the

Indian military forces exactly as the officers stood after the withdrawal of the men and there the cadres exist to this day, not appearing as transferred to the British army, and all vacancies occurring from deaths of officers who have joined the new regiments are filled up exactly as if the officers had not joined the new line regiments.

The whole theory on which the changes of 1861 were based, rested, according to my view, on the Indian army remaining organized, as regards officers, as before; if the soldiers had not been induced to enlist into the British service by the fair bounty paid, the men and officers would for a time have continued as formed bodies in regiments, for all that the 1860 Act of Parliament authorized was, that no more recruits were to be raised in England to replace the men then serving in India; all changes of every kind which would benefit or injure the officers were by the orders of the Secretary of State as far as practicable discouraged, even the vacancies made in cadres by officers joining the new line regiments and new Staff Corps, and obtaining new commissions, were by the Secretary of State's despatches ordered not to be filled up; the forms of the rolls of officers, as given in his despatches, exemplified the position of officers of the cadres of European regiments joining these new regiments as exactly similar to the position of officers joining the new regiments from the cadres of native regiments, and showed that all officers of all regiments remained on the cadre rolls after the 12 new line regiments were raised. This principle was one that was new in military organization, if it could have been practically applied it might have prevented much correspondence, but as it failed from causes which are foreign to this question, I need not detail these causes.

I must ask the Commissioners to bear in mind that regimental promotion was intended to flow on in all the cadres as before 1861, without interruption; the Secretary of State, though well aware that some officers would in all probability join the new line regiments, yet abstained from declaring officers supernumerary in any grade, still there was one exception in one grade, and the only supernumeraries in the Indian armies were declared to be in the grade of colonel, this rank was declared to have supernumeraries only in the artillery of India and in the Bengal infantry and cavalry. There were no supernumeraries in either the infantry or cavalry of the armies of Madras and Bombay.

The Commissioners will doubtless see that in this instance the regular and certain flow of promotion in all the cadres was materially interfered with, by a reduction being ordered in the highest regimental rank, and necessarily affecting all below on the cadres; but the basis on which supernumeraries were declared to exist in the rank of colonel of Bengal infantry and cavalry, and in the three regiments of Indian artillery, rests on two different conditions, one that as regards the colonels of infantry and cavalry of Bengal the regiments of native troops were reduced in number and strength, and as the Secretary of State has recently again stated, the off-reckonings or colonel's allowances were necessarily, in his opinion, diminished; but it is difficult to realize this, as there are at present more regiments of native infantry and cavalry than there were regiments of regular native troops before 1861; whereas as respects the artillery the strength in men was increased, and necessarily the means of providing the colonels with allowances were increased, and yet the colonels of both branches were declared to be supernumerary, and were ordered to be reduced; the reduction being ordered exactly in the same form, in order to reduce the supernumeraries in the Indian artillery and Bengal infantry and cavalry, the Secretary of State ordered that three promotions in four deaths of colonels should alone be filled up, and for all regiments, exactly in the same proportion, so that the small regiments of Bombay Artillery had reductions in the fourth vacancy, which will affect the fourth officer from the top, whereas the bad effect on the Bengal infantry would have relatively fallen on the 25th officer from the top, and then only for a very limited time, I may also mention that the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission, in their report to Government on the draft order of April 1861, advisedly stated that the 18th February 1861 should be the date from which the colonels' casualties should lapse and this date they, after careful consideration, urged on Government to adopt as the date for all changes. The advice was not fully carried out in England.

I therefore do submit that as the Secretary of State, when sending out the 1861 despatches, knew that additional line regiments were to be formed for the British

APPENDIX B.
No. 3.

army, did not declare that either in Bombay or Madras there were any supernumerary colonels, consequent on any supposed transfer of regiments from India to England, that reductions in the number of colonels of Bengal cavalry and infantry were ordered merely because the native troops were reduced, I think that I establish the accuracy of the point I urge, that the cadres in all ranks were to be kept complete, subject only to the diminution as ordered, and these reductions were not made, as the question assumes, by transfers of colonels to the new line regiments.

The questions connected with filling up of the colonelcies in these cadres has further been complicated by alterations in the Secretary of State's original scheme, as at first set forth in his January 1861 despatches, from the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission, advising Her Majesty that that scheme was not based on the assurances given to the officers. As previously stated, no promotions from any cause whatever, arising directly out of the changes, excepting those of the character previously recognized, such as deaths and actual retirements, were even contemplated to be made in the cadres of any regiments when the January despatches of 1861 were penned; but on the report of Lord Cranworth's Commission appearing, the vacancies in regiments by officers going to the 12 new regiments were declared to be of the character by which officers under the rules of the Indian army invariably attained promotion; and though they restricted the advice to allow this promotion only to the native cadres, yet the Commission only excluded the European cadres, on a plea which would not, I think, have been put forward had its ungrounded nature been made clear to the former Commission. The Secretary of State accepted this finding, and in his despatch of 1864 ordered it to be carried out with retrospective effect from the 18th February 1861. Now I view this alteration as one which, properly speaking, belonged to

the original scheme of the Secretary of State, and I put myself in this position, that as this was part of the measure which the Secretary of State, if he had foreseen the result of the inquiry, would have introduced into his despatches of the 18th January 1861; then if this question had been raised in the Calcutta Amalgamation Commission, as to how the arrangement ought to be carried out, I do believe that, viewing the action of that Commission, the Commissioners would have advised Government to apply it in its unrestricted meaning to all the regimental ranks, by giving promotion in lieu of all ranks joining the new regiments, whether colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, or subalterns.

From this detail I hope it will be apparent that I cannot avoid coming to this conclusion, and expressing the strong conviction, that promotions in lieu of the colonels, field officers, and other grades who joined the new regiments ought to take place throughout the Indian army from the date the Secretary of State, in the 54th para. of his despatch of 1864, ordered, viz., 18th February 1861.

I do not here enter into the question as to whether the arrangement which I think the officers have a just right to expect in regard to the promotions is the best mode of settling all the complications of the past few years; I believe they could nearly all be settled by well-devised measures, and for the sake of the great public and private interests involved in the existing serious differences, it is to be earnestly hoped that the most effectual measures will be resorted to, and supported by all statesmen of both political parties. I have only now to reply to the questions how rules may be viewed in their action on the service generally and on individuals of the service, which the Government have from time to time issued; and as these bear on the interests of the officers it is to be hoped that the case of servants in a distant land may be favourably considered.

No. 4.

OBSERVATIONS and EVIDENCE by COLONEL M'GOUN, Comptroller of Military Finance, Madras Army.

POINT 3.

The filling up of only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Lieutenant-Colonels upon the increased rates of pensions.

I am not aware of the exact nature of the grievance in this matter; nor do I understand how loss could have accrued to any particular regiment under the general arrangement; the whole army gained two or three years' line promotion; and as far as I understand the question, there is no substantial ground for grievance in the matter.

POINT 4.

Rule under which Lieutenant-Colonels are to become Colonels and to be entitled to Colonels' allowance after holding the rank of Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel for 12 years.

There are now two ways of obtaining these allowances—one by promotion and the other by service in the substantive rank of lieutenant-colonel.

The former mode has no doubt been considerably retarded by the reduction in the number of such allowances and by allowing the names of officers to be retained on the rolls after they have retired from the service. The former was a necessary consequence of a reduction in the number of regiments, and no one would gainsay the prerogative in such a matter. The latter may be dubious where promotion was obtainable solely by death vacancies or retirements; but if any equitable substitute is granted by a length of service qualification, there can be no ground for complaint. The period of 12 years would seem excessive, but there must be ample available data for fixing the correct period, and therefore it is not necessary to pursue the subject further.

It would appear, from the Army List of the 1st January 1865, that there are only now 12 officers for the Madras Native Infantry who were substantive lieutenant-colonels at the period of the amalgamation; 7 of these have a service of 40 years and upwards; a great number will have completed 50 years' service before they are entitled to their Colonel's allowances; and some of them will have reached nearly the age of three score years and ten.

POINT 5.

Supersession of Regimental Officers by promotions of Officers under the Staff Corps Rules.

Prior to the amalgamation, promotion went on in the Indian army *regimentally* up to the rank of lieutenant-

colonel. There was much difference in the rate of promotion in different regiments.

The Staff Corps Warrant introduced a new principle, viz., length of service; but the periods under this system were much shorter than the averages have been under this regimental seniority system, and the consequence was that the local officers were superseded by their brother officers who had entered the staff corps. This was considered by the Royal Commission a breach of the Parliamentary guarantee. The remedy applied was the grant of corresponding brevet rank to the local officers, according to the scale in the margin, and putting them on a footing of equality as regards rank with the Staff Corps officers.

As regards the Staff Corps the remedy was complete; but the remedy brought into operation a new element; it promoted the *unlucky* men under the old system over the *fortunates*, while it put both on an equality with the Staff Corps officers who were in the enjoyment of superior advantages to either.

The question arises, how can all this be rectified? Assuming that brevet rank is conferred on all according to length of service, and that the commissions granted under that rule are in all respects equal, and equally effectual as regards duty and command, I do not see how a nearer approach to a satisfactory adjustment could have been arrived at than by the grant of brevet rank to all indiscriminately.

The local officer who was fortunate under the *old* rules is now worse off under the *new* as regards his obtaining his colonel's rank and colonel's allowances; but in the gradation list he will stand lower than he would have done; and if superior commands are conferred under this list, his position is worse than it would have been; but this is a remote contingency, and can hardly be considered a substantial grievance with the army generally.

Under all the circumstances of the case, I do not see that more could have been done to remedy the evil in this case than the grant of brevet rank to all. I can suggest no other or better remedy.

THOS. M'GOUN,
Colonel, H.M.'s Madras Forces.
London, 24th July 1865.

No. 4.

After 12 years from date of first com- mission -	} Captain.
After 20 years -	
„ 26 years -	

brevet rank to the local officers, according to the scale in the margin, and putting them on a footing of equality as regards rank with the

Staff Corps officers.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before the COMMISSIONERS.

APPENDIX B.

No. 4.

Colonel THOMAS M'GOUN examined.

1. (*President.*) Will you have the goodness to read that paper (*paper A. appended*) and give the Commissioners any observations that you may have to make upon it?

Answer. I do not think that the question can be answered without illustrations of these instances of supersession being given; I am not acquainted with the cases alluded to.

2. Without naming anybody, there are many captains of regiments over whom junior captains have gone into the Staff Corps with the rank of major, and they have complained of that as a supersession?

A. Yes; that was the original grievance.

3. That is still the complaint made by some of the officers of the Staff Corps, that they have been superseded by regimental officers formerly their juniors?

A. That about their being superseded by their juniors, I do not understand.

4. Complaints are made that the brevet rank given for length of service to remedy supersession has caused additional supersession. Is that so, and can you suggest any remedy?

A. Assuming length of service to be the mode of obtaining promotion, and that it is made applicable to all ranks and all classes, I do not see how supersession can arise from the grant of brevet rank to all.

5. (*Maj.-Gen. Russell.*) But such has not been the rule?

A. I understand it to be the rule now. My remarks have reference to that rule, viz., promotion from length of service.

6. But the supersession has taken place?

A. Yes; supersession has arisen in consequence of the application to promotions obtained under a different principle, of this new principle, and in various ways; but I do not see any remedy for this short of undoing the principle of promotion arising from length of service.

7. (*President.*) Officers having brevet rank for field service complain that they have forfeited all advantage from their service in the field by this new rule. Can this be adjusted?

A. No doubt they have forfeited advantages obtained by such brevets, but I am unable to suggest any mode under which this can be remedied or adjusted under the new principle of promotion.

8. (*Maj.-Gen. Russell.*) Have not officers who got the line step under the old rules lost the advantage arising therefrom?

A. In some respects they have; but an officer is not further off his colonel's allowances nor further off the rank of lieutenant-colonel (if he is a major); he has lost in the gradation list in a great number of cases, inasmuch as he is further off the chance of succeeding to brigade or other higher commands than he would otherwise have been.

9. (*Sir R. Napier.*) The supersession of officers of the line local service by the extraordinary rank obtained in the Staff Corps was pronounced by a late Commission a breach of the guarantee. To remedy this brevet rank was given to all officers of the Indian service, whether Staff Corps or line. By this brevet, Staff Corps officers who had not before superseded local officers were made to supersede them by length of service; line local officers who had been juniors previous to the brevet superseded brother officers. If such cases of supersession are numerous, do you consider the brevet for length of service effectual and sufficient to remove the cause of complaint?

A. The new principle of promotion for length of service has no doubt affected the future prospects of many officers; but so long as that principle is to be the rule, I do not see how the grievance can be entirely removed—that is the present grievance of additional supersession. The remedy intended in the grant of brevet rank to all, did not, in my opinion, fully meet the case. Yet I do not see how more could have been done to remedy the evil in question so long as the existing rules remained in force.

10. To what existing rules do you allude?

A. I allude to the Staff Corps warrant.

11. (*Maj.-Gen. Eyre.*) In your opinion it was as much as could be done to remedy the evil.

A. Yes; so long as the Staff Corps rules are in existence.

12. What originally would have prevented the evil? or what organization would have prevented the disturbance as to the supersession complained of?

A. The first cause of grievance was the Staff Corps warrant, granting rank and additional pay to a certain

number of officers in supersession of the local officers. The continuance of the former organization.

13. Do you object to the staff corps principally?

A. Yes; because it introduced a new principle inapplicable to the original constitution of the army.

14. (*Maj.-Gen. Russell.*) Might not the Staff Corps have been formed without interfering with the original principle of promotion by seniority?

A. Yes. The departure from the regimental system of promotion to the system of promotion by length of service is one of the general causes of the difficulties, and was not necessary to the organization of Staff Corps.

15. Would those difficulties have been obviated had the vacancies in the various regiments caused by the transfer of officers to the Staff Corps been filled up in the way adopted in India when new regiments were raised?

A. They would to a certain extent, but I do not see the immediate connexion between the two points, although the one is probably involved in the other.

16. The connexion between the two is the retention of the names of the officers transferred to the Staff Corps on the cadres of the regiments, do you consider that a grievance caused by the formation of the Staff Corps?

A. It is one of the grievances.

17. Would not that grievance be remedied by removing those names, and by filling up the vacancies on the augmentation principle?

A. That part of the grievance would no doubt be remedied by such a measure.

18. Are you aware of any obstacle in the way of that being done?

A. No; it is a question of money.

19. (*Maj.-Gen. Browne.*) The former European regiments of the Company's service have been transferred to Her Majesty's line; the officers of those regiments formerly belonged to the Indian service, and may or may not, in the course of their own distinct service, now supersede their former brother officers in the Indian service. Would there be any kind of ground of grievance in that respect on the part of the Indian officers?

A. No; any more than in the case of the artillery or engineers; they are quite a distinct and a separate body.

20. Then recognizing the Staff Corps as a distinct regiment, organized upon its own distinct terms of service, and completely separated, therefore, for all time to come, from the local Indian service, supposing the officers from the Indian service who have been transferred to the Staff Corps to be entirely struck out of the old local service, would the officers of the local service have any reason to complain of supersession by them?

A. None.

21. (*Maj.-Gen. Eyre.*) By such arrangements, would there be any departure from the Parliamentary guarantee?

A. No; any more than there is in the case of the European regiments which have been transferred to the British army; there was no breach of guarantee in that transfer.

22. Having taken the statement, which has been given you to read, into consideration (*Paper B.*), are you of opinion, first supposing the promotions still due to be allowed, the officers have sustained any loss of what they were entitled to claim?

A. No, I look upon the vacancies which caused these promotions as simply the result of a boon by the Government to the army at large, and that it conferred no obligation on the Government to give more than was required for the purpose for which it was originally granted. The army had no claim to more, or any right to expect more, but if what was given as a boon is more than sufficient for the purposes intended, it would be an additional boon to grant the difference, whatever it may be.

23. Adverting to the 12 years' rule, are you of opinion that any loss has been or can be occasioned to officers promoted to lieutenant-colonel on or after the 1st of January 1862 by the mere retention of the list of the names in italics?

A. No, certainly not; if their promotion to the colonel's allowance is dependent solely on length of service in the substantive rank of lieutenant-colonel.

24. Do you consider that such retention, having no longer any connexion with the colonelcy, can in any way affect officers now below the rank of lieutenant-colonel?

A. No. I would wish to add that I am not a complainant in this or any other matter connected with the amalgamation, and that I appear now solely at the request of the Commission.

APPENDIX B.

No. 5.

MAJOR-GENERAL FLEMING'S Statement and Evidence.

11, St. Stephen's Road, Westbourne Park, W.,
19th July 1865.

* * * * *
At the time of the retirement of the lieutenant-colonels on the extra pensions, I stood 36th on the list; and I calculated that before my promotion, I might expect four or five steps by retirements of those above me, but every officer who had any thought or wish to retire, took advantage of the extra pension, and I consequently lost the steps of those who would have retired, had no enhanced pension been offered.

Of the 35 lieutenant-colonels above me, 25 took the extra pension, and retired, and most of these returned to Europe; and, therefore, the same number of casualties could not have been looked for amongst them as if they had remained in the service, as the value of an officer's life in Europe is much greater than that of an officer who remains exposed to all the dangers and vicissitudes of his calling in India. On this head, I cannot calculate what retardation to promotion has been occasioned. I would mention that five of the officers above me who retired, remained in India, and of these two have since died; but I have not had one step by the death of any of the 20 who returned to Europe.

I would respectfully submit to the Royal Commissioners that, throughout the entire report of the Royal Commissioners of 1863, they showed that they considered every officer should benefit to the extent of half of the retired lieutenant-colonels, and I beg to quote the following paragraphs of their report in support of this view of the case—

Para. 9. "The main characteristic of the army was, that all promotion, in every branch of it, went according to seniority."

Paras. 15 and 16. "Every casualty, whether occasioned by death, retirement, or removal from a regiment, gave a step to every officer below the officer occasioning the vacancy. It is obvious, from the fact that promotion went strictly by seniority, that every casualty, however occasioned, by giv-

ing promotion to some officer, was advantageous to every one below him, either by giving him promotion or by bringing him nearer to promotion."

Para. 54. "It was made part of the scheme, that for every two lieutenant-colonels accepting these terms, only one vacancy should be filled up. In the case of majors and captains every vacancy was to be filled up."

I have quoted these paragraphs to show that the former Commission considered that at least half of the lieutenant-colonels who retired should be removed from the list; and, in accordance with the rules of the service, that promotion or advancement should be given to all below them. I would refer particularly to paras. 15, 16, and 54.

The Secretary of State had not, I conceive, the right to set aside an Act of Parliament by which I was guaranteed all my rights, privileges, and advantages, by retaining on the effective list men dead to the service.

I would merely ask the Commissioners, after perusing the report of the Royal Commission of 1863, whether they did not consider the intentions of those Commissioners was that the advancement in the room of half the lieutenant-colonels should be given to all below them, and I beg that the Act of Parliament guaranteeing to the officers of the Indian army their privileges should be enforced, when it is supported by the opinion and decision of the Royal Commissioners of 1863.

THOS. F. FLEMING,
Bengal Army, Maj.-Gen.

21st July 1865.

1. How many lieutenant-colonels on your (Bengal) list retired with increased pension?

Answer. I think under 50.

2. How many majors were promoted in their room?

A. I imagine 25; being one for two retirements.

3. How did promotion from major to lieutenant-colonel affect you?

A. It did not affect me at all.

No. 6.

No. 6.

Lieutenant-Colonel ALEXANDER CROMBIE SILVER examined.

1. (President) Do you consider that the statements made by the various memorialists have any foundation?

Answer. Certainly; no doubt of it.

2. You have submitted a memorial representing that the brevet has caused you to be superseded; have you any observations to make on that subject?

A. On a reference to any Army List it will be found that the date of my commission as a Major is the 20th of September 1856; Lieutenant-Colonel Cook's commission as a Major is dated 7th of July 1859; Lieutenant-Colonel Webb's commission is dated 21st of September 1859; both of those officers, therefore, were three years my juniors as field officers. When the Staff Corps was formed in 1861, those two officers, from having been 26 years in the service, were enabled to enter it with rank as lieutenant-colonels from the 18th of February 1861, thereby superseding me. I was precluded from entering the Staff Corps, except as a major, having only 23 years' service. By a despatch dated June 1864, the Secretary of State directs the same system of promotion for the local army as for the Staff Corps, brevet rank being substituted for substantive rank. By this operation I am again superseded by a variety of officers of the local army who had entered the service prior to the 31st of December, 1835, whether the officer's present rank be that of lieutenant-colonel, major, or captain. A reference to any Army List prior to June 1864 will illustrate this, and show that I am superseded in army rank by 26 lieutenant-colonels and 8 majors of the Madras army, and if taken in the general gradation list of the three presidencies, the number is very large; I claim, therefore, that in accordance with paragraph 68 of the despatch dated June 1864 from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, the date of my rank should be adjusted by brevet, to place me in the same relative position as regards the Staff Corps officers that I held before the formation of that corps.

3. (Maj.-Gen. Eyre.) Does your case represent a large class, or is it rather exceptional?

A. It represents a large class, if those officers who have received brevet rank for service in the field be included in it. It was a condition of the company's service into which I entered, that an officer once promoted to the substantive

rank of field officer never could be superseded again, except by brevet rank, conferred for service in the field. The introduction of this new system of promotion by brevet for length of service entirely upsets the original conditions of the service, and I and others are therefore aggrieved thereby.

4. What remedy do you conceive would meet the case of the class you are representing?

A. Simply an adjustment of their rank by brevet, to place them in the same relative position with regard to the Staff Corps officers which they held before, if the system of promotion by brevet for length of service is to be continued.

5. (Maj.-Gen. Browne.) When would you have obtained your regimental lieutenant-colonelcy had not the extra retirements have taken place in December 1861?

A. I should say in about June 1861, or about six months before I did obtain it.

6. What reason do you give for that?

A. Because there were a large number of lieutenant-colonels waiting to accept the bonus on the 31st of December 1861; had no bonus been offered they would have gone without it, the average promotions being from 10 to 12 per annum, and I being senior major, it is quite legitimate for me to say I might have expected promotion six months earlier than I received it.

7. How long were you senior major?

A. I cannot say exactly; but a considerable time in consequence of lieutenant-colonels waiting for the extra annuity which was given in 1861.

8. In what time do you consider you would succeed to the colonel's allowance according to the ordinary course of service from the date of your lieutenant-colonel's commission?

A. It is impossible for me to say exactly, but in from 10 to 12 years. I complain, however, that the conditions of my service have been broken; a distinction has been drawn between a lieutenant-colonel promoted in 1861 succeeding to his colonel's allowance and a lieutenant-colonel promoted in January 1862; the former succeeds either by seniority or under the 12 years' order, while the latter can

only succeed under the 12 years' order, and not by seniority, which was the original condition of my service.

9. Bearing in mind that there is an actual reduction to the extent, say, of 15 regiments, and therefore 15 colonel's allowances, and that you would have under the former systems of which you would wish to have the advantage, to succeed to your colonelcy through them, would you get it as soon by that process as through the 12 years' service?

A. Certainly not; but the necessity may at any time arise to increase again the number of regiments, and I complain of the chance of succeeding by seniority, being withdrawn from me while it is not withdrawn from those promoted before me.

10. (President.) You complain of the 12 years being too long? APPENDIX B.

A. No, I do not; I am quite willing to accept the 12 years; I complain of not being allowed the privilege of succeeding by seniority should it come to me. No. 6.

11. That is to say, you consider that the 12 years is not an equivalent?

A. I do not say that the 12 years is too long; all I complain of is that they do not allow me to succeed either by seniority or by the 12 years, the same as is accorded to all other lieutenant-colonels promoted prior to 1862.

No. 7.

Captain and Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel W. S. SIMPSON (Madras Army), examined.

1. (President.) You probably are aware that various officers have complained of supersession by the grant of brevet rank to remedy the supersession by the Staff Corps. Has such supersession occurred?

A. Yes. I am aware that supersession has occurred in one or two instances, by the grant of this brevet rank; but it is a point that I have not given much attention to.

2. Do you consider that the grant of brevet rank has had the effect of remedying the supersession by the Staff Corps?

A. I consider that the brevet has not remedied the evil before complained of; that is, of regimental supersession.

3. Have you any suggestion to offer to the Commission as a remedy for that evil?

A. The only remedy that I can suggest is by converting the brevet into substantive rank.

4. (Maj.-Gen. Russell.) Would not that proposition seriously affect the British officers serving in India?

A. Not to a greater extent than they are now affected by the substantive rank conferred on Staff Corps officers. The "local rank," for length of service now granted to officers of British regiments serving in India, prevents supersession.

5. Is local rank any equivalent either for brevet or substantive rank?

A. Just as much as it was in former days, when the officers of the British service, serving in India, received local rank after 15 years' service.

6. The Indian officers at that time had no brevet rank?

A. The Indian officers had brevet rank after 15 years' service.

7. Are you quite certain that that was not simply local rank?

A. It was called brevet rank. I was a brevet captain.

8. Did it hold good out of India?

A. I bore Her Majesty's commission as a brevet captain. The officers of the old Company's service in those days had no rank on this side of the Cape.

9. At present the officers of the local army have brevet rank which holds good everywhere?

A. Yes.

10. And the officers of corresponding dates in the British line have only local rank?

A. Yes; but as the officers of the local Indian army can very rarely have to perform any duty out of the Indian territory, the interests of the "British line" can in no way be affected after the latter leave India.

11. Regiments of British and Indian services might be suddenly ordered to embark for China, Ceylon, or elsewhere; time not allowing any "special provision" being made, would not the brevet rank officer of the Indian service supersede the British officers who had been serving in India with local rank, as well as all those officers of the Queen's regiments then serving in that station, and whom, on arrival, they might even find in presence an enemy?

A. I cannot speak with certainty on this point; but am of opinion that the local rank conferred on the officers of the British service would hold good wherever they might be serving with the Indian army; this I take to be the spirit of the order. British regiments ordered direct from England or elsewhere to co-operate with the Indian army would, doubtless, have provision made for them in this point; or the recent general order conferring local rank on officers of the British service, might extend the grant to all officers serving in the East with the Indian armies.

12. (Maj.-Gen. Browne.) Recognizing the Staff Corps as a distinct regiment, organized upon its own distinct terms of service, and completely separated, therefore, for all time to come, from the local Indian service, supposing the officers from the Indian service, who have been transferred to the

Staff Corps to be entirely struck out of the old local service, would the officers of the local service have any reason to complain of supersession by them?

A. No. I think the removal of the whole of the Staff Corps men, from the date of the formation of the Staff Corps, would remove almost every grievance now complained by the local regimental officers.

13. With reference to the statement (paper B) which has been given to you to read, are you of opinion, supposing the promotions still due to be allowed, that the officers have sustained any loss of what they were entitled to claim?

A. I should say they have not.

14. Adverting to the 12 years' rule, do you consider that any loss has been or can be occasioned to officers promoted to lieutenant-colonel, on or after the first day of January, 1862, by the mere retention of the list of the names in italics?

A. No, I do not think it affects them in any way.

15. Do you consider that such retention, having no longer any connexion with the colonelcy, can in any way affect officers now below the rank of lieutenant-colonel?

A. No.

16. Do you wish to make any further statement?

A. I would beg to record my opinion that harmony will never be restored to the Indian army unless the Staff Corps officers are removed from the Cadres of their regiments from date of formation of the Staff Corps, or substantive rank for length of service be granted to the locals, heart burnings and ill-will must exist where officers find themselves superseded by their regimental juniors—two of my regimental juniors have the substantive rank of major, and one of those, Major W. Southey, will be shortly a lieutenant-colonel—and know that the stoppage of their bonus funds, and consequently of promotion, solely arises from double system of promotion.

The Staff Corps officer not only retards the promotion of his brother officers, but he does not contribute to the support of mess, band, or any other institutions of the regiment of which he is still a member.

PAPER A.

With reference to the formation of the Indian Staff Corps, officers have complained, amongst other matters, of the immediate and prospective supersession in rank of regimental officers by those in the Staff Corps.

The Royal Commission of 1863 stated their opinion that there were just grounds for this complaint.

Her Majesty's Government in consequence resolved to confer upon the officers of the Indian army generally "such army rank as shall entirely remove all ground of complaint upon this head by restoring to all who had been superseded the relative position, as regards the Staff Corps officers, which they held before the promotion of those Corps."

But the present Commissioners have now before them a large number of memorials.

Some from regimental officers, representing that they have now been superseded by officers of the Staff Corps who had not superseded them before.

Some from officers of the Staff Corps, that they have been superseded by regimental officers formerly their juniors.

Some from regimental officers, that they have been superseded by regimental officers formerly their juniors;

And some from officers holding brevet rank for field service, that their brevet has now been superseded by the general brevet for mere length of service, and that they have thus been made to forfeit all advantage from their service in the field.

APPENDIX B.
No. 7.

The Commissioners wish to receive from you any observations you may be prepared to offer upon this subject; and also any suggestions which may have occurred to you in regard to what would be, in your opinion, an effectual remedy, or as effectual as may be.

PAPER B.

Upon the measure adopted by Her Majesty's Government of filling up only half the vacancies occasioned by the retirement of lieutenant-colonels upon the extra pensions, 31st December 1862, the Royal Commissioners of 1863 stated that they were "unable to calculate the loss or the advantages, varying as they do, which may have fallen to the lot of the different regiments; but we think that where loss can be ascertained to have taken place, there the guarantee has not been adhered to."

The present Commission wish to have your opinion upon the following statement of this particular question:—

When the arrangement above referred to was adopted it had become necessary to make large reductions in the Indian army, and those reductions were then under contemplation by Her Majesty's Government, but to what extent had not then been actually determined. Whatever the number of regiments to be reduced, there must, of course, have been a corresponding reduction in the number of colonels, and consequently of colonel's allowances (off-reckonings).

To relieve the army as much as possible from the stagnation of promotion which must be occasioned, Her Majesty's Government offered increased pensions to lieutenant-colonels to induce retirement, with the intimation that only half the vacancies so occasioned in that rank were to be filled up.

And the names of the whole of the retired lieutenant-colonels were to be retained on the gradation list of regimental lieutenant-colonels to regulate future promotions to regimental colonel and succession to colonel's allowance.

This was intended as a means of making the retardation of succession to colonel's allowance a gradual process, extending over a course, it might be, of several years, and so making it less immediately felt.

But the exact extent of the reduction to be made not having been actually determined, and consequently no reduced establishment having been published in orders, the actual effect of these arrangements could not, of course, at the time be correctly appreciated.

Now, however, a reduced establishment has been fixed, to stand as under:—

	Former Establishment.		Reduced Establishment.		Decrease.	
	Cav.	Infy.	Cav.	Infy.	Cav.	Infy.
Bengal—Lt.-Colonels	10	30	7	59	3	21
Madras—	8	58	6	43	2	15
Bombay—	3	35	3	26	—	9

[Despatch to Governor of India, 17th June 1864, No. 194. Para 52.]

Then, taking the Madras infantry for the purpose of illustration, the case may be stated thus:—

A reduction is required to the extent of 15 regiments of infantry, representing, therefore, 15 colonels with colonel's allowances, and 15 lieutenant-colonels.

NOTE.—The actual reduction in the Madras army was of three regiments of European infantry, representing four colonels and six lieutenant-colonels, and 12 regiments N.I., representing 12 colonels, 12 lieutenant-colonels, giving a total of 16 colonels and 18 lieutenant-colonels. The pre-

sent reduced establishment being calculated at 15 is, therefore, in favour of the Madras army.

MADRAS INFANTRY.

	Colonels.	Lt-Colonels.
Establishment prior to reduction	59	58
Reduced	16	15
Reduced establishment	43	43

Supposing this reduced establishment had been determined upon and published in December 1861, Her Majesty's Government would, of course, have been distinctly entitled to declare the difference of number, namely 15 colonels and 15 lieutenant-colonels, supernumerary, and, therefore, if thought good, liable to the ordinary process of absorption, more or less gradual.

The extra pensions, then, are to be taken as one of the means devised for the purpose of alleviating the effect of this reduction.

And upon the offer of those pensions, 42 lieutenant-colonels of Madras infantry retired, and 21 promotions were made in their room; but the number actually supernumerary was only 15.

Therefore, 21, the number for which no promotions were made, appears now to have been 6 in excess of the number which Her Majesty's Government was entitled to withhold from promotion as supernumerary.

Thus:—

MADRAS INFANTRY.—LIEUT.-COLONELS.

Establishment prior to reduction	59
Reduced establishment	43
Supernumerary	15
Retired on extra pensions	40
Promotions due to complete the reduced establishment	25
Promotions actually made	21
Promotions due to complete	4

Further, the names of the retired lieutenant-colonels have been retained on the gradation list of regimental lieutenant-colonels to regulate promotion to regimental colonel and colonel's allowance.

But as regards all regimental lieutenant-colonels ranking on and after 1st January 1862, it has since been ordered that their succession to the rank of regimental colonel, with colonel's allowance, shall depend exclusively upon the completion of 12 years' service in the rank of regimental lieutenant-colonel.

In the future, therefore, the number of colonelcies with colonel's allowance being unlimited, regimental lieutenant-colonels ranking on and after 1st January 1862 can be in no way affected by the retention on the gradation list of regimental lieutenant-colonels of the names of the retired lieutenant-colonels.

Taking the preceding statement into consideration, are you of opinion,

1. That, supposing the promotions still due to be allowed, the officers have sustained any loss of what they were entitled to claim?

2. That, adverting to the 12 years' rule, any loss has been or can be occasioned to officers promoted to lieutenant-colonel on or after 1st January 1862 by the mere retention on the list of the names in italics?

3. That such retention having no longer any connexion with the colonelcy can in any way affect officers now below the rank of lieutenant-colonel?

No. 8.

3A, King Street, St. James' Square,
2nd August, 1865.

SIR,
With reference to your letter of the 25th* ultimo I have the honour to forward replies to the questions sent by instructions of the Royal Commission to which you are secretary.

I have, &c.
CHAS. FRED. NORTH,
Maj.-Gen., late R.E.,
Chairman of Committee acting for
Indian Officers.

To Col. Crewe,
Secretary to the Royal Commissioners,
Cannon Row.

* This letter forwarded the two questions to which Maj.-Gen. North now replies.—R.C.

No. 8.

QUESTION.

1. Are you of opinion that the brevet ordered by the despatch to the Government of India, No. 194, of 1864, has proved effectual and sufficient for the purpose of remedying the supersession of regimental officers by officers of the Staff Corps?

ANSWER.

Certainly not.

QUESTION.

2. If not, in what respects do you consider it insufficient?

ANSWER.

There are several reasons why the brevet rank granted in Despatch No. 194 of 1864 should not prove effectual.

Firstly.—Because it is not in accordance with the regulations of the service or the established system and rules which regulate promotion in the Indian army. These rules are still declared by the Secretary of State for India to be in force, and moreover they were solemnly guaranteed to the service by Acts of Parliament, 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106; 23 & 24 Vict. cap. 100. In accordance with them substantive rank can be attained by seniority only, and brevet rank can take precedence of it only in the field or on general duties.

The locals have to depend for their substantive promotion in the cadres of their regiments on the rise by seniority of two classes of officers, viz., those of the Staff Corps and those of the local service; therefore if a certain number of Staff Corps officers, whilst nominally retained on the cadres, attain superior substantive rank independently of their old corps, and not by seniority, the principle by which the system of promotion has been hitherto governed becomes nullified, and the rights and privileges of the local officers become entirely sacrificed to the Staff Corps, although the guarantee of Parliament was intended for both alike.

The officers of the local service seek for a restoration of their prescriptive and guaranteed right to rise by seniority to the rank of regimental major, and for retrospective readjustment of the rank in which supersession has been caused.

Secondly.—Because brevet rank does not entitle the possessor to the same rights or position as substantive rank, and therefore can in no way be regarded either as an equivalent to or a remedy for substantive supersession.

Brevet rank only becomes effectual when troops are brigaded together, or when officers are assembled together on general duties, whilst in the mere routine of regimental duties it is not recognized at all, either in the Indian or English armies.

For instance, a junior captain of one of the cadres, who is also in the Staff Corps, obtains the substantive rank, together with the pay, of a major, after 20 years' service, whilst most of his regimental seniors in the cadre would only be brevet majors with the pay of captain, and of serving together in one corps; the substantive rank of the Staff Corps major would at once give him the right to command his former senior on regimental parades, whereas if two regiments were brigaded together the brevet major would command the brigade in virtue of his seniority.

It has been reported that Sir C. Wood has directed that the brevet shall in all respects have the same effect as substantive rank, with the exception of entitling the holder of it to the pay of the grade; now, if this be so, the local rank granted to the Queen's army must confer similar benefits, and if so the Committee would respectfully beg to point out the practical effect of such a measure.

In the 76th Foot the senior captain is senior by length of service to both the majors, and in consequence of having served more than 26 years would at once become a local lieutenant-colonel; now if the officer commanding (Lieutenant Colonel Brewster) were to leave the regiment, local rank giving all the privileges of substantive rank, the command of the corps would devolve on the senior captain, who would be senior to both the majors.

In the 72nd Foot the first and fourth captains are both senior to the two majors, and the sixth captain (Brevet Lieut.-Col. Macdonald) is senior, not only to the two majors, but to the lieutenant-colonels also, and would, were such an order at all practicable, take command of the regiment at once.

In the Madras Native Army half the substantive field officers commanding regiments would have to resign their commands to those junior to them in regimental but senior to them in army rank.

Thirdly.—Because there is a difference in the pay of substantive and brevet rank. If an officer of the local service who has been superseded in regimental rank obtains a higher grade by brevet to remedy such supersession, while those who superseded him receive increased pay, which he does not, it is obvious that in this highly important respect the grant of brevet rank is not an effectual and sufficient remedy.

Fourthly.—Because the continued retention of the names of officers who have joined other corps on the cadres of the regiments they have left, and the grant of brevet instead of substantive rank to those left in the regiments, has put a stop to that system of acceleration of promotion known as the "bonus system," which was one of the "privileges" guaranteed to the officers of the Indian army by the Acts of Parliament already quoted.

The foregoing are the principal reasons why the brevet in question has proved ineffectual and insufficient to remedy the supersession complained of. In addition to them it may be urged that the effect of the brevet in question has been that officers who had previously no grounds of complaint have now felt themselves aggrieved.

The present Royal Commission has now before it a large number of petitions, some from regimental officers representing they have now been superseded by officers of the Staff Corps who had not superseded them before; some from officers of the Staff Corps that they have been superseded by regimental officers formerly their juniors; some from regimental officers that they have been superseded by regimental officers formerly their juniors; and some from officers holding brevet rank for field service, that their brevet has now been superseded by the general brevet for mere length of service, and that they have been made to forfeit all advantage from service in the field.

If these complaints are well founded the brevet in question which has caused them cannot have been an effectual or sufficient remedy for supersession of any kind. There is no single measure that could be devised which would prove an "effectual and sufficient" remedy for the grievances complained of. That remedy should probably consist of many parts, one of which would be compliance, so far as may now be possible, with the principles upon which alone, according to the recommendations of experienced officers, a Staff Corps, if formed at all, should be organized. Another part would probably be compensation in some shape or other for loss of bonus system, and another and most essential part should be the adoption of some measure that would induce the existing officers of the late East India Company's service to retire altogether.

APPENDIX B.

No. 8.

No. 9.

QUESTIONS sent to MAJOR-GENERAL PEARS.

QUESTIONS.

1. The original establishment of the Bengal Infantry contained	-	-	-	80 Lt.-Cols.
Of whom retired on annuities in 1861	-	-	-	47
	-	-	-	—
		Leaving only	-	33
The establishment now is	-	-	-	59
	-	-	-	—
		Leaving	-	26
wanting to complete.				
One half of the vacancies caused by retirements were filled up, giving the army the fraction	-	-	-	24
	-	-	-	—
		Difference	-	2
	-	-	-	—

Can you state any reason why the two deficient should not be filled up from the date of the retirements to complete establishment?

ANSWERS.

There is some difficulty in reconciling the retirements and promotions under the annuity scheme. In Bengal they appear to have been as follows:—
On the 31st Dec. 1861, there were on the regimental lieutenant-colonels' list - - - 84 names,
(4 supernumeraries).
* Of these - - - 46 retired,
including 2 general officers (Birch & Causland);
Leaving - - - 38
Of these were promoted - - - 23
Making a total of - - - 61
of whom 2 were general officers (Fleming & Hodgson);
Deduct therefrom - - - 2
59 effective,
at which the establishment was eventually fixed.

* This was the eventual result. At first 46 retired and 23 were promoted, but one of the retired (Sissmore) not having attained his rank within the fixed time, could not receive the lieutenant-colonel's annuity, and was not counted as a vacancy to be filled up, one promotion was therefore cancelled, but another officer (Clarke) was afterwards allowed to take annuity and promotion was made, thus giving, actual retirements, 46, promotions, 23.

APPENDIX B.

No. 9.

2. 12 years being the period fixed for serving in the grade of lieutenant-colonel for colonel's allowance, in the case of lieutenant-colonels promoted on and after the 1st January 1862, what is the object, as far as these lieutenant-colonels are concerned, of retaining the names in italics?

3. In the report of Lord Hotham's Committee we find the following statement (para 5, last clause): "In filling up the vacancies occasioned by the drafting off to the Staff List, regard must be paid to the inequality of promotion in the several regiments that must arise if arrangements be not made to meet and correct it. Probably the Indian Government will be able to effect such arrangements without much difficulty, by applying the principles which have been laid down and are well understood in raising new regiments, and generally in all army augmentations."

You are familiar with the system referred to by the committee, as specified in detail in Jameson's Code, page 810, para. 75, and Madras General Regulations, page 364, para. 3.

Do you consider that there were at the time of the formation of the Staff Corps, or that there are now, any insuperable difficulties preventing the adoption of the course above indicated by Lord Hotham's Committee, and, if so, be good enough to state them?

4. Do you consider that the local line officers had any just cause of grievance, on the promotion of the officers of the Indian Ordnance Corps, on the organic change in those corps which promoted captains to lieutenant-colonels from the date of its adoption in India?

5. Do you consider that the local officers would have any greater reason for complaining of their supersession by the Staff Corps officers, provided the two bodies were entirely disconnected by the removal from the cadres of the names now in italics?

6. It is objected on the part of the Indian artillery and engineers that the proportions of general officers for those services fixed by the warrant of January 1862 and June 1864, are too low. On what data were these proportions allotted?

7. In 1854 an establishment of 220 general officers was allotted to the Indian armies. Assuming that as being intended at the rate of 1 for each regiment, was not the Indian list entitled to an augmentation of 3 general officers for the 3 European regiments raised in 1858, and if so, why was it withheld?

8. Was the general officers' list of the British Army augmented when those regiments were transferred to the line?

9. As regards general officers of artillery and engineers, on what grounds are the supernumerary colonels commandant (who are also general officers) retained on the list of effective regimental colonels? General officers who are not colonels commandant are removed from the regiment, and it does not appear why the possession of the colonel's allowance should keep them on the roll of a grade to which they do not belong.

If it can be shown that there were two promotions, not made in Bengal, there would probably be no objection to authorizing them now.

The names are retained in italics for the purpose of regulating the succession of the lieutenant-colonels with date of rank before 1st January 1862, who gained no advancement by the retiring scheme or other amalgamation measures, but who have thus a chance of getting their promotion in ordinary course of succession (as they have done up to this time in Bengal and Bombay) before the 12 years. When all the lieutenant-colonels of date prior to 1st January 1862 are promoted to colonel's allowance, the names of those in italics might be removed.

It would practically involve the necessity of throwing into general lists the officers of the cavalry and infantry of the three presidencies, and would break up the system of promotion by regimental seniority, one of the most important of the privileges guaranteed by Parliament, and carefully preserved by the Secretary of State in the late arrangements.

Although the local officers no doubt did suffer some supersession, I do not think it a just cause of grievance.

The measure was called for on public grounds to protect the officers of the Indian Artillery from supersession in their regimental duties by the officers of Royal Artillery then for the first time serving in India.

I do not quite understand the question.

If the names of the officers borne in italics are removed, promotions must be made in their place, either in the respective cadres, a measure which must lead to great inequality and supersession, or by the means adverted to in Question 3. To both, I think there are most serious objections.

In reply to this question I would quote the following passage from the despatch of the Secretary of State dated 17th June 1864, which has been sent for the information of the Commission:—

"60. It is desirable that the officers of these corps which have become united to the corps of Royal artillery and engineers should as soon as practicable be withdrawn from the list of the Indian army and placed on separate lists, as is the case with those of the old Royal corps, who rise to the rank of major-general on separate lists. It has been determined, therefore, to give to each branch of the ordnance corps in India a separate establishment of general officers, calculated in the same proportion as that which governs the establishment of general officers of the old Royal artillery and engineers."

No augmentation of regiments took place in 1858, as is supposed by the question. Three European regiments were raised in place of 6 native regiments which had mutinied; the officers of the latter being transferred to the former, no addition of general officers was therefore called for.

On the transfer to the British army of the 12 local regiments, the following general officers,—the colonels of those regiments,—were removed from the Indian list and added to the British list of general officers, viz. :—

7 lieutenant-generals.
5 major-generals.

It was not the possession of the colonel's allowance that kept the officers alluded to in the grade of colonel; it was because they were in excess of the proposed establishment of colonel commandant.

The reasons for not removing these officers from the effective list and making promotion in their room are given in paras. 17–21 of a despatch to the Government of India, No. 319, of the 10th August 1861.

T. T. PEARS.

Note.—In question 7, the year 1858 is erroneously named, the date intended is October 1853, when three European regiments were added to the Indian army, one at each presidency, but as the establishment of 220 was not fixed till 1854, the question has no point.

Major-General T. T. PEARS, C.B., examined.

1 (*President*) In your written reply to question No. 3 above, you say that the adoption of the course indicated by Lord Hotham's committee, which is the filling up of the places of the officers transferred from the native regiments to the Staff Corps, on the augmentation principle, and the preservation of the re-filled cadres, would violate the Parliamentary guarantee, by breaking up the system of promotion by regimental seniority. Will you be so good as to explain how this can be, since the regimental succession to promotion would still continue (relieved of the names in italics), and officers would have the same advantages as previously, as a complete regimental body?

Answer I understand the "principles which have been laid down, and are well understood in raising new regiments," to be, that on the occasion of vacancies caused by any extraordinary events in a particular regiment, instead of the promotion going on in that regiment, an officer from some other regiment, in virtue of his regimental seniority, is brought in to fill the vacancy. The officers of the Indian army now complain that the men who have been transferred to the several Staff Corps are not removed from their respective cadres, and that promotion is not given in their places, and I think they would have a much more substantial grievance if the names of such men were removed, and others brought in to supply their places from distinct cadres.

2. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan*.) Would not the removal of the names of the Staff Corps officers and those of the new line regiments distribute a large amount of promotion throughout the service?

A. Yes; it would doubtless give great promotion to the army at large, but I think experience has shown us that any amount of promotion that an individual officer may obtain by a general measure of that nature would not prevent his complaining of any apparent interference with a guaranteed privilege such as promotion by regimental seniority in his own regiment.

3. (*Major-Gen. Browne*.) Under the operation of the augmentation principle each officer having obtained the exact promotion due to his position on the regimental lists, and the several regiments having thus again become homogeneous regimental bodies for all future promotion, would there remain any real ground for complaint of an infringement of the principles of the service?

A. I think that depends very much upon the interpretation of the parliamentary guarantee, which is extremely difficult; I think it would be very difficult to answer the complaint of an officer if he were to state as a grievance that a certain man had been brought over his head from another regiment into his cadre, a proceeding which was inconsistent with the usages of the service. We have to consider not merely what is theoretically just but what, under the present exceptional circumstances, may appear to the officers themselves and to the public to be just, and to be consistent with the parliamentary guarantee.

4. The general brevet has thrown the whole body of officers into a general gradation list, by which their rank has been regulated, both retrospectively and prospectively, regimental rise consequently now affects simply regimental rank and pay. Army rank, which is what constitutes right to command depending on the general gradation, then practically has or has not the principle of promotion by regimental seniority been violated, and would not the reformation of complete regimental bodies, by promotions on the augmentation principle, tend directly to restore the regimental seniority system?

A. The principle of promotion by regimental seniority applies mainly to regimental rank. It has always been the practice to give army promotion according to other principles than those which govern the regimental rise. I do not see how the reformation of the regimental cadres in the manner proposed would restore the system of regimental promotion so as to make it exercise any influence upon the system of army promotion, the one, that is, the regimental promotion, being by regimental succession, and the other, the army or brevet promotion, being by length of service. Regimental rank will still, under the present system, give the advantage of army rank whenever by good fortune in his cadre an officer attains to a certain grade before he can show the length of service which is requisite, under the recent orders, to give him the army rank of that grade.

5. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan*.) In re-adjusting promotion in the manner supposed by the previous questions is it not

probable, nay, almost certain, that every officer would gain, and most of them be removed from their regiment to some other regiment?

A. No doubt there would be a very considerable interchange of regiments; but it is impossible to say to what extent it would be carried.

6. Does it not seem probable that most of the officers would gain in regimental position?

A. Certainly; when it has been already said that the army would gain considerably, you may conclude from that that almost every individual officer would gain.

7. (*Major-Gen Russell*.) Would the removal of officers from one cadre to another cause any inconvenience to the service?

A. None whatever, that I can see, excepting in the Madras army, under its present organization

8. (*Major-Gen Browne*.) Is it not the case in the Madras army, under its present organization in consequence of these reductions, that there is hardly a regiment in the service that has not officers from three, four, or five different corps serving together?

A. I do not think that there are so many cases of officers from other corps doing duty with regiments in Madras. So many of the officers belong to the general list that you will hardly have in the 40 remaining regiments three or four officers from other corps now; the inconvenience would arise from the necessity of moving men from their own regiments and putting them into new regiments. In the two other Presidencies, where there is an irregular organization, you merely transfer the name of an officer, you do not move him from his employment, that is the only difference.

9. (*Major-Gen. Russell*.) How many officers, on the average, are now serving with their own regiments in the Madras Presidency?

A. I cannot tell, but I should think not above five or six; the average of the whole is not more than ten, and a great many of those are from the general list, of which there are about 100.

10. (*Major-Gen. Browne*.) Has not the general brevet had the effect of placing officers upon one general gradation list based simply upon length of service, and must not the effect of this be, in the majority of cases, to render promotion and regimental rise a matter of no further importance as far as rank is concerned?

A. The system upon which army promotion is now given to officers of the Indian army by length of service secures regimental officers against supersession in their own corps, because they stand on their regimental list according to length of service, and although the value of regimental rank as giving army rank is rendered less by the rule that confers army rank after a certain period of service, irrespective of such regimental rank, yet in very many cases where a man is fortunate in his regimental promotion, so as to attain the rank, say, of major, under 20 years' service, it gives him the benefit of the army rank incident to that regimental rank.

11. Are there now, for example, regimental captains who, under the brevet, have taken their place as lieutenant-colonels in the army, and consequently have gone now permanently above a large body of their former seniors?

A. Not their former seniors in their own regiment, but I have no doubt there are cases in which they have superseded those who were seniors in the army at the time. I do not think there are many such cases.

12. (*Sir W. M. Coghlan*.) Have you looked at the operation of it in the 109th Foot?

A. I do not remember that particular case.

13. (*Major-Gen. Browne*.) Do not captains, for example, who have been promoted to lieutenant-colonels by the brevet now stand in the general list of lieutenant-colonels above officers formerly their seniors as field officers and so now stand before them for command?

A. I have no doubt there are some such cases, such captains having been unfortunate in their promotion, and the general tendency of the system recently introduced has been to cause an adjustment of rank among the officers according to length of service.

14. (*Sir R. Napier*.) Is such adjustment of rank consistent with the Parliamentary guarantee?

A. I do not profess to be able to interpret the Parlia-

APPENDIX B.
No. 9.

mentary guarantee, but it is certainly not unjust to the army at large, and I do not think it is likely to affect materially the substantial interests of any individual officer.

15. (*Major-Gen. Russell*) How then would the augmentation principle be unjust to the army at large, considering the very large amount of promotion that is given to every officer?

A. I do not consider, nor have I said, I think, that it would be unjust to the army at large; but I say that an individual officer would have a very good case of grievance with reference to the Parliamentary guarantee if you brought into his cadre an officer from another regiment, because you would interfere with that which affects his individual interests more than anything else—his regimental promotion, the integrity of which has been hitherto upheld as a rule.

16. By the brevet promotion you think that individual officers have also individual causes of grievance?

A. Brevet promotion has always been, at least from time to time, carried on under exceptional circumstances. There is no guarantee against supersession in army rank, and there cannot be. An officer may be superseded by the operation of the Queen's brevet for service in the field, or as a consequence of not having been placed in a position qualifying under the Royal warrant for promotion to the rank of colonel; but regimental promotion has been always conducted and secured to an officer in India upon a fixed rule. Army promotion has not been so conducted, and when you consider that regimental promotion determines the pay and the pension, and that army promotion merely determines occasional questions of command, I think it must be admitted that the chances of an individual officer being injuriously affected by any supersession of that kind are very remote.

17. The chance of an officer being affected by the proposed arrangement is very slight indeed, is it not?

A. I think there are cases in which the interest of the officer might be seriously affected by it; but we have not only to deal with such cases, but also with the principle itself, and with the extent to which an officer might consider himself aggrieved, or might make it the subject of complaint. In very many complaints which are now made, an officer does not say that he has been substantially injured, or injured at all, but he points rather to some supposed departure from the Parliamentary guarantee, and bases his complaint upon that.

18. (*Sir R. Napier*.) In the last sentence of your written reply to question No. 4, received on the 2nd of September, you observe, with reference to question No. 3, that there are most serious objections to the promotion contemplated by Lord Hotham's committee. Will you be so good as to state any further objections that occur to you?

A. I think I have stated all the objections that occur to me in my previous replies, the principal one being that the transfer of an officer from one cadre to another would be considered a grievance by the officers over whose heads he was placed, and that it would be a complaint, under existing circumstances, difficult to answer, or to reconcile with the promise held out by Parliament in regard to promotion.

19. Q Do you consider that if the local regimental officers were separated completely from those of the Staff Corps by the removal of the names in italics, the two bodies having no connexion with each other, the supersession of individuals in the one body by the others would be a grievance?

A. Whether any Government measure does or does not involve a grievance is a question that in most cases must be a mere matter of individual opinion; but if it is

admitted that the promotion of certain officers in the Staff Corps, giving them army rank above that of their senior officers in their former cadres, was a grievance, I do not consider that it would be, in any degree, affected by the mere separation of the names in the army list.

20. It being understood, of course, that the promotions were made in the room of those removed?

A. If that is understood, it opens up a question which has very frequently been answered, and it must be repeated, that such promotion would lead to very great dissatisfaction and very great complications.

21. I do not ask as to the effect of the promotion; but, the promotion having been made, I ask whether you consider the two bodies, having distinct lines of promotion and under distinct rules, would affect each other by individual supersession, any more than is done by the Ordnance Corps, or by any of Her Majesty's regiments which might come from England, and individuals of which might supersede others in the corps of the Indian army?

A. The feeling of dissatisfaction expressed by many officers of the Indian army to promotion given to those in the Staff Corps has arisen chiefly from the Staff Corps being constituted of men who had been drawn from the ranks of the Indian army, and had heretofore held certain positions among the officers of that army. Considering the Staff Corps as a separate body, constituted upon exceptional principles, there ought to be no more dissatisfaction felt at their superior advantages, in point of promotion, by other bodies than would be felt at a run of luck in the Ordnance Corps or any other regiment. But the same cause which has led to the dissatisfaction in the present case would probably give rise to the same feeling, even although the names of the Staff Corps officers might be entirely withdrawn from the list of the Indian army.

22. (*Major-Gen. Browne*.) Many of the officers transferred to the new line regiments have gone to them from native corps, and they may supersede, and I believe some of them have already superseded, their old brother officers. Is there any real ground of grievance in such cases because of that supersession?

A. No; but they are differently situated from officers of the Staff Corps; they have gone into the British service, and they are less likely to be brought into competition with them in local staff employment.

23. Major J. Wilson, of the 26th Madras Infantry, prior to the brevet ranked among the majors. He now stands high up among the lieutenant-colonels. Has not the rank of some of the lieutenant-colonels who had been fortunate in obtaining their rank as lieutenant-colonels under the ordinary system of regimental rise, whilst Major Wilson was still a major, been thus practically set aside?

A. I think that a limited number of men who obtained their promotion subsequently to the 18th February 1861, but prior to the promulgation of the order of 1864, have been superseded by Major Wilson and other officers similarly circumstanced; but I do not think on that account it can be said that the rank has been practically set aside.

24. (*Sir R. Napier*.) We observe in several petitions from old officers who have accepted the increased annuities granted by the despatch of the 10th August 1861, that they consider they have been wrongly dealt with, inasmuch as they say that the despatch, bearing date two days previously, that is, the 8th August 1861, authorizing the colonels' allowances after 12 years' service in the grade of lieutenant-colonel, was published after they retired?

A. I believe that that is a mistake in a year, the first despatch on the subject was dated 31st July 1862.

No. 10.

No. 10.

* MEMORANDUM on the GRIEVANCES of the OFFICERS of the INDIAN ARMIES. By Lieut.-Colonel Rigby, Bombay Staff Corps.

THE amalgamation of the Indian with the Royal Army was a measure which was at first hailed with pride and satisfaction by the Officers of the former service; but the subsequent orders of the Secretary of State for India,—which were quite unnecessary for the purpose of effecting the amalgamation of the two

Armies,—have so ruinously affected the position and future prospects of the Officers of the Indian Army, that complaints and appeals for redress, both to the Secretary of State for India and to Parliament, have been very numerous.

2. The orders issued with a view to remedy the injustice complained of, particularly on the difference

* Received by the Commission, 10th August 1865.

of position between those Officers who were admitted to the Staff Corps and those who either from choice or necessity remained "Local Officers," have aggravated the original causes of complaint, and now the Officers of the Staff Corps as well as the "Locals" complain, with justice, that in many important points their position as regards pay, promotion, and retiring pensions is materially injured; that the terms of the Royal Warrant establishing the Staff Corps have been ignored; the Parliamentary guarantee given on the transfer of the Indian Army to the Crown infringed; and that the understanding on which Officers of the Indian Armies were induced to enter the Staff Corps is not acted up to, and thus a feeling of discontent now exists throughout the Officers of the old Indian services that must prove very injurious to the interests of the country and the Government.

3. Her Majesty's Warrant establishing the Indian Staff Corps distinctly stipulates that Officers of the Indian Army entering the Staff Corps shall continue to enjoy all the benefits of the rules regarding pension on retirement then in force for the Officers of the Indian Army.

4. Under the regulations of 1796 Officers of the Indian Army were entitled to retire on the pension of their regimental rank after completing 22 years service.

5. These retiring regulations were justly regarded as the charter of the Indian Army, the pension was the same for all branches of the service, Engineers, Artillery, Cavalry, and Infantry, and the rates were as follows; viz. :—

	£
Captain	192 per annum.
Major	292 "
Lieut.-Colonel	365 "
Colonel	456 "

6. Some months after the establishment of the several Staff Corps, when many Officers of all ranks had joined them on the faith of the Royal Warrant, the Secretary of State for India deprived the Officers of the Staff Corps of the privileges of the retiring regulations of 1796, and directed that they should only be permitted to claim retiring pensions under another regulation which had been framed many years subsequent to 1796 to meet the case of those Officers whose regimental promotion had been unusually slow, and who were consequently unable to retire after a long period of service on an adequate pension under the former rules.

7. The subsequent rules provided that, irrespective of regimental rank, Officers could retire on the following rates of pension; viz. :—

After 20 years' service, Captain's pension.	
" 24 "	Major's "
" 28 "	Lieut.-Col.'s "
" 32 "	Colonel's "

8. The Secretary of State for India, ignoring the stipulations of the Royal Warrant, has directed that the Officers of the Staff Corps shall only be permitted to claim retiring pensions according to the above regulation, and thus, whilst all those Officers who volunteered for general service, and those who remained Locals, and all Officers of the Indian Cavalry, Engineer Corps, and Artillery still enjoy the benefits of the retiring regulations of 1796, those who elected to join the Staff Corps have to serve under far more unfavourable conditions as regards retiring pensions, and to Officers in the rank of Lieut.-Colonel it is a very cruel hardship, for the increased period of service required is no less than six years.

9. The reason assigned by the Secretary of State for India for thus placing the Officers of the Staff Corps in such an unfavourable position as regards retiring pension was, that the promotion in the Staff Corps might be expected to be more rapid than in the other branches of the service.

10. But at the present time the Lieut.-Colonels of the Staff Corps are in a far worse position as regards promotion than those of any other branch of the old Indian Army.

11. In the Corps of Engineers of each of the three Presidencies Officers have obtained the rank of full Colonel in less than 26 years, the period of service required before obtaining the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff Corps, and have retired with the rank of Major-General on a pension of 456*l.* a year, under the regulations of 1796, and the junior Regimental Colonel of the Bombay Engineer Corps has been less than 24 years in the Army.

12. In the Bombay Artillery the junior full Colonel has been 27 years in the Army, and the junior Lieutenant-Colonel 21 years. In the Cavalry branch the junior Lieutenant-Colonel has been 23½ years in the Army. In the Local Infantry branch seven Lieutenant-Colonels have been less than 26 years in the Army, and have superseded Staff Corps Officers, and all the above Lieutenant-Colonels enjoy an advantage of six years service as regards retiring pensions over their brother Officers who were under the same retiring regulations and rules of service previous to entering the Staff Corps.

13. The advantages of increased rank held out as an inducement to qualified Officers to enter the Staff Corps on their formation have been completely nullified by the extension of army rank for length of service to all Officers of the Indian Army, and as the period of attaining the rank of regimental Lieutenant-Colonel, is, as shown above, much longer in the Staff Corps than in any other branch of the service, the depriving the Staff Corps Officers of the benefits of the retiring regulations of 1796, and compelling them to serve six additional years for the pension of their rank becomes a cruel injustice, for which no reason of equity or good policy exists.

14. Those Officers who have been unlucky in their regimental promotion before joining the Staff Corps have obtained no advantage whatsoever by doing so; on the contrary it has proved a grievous injury to many, by compelling them to remain so many additional years in India, and subject to constant supersession by their juniors who remained Locals. Those Officers who enter the Staff Corps early in their service, and by doing so attain the rank of Captain after 12 years' service, and of Major after 20 years, may attain these positions in a shorter time than they would have done had they remained "Locals," and as a set off against this advantage it may not be unreasonable to add to their qualifying period of service for retiring pensions; but it is manifestly most unjust to apply such rules to Officers who had served upwards of 26 years before entering the Staff Corps, who whilst purchasing nearly every step up the lists of their old regiments had nevertheless been Lieutenants after 15 years' service, and Captains after 25 years, and whose Brevet rank for length of service being of older date than their rank in the Staff Corps obtained no advantage in promotion by having entered it.

15. I will quote two instances to show the great disadvantages under which the Lieutenant-Colonels of the Staff Corps serve as compared with Officers of the same rank who have remained "Local."

1st. Lieutenant-Colonel Coley, Military Secretary to Lord Elphinstone, elected to remain a Local Officer, although most of his service had been on the Staff. He has retired from the service after 20 years 4 months service in India on the pension of his rank (365*l.* per annum) under the retiring regulations of 1796, whereas had he joined the Staff Corps he could not have obtained the same pension until he had served a further period in India, exclusive of all leave, of 4 years and 8 months!

2nd. Lieutenant-Colonel Burrows, also on the General Staff of the Army, joined the Staff Corps on its formation, but finding out its disadvantages, got re-transferred to the Local service; he has in consequence become a Regimental Lieutenant-Colonel after 20 years 6 months service, and after a further service of 18 months is entitled to retire on the pension of his rank, whereas had he remained in the Staff Corps he could not have obtained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel until after a further service of 5½ years, and he could not retire on the pension of his rank for 7½ years.

16. All that the Officers of the Staff Corps ask for relative to the above grievances is, that they may be

APPENDIX B.
No 10

placed on the same footing regarding retiring pensions as the other branches of the old Indian Army by having the retiring regulations of 1796 restored to them; to do so would cost the Government a mere trifle, and it would do away with the heart-burning and sense of injustice which the Staff Corps Officers must always feel so long as their more fortunate brother Officers in the Locals are serving under so much more favourable conditions.

17. Another grievance of Officers who joined the various Staff Corps on their first formation is, that they have deducted from their service for pension all leave of absence previously taken within the limits of the East India Company's charter; whereas Officers who subsequently joined the Staff Corps have been permitted to reckon all such leave as part of their service. Thus there are many cases of Officers who have taken six months leave of absence on medical certificate, in consequence of ill health contracted on field service in Sindh, Persia, or Aden, having all such leave deducted from their service, whilst others who have passed four or five years or more at the Cape or Neilgherries are permitted to reckon all the time so passed as service towards retirement.

18 Another grievance of Officers who have joined the Staff Corps is, that their rates of pay being fixed at the half batta rates of pay of the Infantry, full batta has now been granted to all other branches of the Army, as also to all Officers of the British regiments serving in India, consequently a Major or Lieutenant-Colonel of the Indian Staff Corps receives less pay by about 20l. a month than the corresponding ranks in all other branches of the service.

19 Thus, when a Captain of the Staff Corps is appointed to do duty with a regiment, he receives pay at the rate of 374 rs. a month, whilst a "local" Captain doing duty with the same regiment receives 415 rs. per month. A Staff Corps Major, under similar circumstances, receives 640 rs., and a local Major 789 rs. per month. A Staff Corps Lieutenant-Colonel receives 827 rs., and a local Lieutenant-Colonel 1,002 rs. per month.

20 The system of having different rates of pay for Officers of equal rank whilst performing the same duties, must always be a source of dissatisfaction. In the cases above quoted, the Staff Corps Officers have just cause of complaint; but in cases of which the following is an instance, the local Officers justly complain, viz. :

"A" and "B" entered the service on the same day, and therefore became Majors in the Army on the same day. Both are attached to the same regiment (the 16th N. I.) as Wing Commandants. "A" having joined the Staff Corps obtains substantive rank, and receives 640 rs. per month; and "B," having remained "local," his rank as Major is only Brevet, and he therefore receives only 374 rs. a month.

21. When the Secretary of State deprived the Staff Corps Officers of the benefits of the retiring regulations of 1796, Officers who had elected for the Staff Corps on the faith of the Royal Warrant were offered the option of reverting to the locals, but in the meantime they had lost the opportunity of entering the new line regiments, as the lists of Officers had been filled up, and some had in the meantime refused the bonus to retire which had been offered to all Officers of above 25 years' service, the period allowed for accepting which had previously expired. Such Officers, therefore, had lost the opportunity of retiring with a bonus, and suddenly found themselves condemned to serve for a much longer period to obtain the pension to which the Royal Warrant guaranteed their right under the regulations then in force.

22. A very invidious distinction is kept up between the various branches of the old Indian Army respecting the terms on which leave of absence to Europe is granted. Officers of the Artillery and Engineers can obtain leave on private affairs without forfeiting their pay and appointments, and without any limit as to the previous period passed without leave; but if an Officer of the Staff Corps or "Locals" wishes to return to Europe on urgent private affairs, he forfeits all pay and Staff appointments unless he has had no leave for a term of years previously.

23. Again an Officer in command of a Regiment of Native Cavalry or Infantry who may obtain leave of absence to Europe for six months on urgent private affairs, if he should remain absent a single day in excess of this period, forfeits his command, and has no further connexion with his Regiment, although his whole service may have been passed in it, and he likewise forfeits all that he may have contributed during his entire service to his regimental mess, band, library, and other regimental institutions.

24. Again, an Officer who is attached to a native Regiment, who may, even after 20 years' service in India, wish to take his furlough to Europe, forfeits his appointment from the day he quits his Regiment, and never returns to it. All his regimental donations and subscriptions are lost to him, and, on his return from furlough, he is sent to do duty with a Regiment to which he is an entire stranger. It is a very great hardship to old Officers to be thus severed from their old Regiments, and it attaches a heavy penalty to the taking a furlough to Europe. It quite destroys the old feeling of attachment between the men and their Officers, and it is causing intense dissatisfaction amongst the native ranks of the Army. The liability to be thus suddenly removed from a Regiment, and never return to it, destroys all feeling of esprit de corps.

25. In the old Indian Army a system had for many years prevailed, of the Officers of a regiment combining to give a bonus to old Officers to induce them to retire. The system had been approved of and sanctioned in various Despatches of the Court of Directors; it was a system which operated most beneficially for the interests of Government and for the efficiency of the Army, by enabling Officers who were worn out from long service and ill health, and those who were in debt, to retire and make way for younger and more efficient men. Many Officers had paid towards nearly every step up the list in their regiments, from Ensign to Major, in the full expectation that in their old age they would in turn receive a bonus from the regiments to enable them to retire.

26. In 1837 Colonel Powell, then the Adjutant General of the Bombay Army, and who was after 35 years only a regimental Captain, petitioned the Court of Directors to prohibit the system of regimental purchasing out of old Officers, on the ground that as the Officers of his regiment refused to purchase him out he was being superseded by Officers in other regiments purchasing out their seniors. The following is the reply of the Court of Directors to Colonel Powell's memorial. G. G. O., 22nd May 1838 (Hon. Court to Supreme Government, dated 29th November 1837).

"We see no necessity for interfering with the arrangements which the junior Officers of a regiment may make in individual cases for adding to the comforts of a senior Officer on his retirement from the service on the pension to which he may be entitled. The regulations of 1796 requiring Officers upon retirement to make oath, that they have received no pecuniary consideration for quitting the service, has not been enforced by us in any single case of retirement in England during the period of nearly 40 years which has since elapsed. It was established chiefly on financial grounds to prevent (as observed by Lord Cornwallis when recommending other rules for the same object) an unreasonable load of pension. This presumed necessity for the rule has not been felt, on the contrary, additional facilities have been required, and have been given, for enabling Officers to retire upon full pay. We shall therefore continue to suspend the operation of the rule, and Officers retiring from time to time will not be called upon to make the declaration, unless the financial necessity to which we have referred (and of which due notice shall be given,) shall at a future period be realized."

27. Thus, on the faith of this and other despatches approving of the system, the Officers of the Indian Army continued to give a bonus to old Officers, and now in consequence of the different organization caused by the amalgamation all their payments are lost.

28. The following is an extract of a Government General Order, dated 10th April 1861, par. 58.

"By joining the Staff Corps, or the New Line regiments, Officers will not prejudice their claims on the Military Funds and Orphan Funds, and to retiring pensions under the Indian regulations."

29. In the face of the above, the order depriving the Officers of the Staff Corps of the benefit of the retiring Regulations of 1796 was issued about a year subsequently. All Officers who had in the interval joined the Staff Corps having had no reason to doubt that faith would not be kept with them. In addition to the unfavourable terms on which Officers of the Staff Corps now serve as regards retiring pensions, they are on a lower scale of pay than any other branch of the Army, European or Native, serving in India, and the prospects held out to the old Officers to join the Staff Corps on their formation have been so completely nullified, that most of them would gladly revert to the Locals if permitted to do so.

30. It cannot be denied that throughout all ranks of Officers of the old Indian Army there is a deep feeling of discontent, and of injustice under which they are suffering; the appeals for redress to the Secretary of State, and to both Houses of Parliament, and the letters in the public papers, both in India and England, show how widespread this feeling is, it cannot be for the interests of the Government or the public service that this should continue; to satisfy the just claims of all Officers would cost the Government very little, and the

Officers would become reconciled to a service which they entered with such very different prospects.

31. The change in the prospects of service in India to military Officers owing to the vast rise in prices may be imagined from the following extract of a leading article in one of the chief Indian newspapers.

"But amidst all the jubilation of Bombay there strikes upon the ear, from time to time, a cry of suppressed distress. If any will be curious or faithful enough to plumb it, he will learn how wide, how deep, how nobly suppressed are the sufferings of the military and subordinate Officers amidst all this general prosperity. We need not enlarge. At Kurrachee the Officers of one regiment keep a joint-stock pony between them for regimental duty! In Poona English married Officers and their families, Captains of regiments, and delicate English ladies, cannot in many instances afford animal food more than thrice a week. The Commander-in-Chief must know this. In Bombay matters are worse, and no married man here under 1,000 rs. a month can drink wine and keep a single horse chaise. The political effect of this must ere long prove disastrous."

C. P. RIGBY,
Lieutenant-Colonel Bombay Staff Corps.

APPENDIX B.

No. 10

APPENDIX C.

APPENDIX C

LETTER of Lieutenant-Colonel COOKE, Madras Army, respecting Effect of BREVET-PROMOTION and CORRESPONDENCE relating thereto.

Correspondence on the same Subject with Bombay Government.

EXTRACT MILITARY LETTER from Fort Saint George, dated 20 December 1864, No. 377.

At the suggestion of the Commander-in-Chief, we submit, for your consideration and orders, the accompanying communication from the Adjutant General, 1st December 1864, No. 585, giving cover to a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel C. Cooke, of the Staff Corps, pointing out that the recent brevet promotions have not effected the object for which they were granted by Her Majesty's Government; but that, on the contrary, they have had the effect of placing many officers of the Indian service in a much worse position as regards the Staff Corps officers than they were before, and submitting two plans for meeting the grievances of the Indian service officers.

2. With the above papers we forward a return of lieutenant-colonels superseded by the operation of the recent orders, a copy of which has been already transmitted to the Government of India, for submission to Her Majesty's Government.

PROCEEDINGS of the Madras Government, Military Department, 13 December 1864.

READ the following papers:—

No. 333.—MEMORANDUM from the Adjutant-General, Fort St George, 1 December 1864, No. 585, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department

THE Commander-in-Chief has the honour to submit, for the consideration of Government, the within letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Cooke, of the Staff Corps, pointing out that the recent brevet promotions* have not effected the object for which they were granted by the Home Government; but that, on the contrary, they have had the effect of placing many officers of the Indian Service (for whose especial benefit they were ordered) in a much worse position, as regards the Staff Corps officers, than they were before. Lieutenant-Colonel Cooke then submits for consideration two plans for meeting the grievances of the Indian service officers, which were referred by Her Majesty's Government to a Royal Commission.

2. The Commander-in-Chief suggests that this communication be forwarded to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India at an early date.

3. With letter from this Department, No. 925, dated 29th October 1864, a paper was submitted, showing the effect of these brevet promotions on the lieutenant-colonels in this Presidency; and from that document some idea may be formed of the changes in the positions of the officers of the service generally, under the operation of the measure referred to. It is observed that the paper here alluded to has been transmitted to the Home Government.

* G O G,
18 Sept 1864
No. 351.

Proceedings
of Government,
No
4206, dated
25 Nov. 1864.

From Lieutenant-Colonel C. COOKE, Staff Corps, Madras, 25th November 1864, to the Adjutant-General, Fort St. George.

The brevet promotions.

I HAVE the honour to request permission to submit, for the consideration of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, the following observations in reference to the brevet promotions announced in G. O. G., dated 17th September 1864, and which have been made *subject to Her Majesty's approval*.

APPENDIX C.

Their professed object is to restore the Indian officers to their former relative positions with Staff Corps officers.

This object has not been attained.

As shown by the following examples; in

* Now Lieutenant-Colonels. the case of the Indian and the Staff Corps officers;

the former being in a worse position now than they were before the brevets; and in

the case of the Staff Corps officer, who was a substantive field officer before the formation of the Staff Corps, and the officers of the Indian service;

the former being now passed over by his juniors in the latter service.

It could not have been the intention to disturb the former relative position of Indian officers one with another, or that of Staff Corps officers with each other.

But such has been the effect of these brevets, as shown by the following examples, in

the case of the Indian officers,

majors of 1858-59 being superseded by officers who were but captains in 1864

(also by many additional Staff Corps officers) and in

the case of Staff Corps officers,

who all entered that corps on the same conditions of service; but in consequence of these brevets, lieutenant-colonels of 1861 are superseded by lieutenant-colonels of 1863.

Any change in their conditions of service entitles them to the option of reverting to Indian service.

The intended object of the brevet not having been effected, as exemplified,—a suggestion offered whereby it can be attained.

2. The professed object of granting these brevet promotions is to restore to the Indian officers who had been superseded the relative position which they held with Staff Corps officers before the formation of those corps.—*Vide* Paragraph 63 of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State's Despatch, dated 17th June 1864.

3. I submit, with deference, that this object has been very far from attained by the measure which has been applied; and in support of what I state, I would solicit attention to the following cases, which are merely given as *examples*, and which might be multiplied to almost any extent.

First. Take the relative position of the Indian and the Staff Corps officers. Prior to the formation of the Staff Corps, Majors* Silver and Coode, local service, were senior to Majors Cooke and Webb; but they were superseded by the two latter on their joining the Staff Corps, and promotion to lieutenant-colonel on the 18th February 1861. Now, what has been the effect of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State's Despatch as regards these two injured officers? It not only does *not* restore them to their lost position by again placing them above Cooke and Webb (*by whom alone they have been superseded*), but it places above them thirteen (13) additional Staff Corps lieutenant-colonels, by whom they never *could* have been superseded under the operation of the Staff Corps warrant. Nor is this all; for by the recent brevet promotions, no less than 14 of their junior officers of the *Indian service* are now placed above them. Surely these two officers have suffered a far greater injury by the remedial measure which has been applied, than they could *ever* have sustained by promotions made under the Staff Corps warrant.

Second. Now take the relative position of the Staff Corps officers, *who were regimental field officers* before the formation of the Staff Corps and those of the *Indian service*. Major Thompson (now Lieutenant-Colonel Staff Corps) had been a regimental major of infantry for 12 months on the 18th February 1861.

Having obtained that rank, he was beyond the possibility of supersession under ordinary circumstances. But see how the recent brevets have affected him. So far from the Indian service officers being restored to their former relative position with Lieutenant-Colonel Thompson, that officer is passed over by nine (9) lieutenant-colonels of the Indian service, who were not promoted to the rank of major regimentally until long after he was. Here again, then, the professed object of the remedial measure has not been gained.

4. In the above examples, I have merely taken the words of the Despatch in their literal acceptation. But, while the professed object of the measure was to restore the Indian officers to their former position with Staff Corps officers, there is nothing in the Despatch to show, nor is it reasonable to suppose, that there was any intention of disturbing the relative position of Indian officers *one with another*, or that of Staff Corps officers *with each other*. I will now show how seriously both these classes of officers have been affected by these brevets.

First. To exemplify the cases of the Indian officers, I might again instance Lieutenant-Colonels Silver and Coode; but to show that they are not exceptional, I will take Lieutenant-Colonels D. Hamilton and D. Brown—these two officers are regimental majors of 1858-59, and, as is well known, were beyond the possibility of being superseded, except by promotions made for distinguished services. The effect of the recent brevets, however, has been to place above them 11 local service lieutenant-colonels, who were all their juniors, and some of whom were not promoted to majors *regimentally* until July 1864! (The additional number of *Staff Corps* lieutenant-colonels by whom these two officers have now been superseded need not be mentioned; but it will not be forgotten that it was to *right* them as regards Staff Corps officers that this measure was especially ordered.)

Second. With regard to the relative position of Staff Corps officers, one with another. These officers entered the Staff Corps with a full knowledge of the conditions of their future service. For instance, Majors Dobbs, Woods, Snow, Miller, Cooke, Webb, Eden, and Wyndham were all aware that Cooke and Webb, who were *regimental* majors prior to the 18th February 1861, would be promoted to lieutenant-colonel on admission to the Staff Corps, and that they would supersede the others, who were all above them as majors in the army, but were only captains regimentally. Still those six officers joined the Staff Corps; and having done this with their eyes open, surely their "rights and privileges" do not entitle *them* to the brevet rank whereby they now supersede Lieutenant-Colonels Cooke and Webb. If it is deemed expedient to modify, in any particular, the terms on which officers were invited to enter the Staff Corps, it is surely but just that all who have been admitted thereto should be given the option of re-considering their election. But I would most respectfully beg to submit that whatever measure may be requisite in order to restore the Indian officers to their former relative position *with those of the Staff Corps*, it cannot either be necessary or expedient to alter the relative position of Staff Corps officers *one with another*.

5. Having now, I hope, sufficiently shown, first, that these brevet promotions have not effected the object for which they were granted; and, second, that many, very many officers, whom it *could* not have been intended to injure by these brevet promotions, have had their prospects most seriously prejudiced thereby, I will now, with much deference, venture to suggest a plan by which, it appears to me, that the professed object of the Home Government can be attained.

The grievances to be met, being the supersession of regimental officers by their juniors who have joined the Staff Corps; then the first thing

to consider is the system of promotion in the Indian service; and bearing that system in mind

an officer below the rank of regimental major has no just cause of complaint, because he is superseded by an officer of another regiment.

But he is grievously wronged if superseded by his junior in his own regiment;

therefore brevet rank should be given him on his juniors being promoted in the Staff Corps, and thus would the Guarantee of Parliament to those below field officers be fulfilled.

But under the said system the regimental field officer must be protected from any future supersession: therefore,

regimental majors made lieutenant-colonels in Staff Corps on 18th February 1861, should occasion the promotion of all regimental majors senior to them;

but not the promotion of such of them as were still only majors in the Staff Corps—

and if the Staff Corps lieutenant-colonel was already a brevet lieutenant-colonel before admission to Staff Corps, his substantive promotion should not give promotion to any of his senior regimental majors.

The protection of the regimental field officers' position again exemplified.

The same further exemplified.

The foregoing scheme explained.

Commissions of the same date, how to be rectified.

The Staff Corps Warrant to be modified, to prevent supersession by the promotion of Staff Corps officers to brevet colonel;

and Staff Corps officers to be allowed the option of reverting to local service.

The principles kept in view in this scheme,

6. I assume that the intention is, to meet the complaint of the Indian officers, that their "rights and privileges" as guaranteed by Parliament, have been infringed. The grievance to be answered is, that they have been superseded by their juniors who have entered and been promoted in the Staff Corps. Then the question is, what has been and is the system of promotion in the Indian service?

7. In the Indian army an officer could never be superseded by his junior in the same corps; but, prior to his attaining the rank of major *regimentally*, he was always liable to be superseded by an officer of any corps *other* than his own.

8. It is evident, therefore, that Captain A, of the 1st Regiment, who remained local, has no ground for complaint of an infringement of the Parliamentary Guarantee, because his junior in rank, Captain B., of the 2nd Regiment, has been promoted to the rank of major in the Staff Corps.

9. But it is equally evident that it is a decided infringement of the Parliamentary Guarantee to allow Captain C. of the 2nd, who continued local, to be superseded by his junior in the same corps, *i.e.*, by the above-named Captain B., who obtains his majority in the Staff Corps.

10. I would, therefore, suggest that Captain C. be promoted to major by brevet, from the same date that Captain B. is promoted to major in the Staff Corps.

11. By carrying out this principle in every similar case, the Parliamentary Guarantee would be observed as regards all officers below the rank of major *regimentally*.

12. As regards officers *above* the grade of captain *regimentally*.—In the Indian service the attainment of the rank of *regimental* major protected an officer from any future supersession, except by officers promoted to brevet rank for distinguished services. To secure to regimental field officers their relative position with Staff Corps officers, and to carry out, in their cases, the Parliamentary Guarantee, the following plan is suggested.

13. Take for example, the Army List on the 18th February 1861: Major Webb, of the 38th Regiment, a regimental major of the 21st September 1859, was admitted to the Staff Corps and promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel from the 18th February 1861; therefore all regimental majors of infantry who stood above Major Webb* in the list of majors should be promoted to lieutenant-colonels by brevet from the 18th February 1861. This should not, however, be extended to any regimental major (above Major Webb) who entered the Staff Corps and was only a major in IT. For instance, going lower down in the same list, the admission of Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Budd, 31st Light Infantry, to the Staff Corps, and his promotion to a substantive lieutenant-colonelcy from the 18th February 1861, would not give Majors Thompson and Cunningham their promotion to lieutenant-colonel. Further, as Major Budd was a lieutenant-colonel by brevet prior to entering the Staff Corps, and was already senior in army rank to nearly all the regimental majors who stood above him in that list, his promotion to a *substantive* lieutenant-colonelcy in the Staff Corps should not in any way affect the majors senior to him in the regimental list.

14. Again, take the Army List corrected to the 15th January 1862, page 64. To secure to all the majors their relative position with Staff Corps officers, the whole of the majors† in this list, *other than those belonging to the Staff Corps*, should be promoted to major by brevet from the 18th February 1861, *i.e.*, such of them as had not already been promoted from that date, under the provisions of paragraph 10 of this letter.

N.B.—This would not effect Major Prescott, Cadre 10th Regiment, whose date of rank in the Staff Corps would still be 11th December 1861.

15. Again.—Take the Army List, dated 1st July 1864; Greenaway, *Captain* in the Cadre of the 46th Regiment, is a lieutenant-colonel in Staff Corps from 18th February 1863; therefore all regimental lieutenant-colonels whose rank as such dates subsequent to his, as also all regimental majors, must be promoted to lieutenant-colonel by brevet from 18th February 1863.

16. The scheme may be briefly explained thus. When an officer is promoted to major *regimentally*, should there be a Staff Corps lieutenant-colonel among the cadres of the regimental captains, the officer promoted to a majority must, at the same time, be advanced to the rank of lieutenant-colonel by brevet.

17. It is possible that by the plan suggested, the regimental majors will not in every case be protected from supersession by field officers of the Staff Corps, who are only captains in the cadres of their regiments; for, it may happen that the Staff Corps officer is senior in rank as a captain to the regimental major. Such instances will, however, be very few, and whenever it *does* so happen, the regimental field officer must have his captain's rank antedated, to secure to him his relative position with the Staff Corps officer.

18. I see some difficulty in preventing the local officers being superseded by the promotion of those of the Staff Corps to the rank of brevet colonel.

The Staff Corps Warrant provides for the promotion of all lieutenant-colonels after five years' service in that grade; and, unless this rule be extended to the officers of the Indian service, I do not see how their interests are to be protected. Perhaps this will be allowed in order to meet the difficulty; but should it be objected to, as seriously affecting the interests of the lieutenant-colonels of the *British* Army, it only occurs to me to suggest that that portion of the Staff Corps Warrant, which gives promotion to colonel to *all* lieutenant-colonels, indiscriminately, be revised, and that the provisions of the Royal Promotion Warrant of 1859 be made applicable to Staff Corps lieutenant-colonels. If this plan should be decided on, it would greatly simplify the question; but it will then, of course, be necessary to give all Staff Corps officers the option of reverting to the local service.

19. It will be apparent that, in this scheme, the two principles I have endeavoured to keep in view are—

First. That a *regimental* field officer shall not be liable to supersession, *as such*, by any officer of the Staff Corps, of whatever rank, who was still a captain in the cadre of his regiment when the officer of the Indian service was promoted to a majority *regimentally*.

* Vide page 74 of the Army List.

† From Innes downwards.

the observance of which will shut the door against any just cause of complaint; while, on the other hand,

the instructions of the Home Government involve a manifest breach of the Guarantee of the British Parliament.

The interests of those promoted for distinguished services cannot be protected by any definite rule; but

such officers may confidently leave their claims to be considered by Her Majesty.

The proposed scheme, though strictly observing the Parliamentary Guarantee, will not give satisfaction to the local service; therefore,

another and, to them, a more acceptable arrangement proposed as follows:—

The establishment of Native Infantry Regiments is now 40 corps, but there are 55 cadres of officers.

Aggregating about

552 of all ranks below lieutenant-colonels, who

would be satisfied if they were formed into 40 regiments, having

an organization of 13 officers in each corps, thus disposing of the whole, and

giving considerable, though not undue, substantive promotion, and tending to restore the purchase system, and so hastening the extinction of the local service; which

is the object especially desired by Home Government.

As casualties occur smaller sums will be given to retiring officers, still promotion will be accelerated, and

the present discontent and uncertainty among the officers will be removed.

But even under this arrangement, field officers who rank as such regimentally before 18th February 1861, must be protected from supersession upon the former plan.

The second suggestion will not answer for the cavalry.

Second. That no *regimental* officer shall be liable to be superseded by his junior in the *same* regiment, consequent on the promotion of the latter in the Staff Corps, though he may be so superseded by his juniors in *other* corps prior to his becoming a major regimentally.

These have, all along, been the two main features of the system of promotion in the Indian forces; and, so long as they are borne in mind and acted upon, officers of the Indian army have no just reason to complain. Here my scheme, as regards the observance of the Parliamentary guarantee, ends. Whatever exception may be taken to it, it certainly does not involve a glaring infringement of the guarantee of the British Parliament, such as is manifest in the measure which has been ordered by the Home Government. I here allude to such cases as the supersession of officers of the Indian service who were *regimental field officers* of 1856, by others of the local service who were but *regimental captains* so recently as July 1864, and also by *Staff Corps officers* by whom they never could have been superseded had these *brevet promotions* not been made.

20. I do not forget that I have made no provision to protect the interests of those who have been promoted for distinguished services; but I conceive that an attempt to do so, on any definite system, must fail. It is simply impracticable. It is, however, to be remembered that *brevet promotion*, as a general rule, gives an officer but a temporary advantage, and that he is always liable to supersession in his subsequent service. Has he, then, now any right to look for a rule which shall secure him an advantage he has never heretofore had? May not such officers confidently rely on Her Majesty being graciously pleased to advance them to higher rank, in due course of time, according to their respective merits and the distinguished services which they have rendered to the State: thus protecting them from undue supersession by others, either of the Indian service or Staff Corps?

21. Having now detailed my scheme, by which I conceive that the door will be shut against any just cause of complaint of an *INFRINGEMENT* of the *Parliamentary Guarantee*, I have done what I proposed to do; but I see that it will not give satisfaction to the local service officers, for, at best, it grants only *brevet rank*, whereas the Staff Corps officers have substantive rank. I will, therefore, now submit another arrangement, which though it does not fulfil the terms of the *Parliamentary Guarantee*, will, if I mistake not, be a very acceptable measure to at least nine-tenths of the local service. It is a plan which I have repeatedly mentioned in conversation with officers any time within the last three years, or since the reduction of the eight corps of Native Infantry in the beginning of 1862.

22. The following is the arrangement I refer to:—

23. The number of regiments of Native Infantry on this establishment has now been reduced to 40; but we have still the *cadres* of the officers of the three late European corps and 52 Native regiments.

24. At the present time there are in these 55 cadres about

33 Majors,
199 Captains, and
320 Lieutenants,

who are still in the local service, viz., a total of 552 officers.

25. It occurs to me that these officers would be satisfied if *forty new regiments* were formed and officered by them; the principle on which the 2d and 3d European regiments were officered being, as far as possible, maintained. Should this proposal be entertained, the officers of the Staff Corps and those who have been transferred to British regiments must, of course, hold their positions in the regimental cadres, in order to determine the just position of the Indian service officers in the 40 new corps.

26. Allowing for admissions to the Staff Corps under recent orders, it may, I think, be assumed that the total remaining in the Indian service will shortly be reduced to 520. This number will give 13 officers per regiment, i.e.:—

1 Major,
7 Captains,
5 Lieutenants;

or the number of captains and lieutenants might each be fixed at six.

27. It will be seen that even the latter establishment will give considerable *substantive* promotion to these officers; and this is what they really desire.

28. It appears to me that the suggested measure has this further recommendation, viz., that it forms this body of officers into separate corps, in each of which every individual in it is interested in the retirement of his senior, and therefore the scheme tends in some measure to restore the purchase system. It will therefore hasten the *extinction* of the local service; and is not this what the Home Government especially desires to effect?

29. The paucity of officers in a corps, and the circumstance of vacancies not being filled up, will of course prevent officers from raising the large sums that used to be given to those retiring; and, as casualties occur, the sums paid will gradually become less. Still I believe that promotion will be accelerated.

30. It is frequently said now that an officer "belongs to nothing!" He is liable to be moved here and there, and has no home! He is dissatisfied with his position and always in a state of uncertainty, and can take no interest in his duties. All this will be removed by the arrangement I propose. Surely this is no small recommendation.

31. Should this latter scheme be favourably entertained, I must not omit to add that officers who were field officers regimentally before the formation of the Staff Corps, must still, I conceive, be protected from supersession by Staff Corps officers in the manner I have suggested in the former part of this letter. But those promoted to regimental major after 18th February 1861, must be satisfied with the benefit conferred in the latter proposal.

32. The latter arrangement will not however answer for the cavalry. This will be obvious on looking at the comparatively small number of cavalry officers who have entered the Staff Corps. My former plan therefore can only apply to them.

There is no actual necessity for officers of the General List to be posted to the 40 new corps, but still there is no apparent objection to their being so.

33. I have made no provision for officers on the General List, and I see no actual necessity for doing so. They entered the service subject to any conditions that might be determined on in regard to them. There is therefore no injustice in letting them remain as they are. But there seems to be no objection to their being added to the number of regimental local service officers. They number now 101 lieutenants in the infantry. In posting them to the 40 new regiments, I submit that they should stand below all lieutenants who are now on the strength of corps.

34. I have to regret the great length to which this communication has extended, and must apologize for having occupied so much of the valuable time of the Commander-in-Chief in its perusal. But the subject is one of great importance and is a question which cannot be disposed of in a few brief paragraphs. Sir Hope Grant is well aware that the deepest interests of a large body of officers, many of them very deserving servants of Government, are seriously involved in the final settlement of this long agitated question of the grievances of the local service, and I trust his Excellency will therefore be pleased to forward this letter for the consideration and orders of Government, with such remarks as he may see fit to offer.

No. 334.—ORDER, No. 4456, 13 December 1864.

ORDERED to be forwarded for the consideration and orders of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, copies being transmitted to the Governments of India and Bombay, with reference to proceedings of Government, 25th November 1864, No. 4206.

(Signed) H. MARSHALL, Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

No. 335.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George, 13 December 1864, No. 4457; to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department.

WITH reference to my letter of the 25th November 1864, No. 4208, I am directed to forward the accompanying copy of a communication received from the Adjutant-General, and transmitted for the consideration and orders of Her Majesty's Government, pointing out the effect of the recent brevet promotions upon the officers of the Indian service, and submitting two plans for remedying the supersessions occasioned thereby.

No. 336.—The same to the Secretary to Government of Bombay, Military Department, dated 13 December 1864, No. 4458.

PROCEEDINGS of the Madras Government, Military Department, 25 November 1864.

READ the following Papers:—

No. 692.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Poona, 12 September 1864, No. —, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Madras.

I HAVE the honour to communicate the accompanying copy of a letter (with its accompaniments), No. 2411, of 6th instant, addressed to the Government of India; and to inquire whether the point therein discussed has engaged the attention of the Government of Madras.

From the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Military Department, Bombay, 6 September 1864, No. 2411, to the Secretary to the Government of India.

I HAD the honour of dispatching a telegram, as per margin, to your address on 31st August; I am desired now to add the following explanation of the telegram, which was consequent on an examination of the grounds of remonstrances addressed to this Government by officers affected by the Secretary of State's Despatch, No. 194, of 17th June.

2. The Despatch states that the Royal Commission regarded "the supersession in army rank, to which officers remaining with their regiments have been subjected by the promotion of officers joining the Staff Corps under the regulations established for promotion in that corps," as a departure from the Parliamentary guarantee (paragraphs 31 and 53).

It is added (paragraph 54) that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to accept the opinion of the Commission on this point.

It is stated (paragraph 68) that "the only satisfactory course open to the Government is to confer upon the officers of the Indian army generally such army rank as shall entirely remove all ground for complaint upon this head, by restoring to all who had been superseded, the relative position, as regards the Staff Corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps."

The 69th paragraph then gives a rule of promotion, "by which Her Majesty's Government believe that the object in view can be effectually attained."

3. It seems to this Government that the rule of promotion given will fail to attain the purpose of placing the officers who remained with their regiments in the same relative position as regards Staff Corps officers as they held before the formation of the Staff Corps.

4. To exemplify this, the accompanying lists of officers of the Bombay army have been prepared. An officer, who was a lieutenant-colonel before 18th February 1861, could not be superseded by a Staff Corps officer. The first list therefore begins with the senior major, on 17th February 1861, and has been continued to the junior major of that date.

5. The officers of the British army have been omitted for the sake of simplicity of illustration; because, although the provisions of paragraph 69 of the Despatch extend to them also, the measure is devised to adjust the relative rank of local regimental officers and Staff Corps officers; and the point for consideration is that, when worked out in practice, it seems to fail of the fundamental purpose.

6. The first thing noticeable in the lists is that the following officers appear in the second and third lists respectively, whose names are not in the first list because they were only captains on 17th February 1861.

NAMES	Date of Rank as Captain.
Second List.	
Lieutenant-Colonel McLeod	28 February 1848.
" G. A. Leckie	22 March 1849.
" Compton	27 June 1849.
" Rigby	28 January 1850.
" J. T. Barr	17 January 1851.
" Thacker	6 July 1851.
" G. S. A. Anderson	17 February 1852.
Third List.	
Lieutenant-Colonel Boyd	19 August 1847.
" Moyle	1 May 1848.
" Westropp	6 June 1851.
" C. F. Grant	10 June 1851.
" W. Taylor	10 July 1851.
" Combe	1 January 1852.
" Burroys	23 November 1856.

7. Lieutenant-Colonel McLeod, of the Staff Corps, has superseded 13 regimental officers of the second list, and will still supersede, in the third list, 11 regimental officers who were his seniors on 17th February 1861. Similarly Lieutenant-Colonel Leckie has superseded 15, and will supersede 17 in the third list.

Lieutenant-Colonel Compton supersedes 15 in the second list and 21 in the third.

Lieutenant-Colonels Rigby and J. T. Barr, supersede 15 in the second list, and 18 in the third.

Lieutenant-Colonel Thacker supersedes 13 in each list.

Lieutenant-Colonel Anderson supersedes 12 in the second, and 11 in the third.

Lieutenant-Colonel Vincent, the junior in the first list, supersedes at present every regimental officer in the second list, of whom two only (Lieutenant-Colonels Lynch and Powell) will recover their relative position to him.

8. All the above cases are of supersession of officers who remained with their regiments, by Staff Corps officers in army rank, the matter which this Government understands it is intended to remedy.

APPENDIX C.

9. In several of the above instances the supersession of regimental officers by Staff Corps officers is actually increased by the measure.

Beale.
Adams.
Graves.
Leckie.
Anderson.
Coley.

10. The general results of the measure may be shown in another manner. Of the 19 regimental officers in the second list only six obtain a better position in the third list by the new promotions; whilst 13 are placed in an inferior position. So that, so far as the body of regimental officers shown in these lists are concerned, they, on the whole, suffer more supersession by the very measure designed to remedy supersession.

11. I am to explain that the third list has been arranged with anticipation of the promotions in the local army, provided by paragraphs 51 and 79 of the same Despatch. If these had not been taken into account, the result would have departed even more widely from the expressed purpose.

12. The comparison has been restricted to the officers in the accompanying list to save time in placing before the Government of India the explanation of my telegraphic despatch. But the inquiry as to the operation of the order will be carried through the entire list, excluding those who entered under the new condition of appointment, and further report will be made of the result.

13. I am desired also to submit the accompanying memorandum on this subject by the Adjutant-General, and a reply thereto by myself, with the remarks of his Excellency Sir William Mansfield thereon.

14. In conclusion, I am desired to submit two appeals with accompanying letters, as per margin, against the measure under discussion. Major Arthur's appeal does not stand on the same base as that by Captain Morris. Major Arthur is a Staff Corps officer and cannot appeal to the parliamentary pledge as interpreted by the

Royal Commission; and so far as his rights are concerned, the Government agree with the observations by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief conveyed in the Adjutant-General's letter, No. 164, of 29th August. But Captain Morris is a regimental officer, and before the merits of his appeal can be judged, it must be determined whether the purpose of re-adjusting the relative army rank of local and Staff Corps officers is intended irrespectively of their belonging to the same cadre, as assumed by that officer. On this subject the Government refers to the remarks by his Excellency Sir William Mansfield.

STATEMENT showing the Seniority of the Majors of the Bombay Army as they stood on the 17th February 1861, as the same Officers stand now, and as they will stand after the Promotions ordered by the Secretary of State's Despatch, No. 194, of 17th June shall have been made.

On the 17th February 1861.			As they stood on 1st July 1864.			As they will stand after the Promotions now due are made.		
No.	Rank and Names.	Date of Rank.	No.	Rank and Names.	Date of Rank.	No.	Rank and Names.	Date of Rank.
1	Major W. B. Salmon	20 June 1854	1	Lt.-Col. W. B. Salmon	18 Feb. 1861	1	Lt.-Col. W. B. Salmon	18 Feb. 1861.
2	" T. Stock	20 " "	2	" T. Stock	18 " "	2	" T. Stock	18 " "
3	" E. P. Lynch	20 " "	3	" E. P. Lynch	18 " "	3	Lt.-Col. E. P. Lynch	18 Feb. "
4	" R. Wallace	20 " "	4	Lt.-Col. R. Wallace	21 Feb. "	4	Lt.-Col. R. Wallace	18 Feb. "
5	" R. J. Shaw	20 " "	5	" B. R. Powell	31 Dec. "	5	" R. J. Shaw	18 " "
6	" B. R. Powell	28 Nov. "	6	" J. W. Schneider	31 " "	6	Lt.-Col. B. R. Powell	18 Feb. "
7	" M. F. Gordon	28 " "	7	" H. Stanley	31 " "	7	Lt.-Col. M. F. Gordon	18 Feb. "
8	" W. H. B. Green, C.B.	24 " 1856	8	" J. S. Gell	31 " "	8	" H. T. Vincent	18 " "
9	" W. L. Merewether, C.B.	24 " 1856	9	Lt.-Col. E. Wallace	1 Jan. 1862	9	Lt.-Col. R. Richards	13 Nov. "
10	" R. Phayre	16 June 1857	10	" E. J. Shann	1 " "	10	" E. C. Beale	11 Dec. "
11	" E. C. Marston	16 " "	11	" S. J. K. Whitehall	17 " "	11	Lt.-Col. C. R. W. Hervey, C.B.	11 Dec. "
12	" E. C. Beale	3 Dec "	12	" M. F. Gordon	16 July "	12	" D. O. T. Compton	21 " "
13	" C. R. W. Hervey	19 Jan 1858	13	" C. R. W. Hervey, C.B.	18 Feb. 1863	13	Lt.-Col. J. W. Schneider	31 Dec. "
14	" J. C. Graves	19 " "	14	" C. M. Barrow	18 " "	14	" H. Stanley	31 " "
15	" J. A. Wood, V.C.	19 " "	15	" T. A. Cowper	18 " "	15	" J. S. Gell	31 " "
16	" E. L. Taylor, C.B.	19 " "	16	" G. A. Leckie	18 " "	16	Lt.-Col. S. J. K. Whitehall	17 Jan. 1862.
17	" J. Wray	19 " "	17	" D. O. T. Compton	18 " "	17	" J. T. Barr	17 " "
18	" C. T. Atchison	19 " "	18	" C. P. Rugby	18 " "	18	" C. B. Rugby	18 " "
19	" E. P. Arthur	19 " "	19	" J. T. Barr	18 " "	19	Lt.-Col. H. A. Adams	7 Feb. "
20	" J. A. Collier	19 " "	20	" W. H. B. Green, C.B.	17 April "	20	Lt.-Col. G. A. Leckie	7 Feb. "
21	" M. S. Green, C.B.	19 " "	21	" W. L. Merewether, C.B.	21 " "	21	" T. A. Cowper	9 Mar. "
22	" J. J. Laurie	24 Mar "	22	" R. Phayre	10 June "	22	Lt.-Col. C. F. Grant	10 June "
23	" J. W. Schneider	25 April "	23	" E. C. Marston	29 " "	23	" W. W. Anderson	30 July "
24	" G. E. Ashburner	20 July "	24	Lt.-Col. E. C. Beale	29 June "	24	" J. C. Graves	27 Nov. "
25	" J. W. F. Sandwith	20 " "	25	" H. A. Adams	29 " "	25	Lt.-Col. C. M. Barrow	19 Jan. 1863.
26	" H. A. Adams	20 " "	26	Lt.-Col. W. E. Macleod	11 Dec. "	26	Lt.-Col. W. Ashburner	19 Jan. "
27	" W. M. Leckie	20 " "	27	" S. Thacker	11 " "	27	Lt.-Col. D. Boyd	19 " "
28	" W. W. Anderson	20 " "	28	Lt.-Col. J. Field	22 Feb. 1864.	28	Lt.-Col. W. H. B. Green, C.B.	17 April "
29	" A. W. Lucas	20 " "	29	Lt.-Col. B. L. Taylor, C.B.	11 June "	29	" W. L. Merewether, C.B.	21 " "
30	" J. C. Coley	20 " "	30	" J. B. Dunsterville	11 " "	30	Lt.-Col. J. Field	26 April "
31	" E. Campbell	20 " "	31	" G. S. A. Anderson	12 " "	31	Lt.-Col. R. Phayre	10 June "
32	" H. H. A. Wood	20 " "	32	Major J. C. Graves	19 Jan. 1858	32	" E. C. Marston	29 " "
33	" W. Scott	20 " "	33	Major J. A. Wood, V.C.	19 Jan. "	33	" W. E. Macleod	11 Dec. "
34	" R. H. Keatinge	20 " "	34	" J. Wray	19 " "	34	" S. Thacker	11 " "
35	" J. H. B. Dennis	20 " "	35	" C. T. Atchison	19 " "	35	Lt.-Col. W. M. Leckie	12 Dec. "
36	" F. A. E. Loch	20 " "	36	" E. P. Arthur	19 " "	36	" W. W. Taylor	13 Feb. 1864.
37	" A. B. Little	20 " "	37	" J. A. Collier	19 " "	37	" E. H. S. Bowdich	1 Mar. "
38	" E. A. H. Bacon	20 " "	38	" M. S. Green, C.B.	19 " "	38	Lt.-Col. J. B. Dunsterville	11 June "
39	" W. A. Dick	20 " "	39	Major J. J. Laurie	24 Mar. "	39	Lt.-Col. J. J. Combe	11 June "
40	" H. Stanley	21 Aug "	40	" G. E. Ashburner	20 July "	40	Lt.-Col. G. E. Ashburner	12 June "
41	" J. S. Gell	2 Dec. "	41	" J. W. F. Sandwith	20 " "	41	Lt.-Col. G. E. Ashburner	16 July "
42	" C. M. Barrow	7 " "	42	" W. W. Anderson	20 " "	42	" J. C. Coley	18 " "
43	" C. R. Baugh	7 " "	43	" A. W. Lucas	20 July "	43	" H. R. C. Moyle	18 " "
44	" J. H. Champion	7 " "	44	Major J. C. Coley	20 July "	44	" R. M. Westropp	18 " "
45	" A. Carnegy	7 " "	45	Major E. Campbell	20 " "	45	" G. R. S. Burrows	18 " "
46	" F. J. Oldfield	7 " "	46	Major H. H. A. Wood	20 July "	46	Lt.-Col. A. W. Lucas	18 " "
47	" C. Buckle	7 " "	47	" W. Scott	20 " "	47	Major J. A. Wood, V.C.	1 Sept. "
48	" W. G. G. Cumming	7 " "	48	" R. H. Keatinge, V.C.	20 " "	48	Major J. Wray	19 Jan. 1863.
49	" M. F. Gordon	18 Jan. 1859	49	" J. H. B. Dennis	20 " "	49	" C. T. Atchison	19 " "
50	" F. Roome	15 Sept "	50	Major J. H. B. Dennis	20 July "	50	" E. P. Arthur	19 " "
51	" R. M. Johnstone	4 Nov. "	51	" F. A. E. Loch	20 " "	51	" J. A. Collier	19 " "
52	" F. M. Gowan	20 Dec. "	52	" A. B. Little	20 " "	52	" H. S. Green, C.B.	19 " "
53	" M. J. Soppitt	2 " "	53	Major E. A. H. Bacon	20 July "	53	" J. J. Laurie	24 Mar. "
54	" S. J. K. Whitehall	2 June 1860	54	Major W. A. Dick	20 July "	54	" J. J. Combe	20 July "
55	" E. H. S. Bowdich	16 June "				55	Major H. H. A. Wood	20 July "
56	" W. Gray	2 July "				56	" W. Scott	20 " "
57	" J. Field	26 Sept. "				57	" R. H. Keatinge, V.C.	20 " "
58	" J. B. Dunsterville	7 Oct. "				58	" J. H. B. Dennis	20 July "
59	" T. A. Cowper	18 Nov. "				59	" F. A. E. Loch	20 " "
60	" H. T. Vincent	2 Jan. 1861				60	" A. B. Little	20 " "
						61	Major E. A. H. Bacon	20 July "
						62	Major W. A. Dick	20 July "
						63		

Note.—The Staff Corps officers are distinguished by *Italics*.

(Signed) T. Stock, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Adjutant-General.

MEMORANDUM by the Adjutant-General, dated
2nd September 1864.

I AM inclined to think we shall go rather beyond the question involved under paragraphs 65 to 69 of the late orders, if we argue on the difference which those orders will make in the relative rank of field officers.

To look at the case properly, we must go back to paragraph 53, first clause; it is on this point that Government have accepted the opinion of the Royal Commission, viz., "The supersession of regimental officers by the promotion of their brother officers under the Staff Corps rules."

The question, therefore, in my opinion, resolves itself into a purely regimental one, and if we go into that of relative rank of officers generally, we shall travel beyond it.

Paragraph 65 says, that the promotion under the Staff Corps rules caused extensive supersession of the officers who remained with their regiments.

Paragraph 66 then gives the remedy as follows:—"The remedy for this supersession" (that is regimental supersession), by restoring them (the regimental officers) to their "relative position as regards Staff Corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps" (and this, it is supposed—means Staff Corps officers withdrawn from their corps). All the memorials hinged upon this, not on the question of supersession in the line, but the supersession of officers who remained with their regiments; and to obviate this as much as possible, Government has given brevet promotion generally throughout the army, regulated by length of service.

Now, this order, as respects rank, puts all officers remaining with their regiments on a par with the Staff Corps officers, and provides the remedy for the regimental supersession complained of and acknowledged to have been a breach of the guarantee.

With respect to the new promotions upsetting majors and lieutenant-colonels in their relative positions as regards army rank, it would seem that this question has not been touched upon in the late orders, which as before stated, appear to apply the remedy to regimental supersession only; therefore, the case of Lieutenant Colonel Vincent, quoted by Colonel Marriott, as such a strong one, has nothing to do with the question, as I understand it, as Lieutenant Colonel Vincent has not superseded any of his regimental brother officers under the Staff Corps rules.

T. SROCK, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Adjutant-General.

MEMORANDUM by Secretary Lieut.-Colonel Marriott,
dated 2nd September 1864.

THE Adjutant-General assumes that it was only intended to re-adjust the relative positions of regimental and Staff Corps officers of the same cadres.

To this view it must be objected, in the first place, that neither the royal commission nor the Secretary of State says so.

The thing declared to require remedy is, "The supersession in army rank to which officers remaining with their regiments have been subjected by the promotion of officers joining the Staff Corps under the regulations established for promotion in that corps."

An officer (Lieutenant-Colonel Lynch, for instance) might ask, "Have I, who remained with my regiment, been superseded in army rank by the promotion of an officer (Lieutenant-Colonel Vincent) joining the Staff Corps, or not? And is that remedied by the present orders?"

The answer must be, "You have been so superseded, and it is not remedied." But the Adjutant-General would add, "The Royal Commission only intended supersession in army rank by officers who formerly belonged to your own regiment."

The officer would rejoin, "Where is this stated?"

There is another weighty objection, that the interpretation assumed by the Adjutant-General could not have been consistently intended.

The following three cases are distinguishable; although, in fact, no distinction is expressed in the Secretary of State's Despatch or in the Royal Commission's Report.

- 1st. The claim of a regimental field officer not to be superseded in army rank by any officer who was his junior in the army when he attained his regimental majority.
- 2nd. The claim of an officer not to be superseded in army rank by officers of his own regiment.
- 3rd. The claim of officers below the rank of major regimentally against supersession in the line.

The first two cases, with certain exceptions, were guaranteed by the rules for promotion in force at the time immediately preceding the formation of the Staff Corps. I do not mean that these officers were guaranteed against any

alteration of these rules, but that those rules whilst in force guaranteed these points.

The exceptional cases were that any officer might be superseded in army rank by the operation of brevet promotion for field service; that owing to the fluctuating rate of promotion, a regimental field officer might be superseded by one of another arm; because there were separate lists for the artillery, engineers, cavalry and infantry; that a lieutenant-colonel might be superseded by the operation of the warrant, which makes eight years' service, in some cases, and five in others, the qualifying period for the rank of colonel; and a lieutenant-colonel might also be superseded by the appointment of another to be aide-de-camp to Her Majesty, which carries with it the rank of colonel.

But the third claim, stated above, has no foundation in the old rules. Continual supersession of the kind occurred; and if consideration was due to this case at all, it was only because of the quantity caused all at once by the constitution of the Staff Corps.

Therefore although it would be consistent to apply the Parliamentary pledge to the first and second cases to the exclusion of the third, it is not consistent to apply it (as on the Adjutant-General's assumption) to the second case to the exclusion of the first.

The Adjutant-General seems to see something in favour of his view in the terms "regimental officers" and "officers remaining with their regiments." But these are the terms used by the Royal Commission to designate those we usually call "local officers." This term is inaccurate, the Staff Corps being equally local; and the Royal Commission and the Secretary of State used the more accurate designation. They treat the whole body of Indian officers as consisting of Staff Corps officers and "regimental officers" or "officers remaining with their regiments." These words, therefore, have no more force for the present argument than if the term "local officers" had been used instead.

W. F. MARRIOTT, Lieut.-Colonel.

REMARKS by His Excellency Sir W. R. MANSFIELD,
K.C.B., dated 2nd September 1864.

THE Right Honourable the Secretary of State having been pleased to declare his decision a final one, I approach the difficulty which has been raised with regard to the operation of the 69th paragraph of his despatch with great unwillingness and diffidence.

To begin with the lower ranks of regimental officers who did not reach the position of substantive majors in February of 1861. Such officers, of whom Captain Morris is one, have never looked beyond the limit of their own regiments with respect to the seniority of others. They cannot according to the regimental principal on which their position is founded, plead that they are in any way superseded because an officer in another regiment has received quicker promotion than they have. To put forward such a pretension now, is to commit themselves to the usurpation of a principle of promotion which is wholly opposed to what has been considered the right of the regimental officer rising in his regiment according to his good fortune.

This is, however, not so with the field officers who, on obtaining the rank of major in the Indian armies, come into one list of promotion.

Consequently, it appears to me that the difficulty is very great, as stated by the Secretary, in respect of substantive field officers who were majors before February 1861 and are, under the new orders, liable to be superseded by officers, on account of total length of service, who were captains of that date.

I am of course unable to guess whether this is one of the objections alluded to by the Secretary of State in paragraph 72, to compensate for which Her Majesty's Government announce further measures; *vide* succeeding paragraphs of the Despatch.

(Signed) W. R. MANSFIELD.

From Captain G. S. MORRIS, Wing Officer, 15th Regiment, Native Infantry, Camp Mhow, 6th August 1864, to the Adjutant, 15th Regiment, Native Infantry.

I HAVE the honour to request you will lay this communication before the Commandant, in order that, should it meet with his approval, the subject may be brought to the notice of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

2. I trust that the importance of the circumstances to myself may plead as an excuse for my endeavouring to gain time by alluding to a Despatch at present published only in the public papers.

3. In calling attention to paragraphs 68 and 69 of the Secretary of State for India's Despatch, dated India Office, 17th June 1864, I would respectfully point out that, according to the former of these, all officers of the Indian army should retain the relative position, as regards the

APPENDIX C.

Staff Corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps, whereas by the latter coming into operation, far from retaining the position in the army which I occupied before the formation of the Staff Corps; from the 14th June 1865 till the 13th June 1872, I shall continually be retrograding by the promotion of others over my head, who will, during these seven years, be promoted in the army for length of service.

4. The number of those who will thus supersede me amounts to one hundred and thirty-two (132), of whom fifteen (15) are at present lieutenants.

5. The above-mentioned officers are now not only my juniors in the army, but also lower in position on the cadres of their respective regiments.

6. It would be unnecessary for me to dilate on the immense difference this novel system will make in my prospects, for it is at once apparent on perusal of the above facts; but I trust I may not be deemed presumptuous in making the following statement:—

7. I was promoted to my present rank as captain in June 1860, and have therefore not gained in rank the least by any measure connected with the amalgamation.

8. To obtain this rank early in life, I paid various sums to senior officers as an inducement for them to retire; for these sums thus expended I shall have no return, neither shall I even derive benefit in any way (with one exception) from my advancement on the cadre of the regiment to which I belong, for this reason, that all who supersede me in the army will be above me in every capacity now that regimental rank is native corps is abolished, and officers transferred from their own regiments to others. The one exception is promotion to regimental major; but from the present rate at which vacancies occur, this cannot happen till long after I shall have attained that rank by brevet for length of service.

9. In conclusion, I would, with the utmost deference, suggest that paragraph 69 of the above quoted Despatch cannot but have a most ruinously injurious effect upon my position, unless it be carried into effect, by granting me promotion by brevet on the same day that the substantive rank of major may be attained for length of service by the first officer in the Staff Corps junior to myself as captain in the army.

From the Officer commanding 15th Regiment, Native Infantry, Mhow, 8th August 1864, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, Poona.

I do myself the honour of forwarding, for submission to the Commander-in-Chief, a letter, dated the 6th instant, from Captain Morris, of the regiment under my command. The facts which this officer has advanced in regard to the matter of it require, perhaps, no comment of my own; nevertheless, in giving my support to the communication, I beg to draw particular attention to the 7th and 8th paragraphs thereof.

2. Captain Morris, it would appear, obtained the rank of captain when early in the service, under the old régime, chiefly by purchasing out his regimental seniors. He is not indebted one iota to the amalgamation scheme, I understand, for his present position; but if (as he apprehends will be the case) the 69th paragraph of the Secretary of State's Despatch, dated 17th June 1864, is to have full effect, then the Army Amalgamation Scheme will prove to his future prospects in the service damaging indeed.

I am, however, inclined to believe that the absence in the Despatch of any remark regarding the protection of officers situated as Captain Morris is, must be the result of an oversight on the part of the home authorities; or that such important considerations are left to be dealt with by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, who will, it is confidently hoped, when giving effect to the instructions contained in the Secretary of State's Despatch, provide that "all officers of the Indian army" under his command "retain the relative position, as regards the Staff Corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps" (paragraph 68 of Despatch).

I earnestly solicit the Commander-in-Chief's attention to this point, and having given my support to Captain Morris's appeal, I beg most respectfully to inform His Excellency that I likewise shall be a sufferer in the event of the terms of the 69th paragraph in question being brought to bear on my case. I dearly purchased my majority, firmly believing, as a matter of course in the year 1858, that the advantages which I then secured for myself would remain undisturbed throughout my career in the service as a prescriptive right, for when once a major there was no possible chance of supersession under the old system, except by brevet rank, won in the field.

The Military Amalgamation Scheme, I need scarcely add, has deprived me of every hope of recovering aught which I have expended on the purchase of promotion. This fact, however, is but of minor importance when compared to the mortification which any military man, situated as I am, must suffer on seeing those who have for years past been his acknowledged juniors in the service superseding him, under the provisions of the 69th paragraph in question. That such will be the case is a prevalent idea with some, and it tends to disturb their minds, under the impression that their future prospects in the service are imperilled.

Yet, for myself, I cannot but believe, as I have already stated, that such cases will receive due protection, more especially so as the late promotion scheme has been introduced, I understand, with the sole object of supplying a remedy whereby all supersession grievances consequent on the Indian army amalgamation shall be smoothed away.

When it be taken into consideration by the Commander-in-Chief that those officers who gained an advantage in the Indian army under the old system, by (comparatively speaking) rapid promotion, long before the amalgamation scheme was introduced, and at considerable expense to themselves, are now apprehensive of being brought under (to them) the withering influence of the Secretary of State's 69th paragraph under notice, I trust His Excellency will readily excuse me for thus venturing to address you on a matter which has, as yet, appeared only in the public journals.

From the Adjutant-General of the Army, Head Quarters, Poona, 19th August 1864 (No. 1,567), to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Bombay.

IN forwarding for the perusal of the Honourable the Governor-in-Council the accompanying letters, received from Lieutenant-Colonel Stanley, commanding 15th Regiment Native Infantry, and Captain Morris of that corps, I am directed by the Commander-in-Chief to state that, although His Excellency cannot support the views entertained by these officers, it seems desirable that Government should be in possession of the opinions which some officers hold on the late orders of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

From Major E. P. ARTHUR, Bombay Staff Corps, and Political Superintendent, Pahlunpoor, 18th August 1864 (No. 270), to the Adjutant-General of the Bombay Army, Poona.

I HAVE the honour to request you will be so good as to submit the following brief statement of the injurious operation of the last clause but one of paragraph 69 of the Despatch of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India, dated 17th June 1864, which will cause my being superseded by several officers in Her Majesty's Indian army.

2. I became a field officer on the 19th February 1858, being promoted for service in the field, and have gradually ascended in the line until nearly at the top of the list of majors.

3. I would respectfully beg to point out that the practical working of the paragraphs above quoted will be the introduction of one kind of supersession for another, and giving length of service a higher value than service in the field.

4. As the whole of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India's Despatch breathes a desire to prevent supersession, I cannot but think that the way in which it defeats its own object has escaped attention. I do not mean in any way to complain that I have been treated with injustice, for I fully recognise the right of the Government to promote such of their officers as they please.

5. I would merely solicit that the same care may be taken to prevent my supersession by old officers of the local service, as has been evinced to prevent their being superseded by officers of the Staff Corps.

6. I beg to submit one example in illustration of my case. Major Ashburner, of the 3rd Bombay Cavalry, was appointed to the service in 1837; he became a brevet major for length of service in 1864. Now, under the operation of the clause above quoted in paragraph 1, Major Ashburner becomes a lieutenant-colonel, and supersedes me in the line, who am five years and a half (5½) his senior as field officer.

7. It is obviously the desire of Her Majesty's Government that there shall be no supersession of one class of officers over another, and any promotion, which inadvertently causes it, must be opposed to the spirit of this Despatch.

8. Should his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief be pleased to determine that my representation is deserving of consideration, I would solicit its being brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India, with a view to officers, who have been promoted for service in the field, being treated with the same consideration which has been extended to local officers who are to receive brevet promotion for length of service.

From the Adjutant-General of the Army, Head Quarters, Poona, 29th August 1864 (No. 1621), to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Bombay.

THE Commander-in-Chief deems it expedient to forward all appeals consequent on the operation of measures of reform in the constitution of the army, notwithstanding that he may consider that they are untenable.

2. Such his Excellency believes to be the case with the enclosed appeal from Major Arthur, of the Staff Corps, which, in point of fact, amounts to this, that because Her Majesty on account of certain services was pleased to grant him brevet rank, the same prerogative is not to be extended with regard to other officers in this army, owing to considerations different in kind from that, to which Major Arthur owes his promotion.

3. His Excellency would request to call to mind a decision given at the instance of a Royal Commission which sat to determine on a claim of a character akin to that put forward by Major Arthur.

4. Certain colonels were promoted in the Crimea for service in the field in the year 1855. Subsequently, in order to rectify irregularities in the warrant of 1854, which had not been foreseen when it was issued, it was ordered that all lieutenant-colonels who held that rank prior to the 20th June 1854, should take rank as colonels from the 28th November of that year, consequently the service colonels, as they are called, who had superseded a great many lieutenant-colonels by their extraordinary promotion, were superseded by many of the latter in consequence of the last order above described.

5. Thus it happens that the advantage gained by the promotions on account of the field service was to a certain extent neutralized; against this the service colonels appealed; and as Sir William Mansfield understands from the reports he has read in the newspapers, their appeal was disallowed by a Royal Commission.

6. As the case put by Major Arthur is sure to be referred in Bengal, his Excellency would suggest that Major Arthur's appeal, together with this letter, be submitted to the Government of India, should the Honourable the Governor-in-Council see no objection.

Referred for the observations of the Commander-in-Chief. 23rd September 1864.

No. 693.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Bombay, 26th September 1864 (No. 2,605A), to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, Simla.

WITH reference to my letter, No. 2,411, of 6th instant, I have the honour to point out that, in my memorandum of the 2nd appended thereto, the case of Lieutenant-Colonel Lynch is erroneously given as an instance of failure of the late orders to re-adjust the relative positions of regimental and Staff Corps officers; but, Lieutenant-Colonels Lynch and Powell excepted, the name of any regimental officer in the second list would have fulfilled the argument,

Copy forwarded to the Secretary to Government of Madras for information.

(Signed) W. F. MARRIOTT,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

No. 694.—TELEGRAM from the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Military Department, Poona, 23rd September 1864, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Madras.

In my memorandum accompanying my letter of 5th September, the name of Lieutenant-Colonel Lynch is wrongly instanced, any regimental officer, except Lynch and Powell, would answer.

Referred to the Commander-in-Chief (Adjutant-General's Department), in connexion with the reference dated the 23rd instant.

24th September 1864.

No. 695.—From the Adjutant-General, Head Quarters, Ootacamund, 29th October 1864 (No. 925), to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George.

IN returning the enclosures received with letter from the Military Secretary to the Government of Bombay, dated 12th September 1864, No. 4,963, referred to the Commander-in-Chief on the 23rd idem, I have the honour, by order of his Excellency, to enclose a return of lieutenant-colonels superseded consequent on the operation of paragraph 69 of the Despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, dated 17th June 1864, No. 194, republished in G. O. G., 23rd August 1864, No. 324.

2. I am directed to observe, that the supersessions in this army appear to be quite as many in proportion as those which have occurred in the Bombay Presidency.

No. 696.—ORDER, No. 4206, 25th November 1864.

ORDERED that the foregoing letter from the Adjutant-General and its enclosure, be communicated to the Government of India, for submission to the Secretary of State, and that a copy thereof and of the following letter to the Government of India be furnished for the information of the Bombay Government.

(Signed) H. MARSHALL, Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

No. 697.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George, 25th November 1864 (No. 4207), to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department.

IN continuation of the two communications marginally noted, and to the remarks contained in the second paragraph, of the first of those communications, I am directed to forward, for submission to the Government of India, and eventual transmission to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, the accompanying letter from the Adjutant-General enclosing a Return of Lieutenant-colonels superseded consequent on the operation of paragraph 69 of the Secretary of State's Despatch,* No. 194 of 17th June 1864.

To Officiating Secretary to Government of India, 4th October 1864, No. 3510.
To Secretary to Government of India, 22d October, 1864, No. 3769.

* Published in G.O.G. 4th August 1864, No. 632.

No. 698.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George, 25th November 1864 (No. 4,208), to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Bombay.

WITH reference to the correspondence marginally noted, I am directed to forward, for the information of the Government of Bombay, the accompanying copy of a letter from the Adjutant-General, showing the effect in this Presidency of paragraph 69 of the Secretary of State's Despatch, No. 194 of 17th June 1864, and of the communication which has been addressed to the Government of India on the subject.

(True copies.)

R. HAMILTON, Lieut.-Col.,
Under Secretary to Government.

RETURN OF LIEUTENANT-COLONELS SUPERSEDED

NAMES.		SUPERSEDED BY							
1	Lt.-Col. G. P. Eaton, R.A.	Lt. Col. R. S. Dobbs.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Kelso.	Lt.-Col. W. G. Woods.	Lt.-Col. R. T. Snow.	Lt.-Col. J. Kitson.	Lt.-Col. G. turrock.	Lt.-Col. E. E. Miller.	2
2	Lt.-Col. J. G. Balmain, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	3
3	Lt.-Col. G. Selby, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	4
4	Lt.-Col. A. W. Macintire, C.B., R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	5
5	Lt.-Col. C. Cooke, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	6
6	Lt.-Col. T. H. Campbell, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	7
7	Lt.-Col. E. A. H. Webb, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	8
8	Lt.-Col. C. H. Hutchinson, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	9
9	Lt.-Col. F. G. Nuthall, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	10
10	Lt.-Col. A. T. Cadell, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	11
11	Lt.-Col. R. Macpherson, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	12
12	Lt.-Col. R. S. Dobbs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13
13	Lt.-Col. A. J. Kelso	Lt.-Col. W. G. Woods.	Lt.-Col. R. T. Snow.	Lt.-Col. J. Kitson.	—	—	—	—	14
14	Lt.-Col. G. Sturrock	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. J. F. Stevens.	Lt.-Col. A. H. A. Hervey.	Lt.-Col. R. A. Doria.	Lt.-Col. F. F. Warden.	15
15	Lt.-Col. A. C. Silver	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	16
16	Lt.-Col. J. P. Coode	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	17
17	Lt.-Col. J. F. Stevens	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	18
18	Lt.-Col. A. H. A. Hervey	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	ditto	ditto	19
19	Lt.-Col. D. Hamilton	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	20
20	Lt.-Col. R. A. Doria	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	ditto	21
21	Lt.-Col. D. Brown	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	ditto	22
22	Lt.-Col. G. S. Dobbie	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	23
23	Lt.-Col. W. G. Woods, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24
24	Lt.-Col. T. Thompson, S.C.	Lt.-Col. F. F. Warden.	Lt.-Col. H. T. Snow.	Lt.-Col. J. Kitson.	Lt.-Col. E. E. Miller.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	25
25	Lt.-Col. F. F. Warden, Infy.	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	26
26	Lt.-Col. W. T. Money, Infy.	—	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	27
27	Lt.-Col. A. V. Falls, R.A.	—	ditto	ditto	—	—	—	—	28
28	Lt.-Col. R. T. Snow, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29
29	Lt.-Col. J. Kitson, Infy.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30
30	Lt.-Col. T. Raikes	Lt.-Col. E. E. Miller.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Abbott, C.B.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	31
31	Lt.-Col. W. H. Freese, Infy.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	32
32	Lt.-Col. F. W. Bond, R.A.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	33
33	Lt.-Col. C. E. M. Walker, Infy.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	34
34	Lt.-Col. E. E. M. Walker, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	35
35	Lt.-Col. C. A. Purvis, S.C.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Abbott, C.B.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	36
36	Lt.-Col. H. D. Abbott, C.B., S.C.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	Lt.-Col. J. White.	37
37	Lt.-Col. T. Clerk, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	38
38	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden, S.C.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	—	—	—	—	—	—	39
39	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham, S.C.	ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—	40
40	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill, S.C.	ditto	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	41
41	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott, S.C.	ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—	42
42	Lt.-Col. J. H. M. Babington, S.C.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	Lt.-Col. J. White.	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. S. J. Batten.	43
43	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	44
44	Lt.-Col. H. Man, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	45
45	Lt.-Col. J. White, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46
46	Lt.-Col. A. Tod, S.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	47
47	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw, S.C.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. A. K. Gore.	Lt.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	Lt.-Col. W. J. Cooke.	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.	48
48	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	49
49	Lt.-Col. C. C. McCallum, S.C.	Lt.-Col. S. J. Batten.	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Peyton.	Lt.-Col. A. K. Gore.	50
50	Lt.-Col. S. J. Batten, S.C.	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	51
51	Lt.-Col. T. Greenaway, S.C.	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	52
52	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier, Infy.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	53
53	Lt.-Col. J. E. Mayne, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	54
54	Lt.-Col. F. J. Goldsmid, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	55
55	Lt.-Col. J. G. Halliday, Infy.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	56
56	Lt.-Col. H. Drury, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	57
57	Lt.-Col. D. G. Pollard, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	58
58	Lt.-Col. F. G. Kempster, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	59
59	Lt.-Col. A. R. Fraser, S.C.	—	—	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	60
60	Lt.-Col. A. L. Steel, S.C.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. R. S. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. W. T. Williams.	Lt.-Col. G. Harkness.	Lt.-Col. F. Young.	61
61	Lt.-Col. G. H. Saxton, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	62
62	Lt.-Col. A. N. Rich, Infy.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	63
63	Lt.-Col. G. F. Shakespear, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	64
64	Lt.-Col. F. J. B. Friesley, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	65
65	Lt.-Col. A. K. C. Kennedy, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	66
66	Lt.-Col. A. Howlett, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	67
67	Lt.-Col. H. Hoseason, S.C.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	68

RETURN OF LIEUTENANT-COLONELS SUPERSEDED.

SUPERSEDED BY

4	Lt.-Col. J. F. Stevens.	Lt.-Col. A. H. Hervey.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.						
5	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.					
6	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.				
7	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto				
8	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	8
9	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	9
10	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	10
11	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	11
12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
15	Lt.-Col. E. E. Miller.	Lt.-Col. W. F. Eden.	Lt.-Col. A. Wyndham.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	Lt.-Col. J. White.	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	15
16	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	16
17	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	17
18	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	18
19	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	19
20	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
21	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	21
22	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	22
23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23
24	Lt.-Col. F. H. Scott.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Russell.	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	Lt.-Col. J. White.	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	24
25	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	25
26	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	26
27	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	27
28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	28
29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29
30	Lt.-Col. H. Man.	Lt.-Col. J. White.	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. S. J. Batten.	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	30
31	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	31
32	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	32
33	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	33
34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34
35	Lt.-Col. J. White.	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. S. J. Batten.	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	35
36	Lt.-Col. A. Tod.	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Peyton.	Lt.-Col. A. K. Gore.	Lt.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	36
37	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	37
38	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	38
39	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	39
40	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	—	ditto	—	ditto	ditto	40
41	—	—	—	—	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	41
42	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier.	Lt.-Col. Hon. H. Arbuthnott.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. J. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. G. W. Peyton.	Lt.-Col. A. K. Gore.	Lt. Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	Lt.-Col. W. J. Cooke.	42
43	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	43
44	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	44
45	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	45
46	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	46
47	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	47
48	Lt.-Col. H. D. Innes.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48
49	Lt.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	Lt.-Col. W. J. Cooke.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Innes.	Lt.-Col. R. S. Wilson.	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.	Lt.-Col. W. T. Williams.	Lt.-Col. G. Harkness.	—	49
50	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	50
51	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	51
52	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	—	ditto	—	—	—	52
53	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. F. Young.	53
54	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	54
55	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	55
56	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	56
57	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	57
58	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	58
59	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	59
60	Lt.-Col. C. J. Fullerton.	Lt.-Col. M. Cholmeley.	Lt.-Col. H. E. Walpole.	Lt.-Col. F. C. Barber.	Lt.-Col. C. P. Molony.	Lt.-Col. J. D. Dale.	Lt.-Col. M. T. Ffrench.	Lt.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	60
61	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	Lt.-Col. A. F. Place.	Lt.-Col. R. S. Dobbie.	61
62	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	62
63	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	63
64	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	64
65	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	65
66	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	66
67	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	67

RETURN OF LIEUTENANT-COLONELS SUPERSEDED—continued.

SUPERSEDED BY.										
11	Lt.-Col. A. J. Greenlaw.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Innes.	Lt.-Col. R. A. Doria.	Lt.-Col. W. C. R. Macdonald.	Lt.-Col. A. R. Thornhill.	Lt.-Col. R. Woolley.	Lt.-Col. F. F. Warden.			
12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—			
15	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	Lt.-Col. W. J. Cooke.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Innes.	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.						
16	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto						
17	—	—	—	—						
18	—	—	—	—						
19	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto						
20	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto						
21	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto						
22	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto						
23	—	—	—	—						
26	Lt.-Col. G. W. Peyton.	Lt.-Col. H. D. Abbott, C R.	Lt.-Col. E. W. Boudier.							
27	ditto	ditto	ditto							
28	—	—	—							
29	—	—	—							
30	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.	—	—							
31	ditto	—	—							
32	ditto	—	—							
33	ditto	—	—							
34	—	—	—							
35	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.	Lt.-Col. W. T. Williams.	Lt.-Col. G. Harkness.							
36	—	—	—							
37	Lt.-Col. W. T. Williams.	Lt.-Col. G. Harkness.	—							
38	—	—	—							
39	—	—	—							
40	—	—	—							
41	—	—	—							
42	—	—	—							
43	—	—	—							
44	—	—	—							
45	—	—	—							
46	—	—	—							
1	Lt.-Col. G. W. Peyton.	Lt.-Col. M. C. Spottiswoode.	Lt.-Col. W. Vine.	Lt.-Col. W. J. Cooke.	Lt.-Col. W. G. Owen.	Lt.-Col. C. O. Lukin.	Lt.-Col. W. Swinton.	Lt.-Col. A. Cooper.	Lt.-Col. J. Daniel.	Lt.-Col. B. Hodson.
2	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto
3	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto
4	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto
5	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto
6	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto
7	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel, Adjutant-General.

APPENDIX C.

No. 114 of 1865.—Military Department.
To the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for
India.

Fort Saint George, 8th April 1865.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

Pro. of Gov-
ernment,
6 April 1865,
Nos. 75, 77 ;
No. 4 in the
Packet.

IN continuation of our Despatch in this Department, No. 377, dated 20th December last, we forward, for the consideration and orders of Her Majesty's Government, a letter from the Adjutant-General, giving cover to a return showing the effect on the lieutenant-colonels of the local service of the brevet promotions made under paragraph 69 of your Despatch, No. 194, dated 17th June 1864.

We have, &c.

(Signed) W. T. DENISON, T. PYCROFT,
J. HOPE GRANT, H. D. PHILLIPS.
(True copy.)

R. HAMILTON, Lieut.-Col.,
Under Secretary to Government.

PROCEEDINGS of the Madras Government, Military
Department, 6th April 1865.

READ the following papers :—

(No. 75).—From the Adjutant-General, Fort Saint George, 27th March 1865 (No. 222), to the Secretary to Government, Military Department.

* Vide Mem-
orandum
No. 885.

ON the 1st December last, the Commander-in-Chief submitted to Government a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Cooke, of the Staff Corps, pointing out that the brevet promotions which were notified in Orders on the 13th September 1864, had not effected the object for which they were granted by the Home Government; but they had, on the contrary, placed many officers of the Indian service in a far worse position than they were before.

2. The loss or gain to an officer by these brevet promotions can scarcely be ascertained with accuracy, until he has obtained the rank of lieutenant-colonel. An attempt has not, therefore, been made to look into the working of

this measure, as it affects the grades below the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

3. The Commander-in-Chief now directs me to submit, for the information of Government, the accompanying return, showing the effect of the brevet promotions of the lieutenant-colonels of the local service. A glance at the last two lines of the figures will satisfy Government that the return fully bears out what Lieutenant-Colonel Cooke alleged in his letter above referred to.

4. His Excellency directs especial attention to the memorandum attached to the return; out of the 32 officers whose cases are given, 23 are now far worse off than they were, or could ever be, consequent on the promotions under the Staff Corps warrant; and, of the whole number, five only are in a better position than they would have been without the amalgamation changes; and the benefit that these five have gained has been by superseding those whom they ought not to have passed over, for they never could have superseded them had the old Indian service remained unchanged.

5. The return shows that, in some cases, these Indian service lieutenant-colonels have passed over officers of the Staff Corps who were senior to them without reference to their promotion in the Staff Corps. Thus a grievance has been created for the officers of the Staff Corps by the measure devised to redress the complaint of those of the local service. The nominal roll of these superseded Staff Corps officers is also submitted for the information of Government. In addition to showing the extent to which these officers have been passed over by the juniors of the local service, this roll gives the instances of supersession of Staff Corps officers by Staff Corps officers which was also brought to notice in Lieutenant-Colonel Cooke's letter above alluded to; vide clause 2, paragraph 4. Sir Hope Grant considers that this last effect of the brevet promotions may possibly have been lost sight of when these promotions were ordered. It is scarcely likely that these officers would have entered the Staff Corps had they been aware that they would be liable to supersession by officers of their own corps, otherwise than by brevet promotion conferred for distinguished services in the field. All general brevets ceased in 1854, so it was supposed.

RETURN showing how the Regimental Lieutenant-Colonels of the Local Service and those promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel by Brevet, prior to the General Brevets ordered by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, in Despatch, dated 17th June 1864, were affected by Promotions made under the Staff Corps Warrant, and how their Positions in the General Gradation List are now affected by the Brevet Promotions ordered in that Despatch.

	NAMES.										
	J. Kitson (Local).	G. Sturrock (Local).	J. F. Stevens (Local).	A. H. A. Hervey (Local).	The Hon H. Arbuthnot (Local).	A. K. Gore (Local).	W. J. Cooke (Local).	H. D. Innes (Local).	R. A. Dorris (Local).	F. F. Warden (Local).	A. C. Silver (Local).
The Grievance— Superseded by Staff Corps officers, viz. The Redress:—	By 1 -	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 25 -	By 25 -	By 20 -	By 23 -	By 2 -	By 1 -	By 2.
By which the position lost as above, was recovered by the brevet promotions to the following extent, viz. —	By 1 -	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 25 -	By 23 -	By 18 -	By 17 -	By 0 -	By 1 -	By 0.
By which additional supersession has been occasioned by the brevet promotions as follows, viz. —											
By Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 0 -	No. 2 -	No. 3 -	No. 3 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 11 -	No. 12 -	No. 13.
By local officers - - -	No. 0 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 0 -	No. 1 -	No. 2 -	No. 6 -	No. 9 -	No. 10 -	No. 14.
By which officers who were senior both before and after the amalgamation changes, and until the brevet promotions, are now superseded by their juniors, viz. —											
Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 2 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 6 -	No. 4 -	No. 5 -	No. 4 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0.
Local service officers - - -	No. 10 -	No. 0 -	No. 2 -	No. 2 -	No. 14 -	No. 15 -	No. 16 -	No. 14 -	No. 3 -	No. 5 -	No. 0.
The Result:—											
Effect of the Staff Corps warrant (the Grievance) - - - - -	*Loss 1	Loss 2 -	Loss 2 -	Loss 2	Loss 25 -	Loss 25	Loss 20	Loss 23	Loss 2	Loss 1	Loss 2.
Effect of the brevet promotion (the Redress) - - - - -	*Gain 12	Loss 3 -	Loss 2 -	Loss 2	Gain 20 -	Gain 16	Gain 17	Gain 6	Loss 19	Loss 17	Loss 29.

—continued

	NAMES.										
	J. P. Coode (Local).	D. Hamilton (Local).	D. Brown (Local).	G. S. Dobbie.	E. W. Boudier (Local).	W. T. Money (Local).	W. H. Freese (Local).	C. E. M. Walker.	W. T. Williams	J. G. Halliday.	M. Cholmeley.
The Grievance— Superseded by Staff Corps officers, viz. The Redress:—	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 2 -	By 0 -	By 17 -	By 1 -	By 1 -	By 1 -	By 20 -	By 17 -	By 23.
By which the position lost as above, was recovered by the brevet promotions to the following extent, viz. —	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 5 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 14 -	By 0 -	By 9.
By which additional supersession has been occasioned by the brevet promotions as follows, viz. —											
By Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 13 -	No. 13 -	No. 13 -	No. 13 -	No. 0 -	No. 13 -	No. 13 -	No. 13 -	No. 0 -	No. 1 -	No. 1
By local officers - - -	No. 14 -	No. 12 -	No. 13 -	No. 11 -	No. 10 -	No. 12 -	No. 11 -	No. 11 -	No. 8 -	No. 13 -	No. 11.
By which officers who were senior both before and after the amalgamation changes, and until the brevet promotions, are now superseded by their juniors, viz. —											
Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 2 -	No. 0 -	No. 0.
Local service officers - - -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 3 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 5 -	No. 0 -	No. 2.
The Result:—											
Effect of the Staff Corps warrant (the Grievance) - - - - -	*Loss 2	Loss 2 -	Loss 2	Loss 0	Loss 17	Loss 1	Loss 1	Loss 1	Loss 20	Loss 17 -	Loss 23.
Effect of the brevet promotion (the Redress) - - - - -	*Loss 29	Loss 27 -	Loss 27	Loss 24	Loss 19	Loss 26	Loss 25	Loss 25	Loss 7	Loss 31 -	Loss 24.

—continued

	NAMES.										
	J. D. Dale.	R. S. Dobbie.	A. N. Eich.	W. J. Tweedie.	J. Buchanan.	C. S. Bivar.	W. H. Watts.	G. T. Radcliffe.	C. P. Y. Truscott.	C. E. Staunforth.	
The Grievance— Superseded by Staff Corps officers, viz. The Redress:—	By 20 -	By 25 -	By 23 -	By 23 -	By 20 -	By 20 -	By 20 -	By 20 -	By 20 -	By 20.	
By which the position lost as above, was recovered by the brevet promotions to the following extent, viz. —	By 6 -	By 4 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0 -	By 0.	
By which additional supersession has been occasioned by the brevet promotions as follows, viz. —											
By Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1 -	No. 1.	
By local officers - - -	No. 13 -	No. 20 -	No. 24 -	No. 26 -	No. 24 -	No. 24 -	No. 24 -	No. 24 -	No. 24 -	No. 24.	
By which officers who were senior both before and after the amalgamation changes, and until the brevet promotions, are now superseded by their juniors, viz. —											
Staff Corps officers - - -	No. 0	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0.	
Local service officers - - -	No. 5	No. 1 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0 -	No. 0.	
The Result:—											
Effect of the Staff Corps warrant (the Grievance) - - - - -	*Loss 20	Loss 25 -	Loss 23	Loss 23 -	Loss 20 -	Loss 20 -	Loss 20 -	Loss 20 -	Loss 20 -	Loss 20.	
Effect of the brevet promotion (the Redress) - - - - -	*Loss 22	Loss 41 -	Loss 47	Loss 50 -	Loss 45 -	Loss 45 -	Loss 45 -	Loss 45 -	Loss 45 -	Loss 45.	

* Of places in the General Gradation List.

Adjutant-General's Office, Fort St. George,
27th March 1865.

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel.
Adjutant-General.

APPENDIX C.

MEMORANDUM.

The measure devised in order to redress the grievances of the local service officers having been determined on, for the express purpose of restoring them to their former relative position with Staff Corps officers, attention is requested to the following observations:—

First.—That of the 32 local service lieutenant-colonels, whose names are given in the return, only six* have been restored to their former relative position with the Staff Corps officers by whom they were superseded.

Second.—That four† of these six have now (by the brevet promotions) been passed over by others of the Staff Corps, and that two‡ have been placed above Staff Corps officers who were senior to them irrespectively of their promotion in the Staff Corps.

Third.—That two§ of the same six officers have now lost just the same number of places in the gradation list as they did by the Staff Corps warrant,—that a third|| and fourth have lost respectively one and sixteen additional places while the remaining two¶ have gained, the former 12, the latter 20 places, by superseding local service and Staff Corps officers who have now valid ground for complaint in having been thus passed over.

Fourth.—That three** (of the 32) who have not altogether recovered their position with the Staff Corps officers by whom they were superseded, have gained considerably by superseding other Staff Corps officers and officers of the local

service, who would stand above them in the general gradation list, were it not for the amalgamation changes.

Fifth.—That 22†† (in addition to Lieutenant-Colonel Warden mentioned above) have now far more reason to complain of the remedy, than they had of the supersessions under the Staff Corps warrant. One officer who had lost nothing by the latter, being now a loser of 24 places in the gradation list—and others who had been superseded by one or two of the Staff Corps being passed over by 25, 26, 27, 29, &c.

Sixth.—That the remaining lieutenants-colonel‡‡ (of these 32), though he has not recovered his relative position with the Staff Corps officers by whom he was superseded, has a better position than he had, having lost only seven places in the gradation list instead of 20.

Finally.—That in no single instance does an officer hold the same relative position with his brother officers either of the local service or the Staff Corps, that he would do, had the Staff Corps not been formed, nor the brevet promotions for length of service ordered. In fact the great grievance, supersession, has been aggravated twenty, forty, and even fifty-fold by the brevet promotions.

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel,
Adjutant-General's Office, Fort Saint George, March 27, 1865. Adjutant-General.

NOMINAL ROLL of Lieutenant-Colonels of the Staff Corps who, by the Brevet Promotions ordered in the Secretary of State's Despatch, dated 17th June 1864, No. 194, have been superseded by their Juniors of the Staff Corps, as well as by their Juniors of the Indian Service, above whom they ought to stand in virtue of their Regimental Positions, or in virtue of previous Brevet Bank, independently of their Promotion in the Staff Corps.

Names.	Superseded by Juniors	
	Of the Staff Corps.	Of the Indian Service.
C. Cooke - - -	By 6	By 2
E. A. H. Webb - - -	" 6	" 2
T. Thompson - - -	" 12	" 9
H. D. Abbott, C.B. - - -	" 10	" 0
T. Clerk - - -	" 11	" 0
A. R. Thornhill - - -	" 7	" 8
J. H. M. Babington - - -	" 7	" 2
C. C. McCallum - - -	" 1	" 3
J. E. Mayne* - - -	" 0	" 13
F. J. Goldsmid* - - -	" 0	" 13

* N.B.—These two officers received brevet rank for distinguished services in the Crimea.

Adjutant-General's Office,
Fort Saint George, March 27, 1865.

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel,
Adjutant-General.

No. 76.—ORDER, No. 1305, 6th April 1865.

ORDERED to be forwarded for the consideration and Orders of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, in continuation of Proceedings of Government, No. 4456, dated 13th December 1864, copies being transmitted to the Governments of India and Bombay.

(Signed) H. MARSHALL, Colonel,
Secretary to Government,

2. These papers have been transmitted to the Secretary of State for the consideration and orders of Her Majesty's Government.

(The same to the Secretary to Government of Bombay,
Military Department.)

(True extract)
R. HAMILTON, S. W. C.
Under Secretary to Government.

No. 77.—From the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George, 6th April 1865, No. 1306, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department.

In continuation of my letter, No. 4457, dated 13th December last, I am directed to forward, for submission to his Excellency the Governor-General in Council, the accompanying copy of a letter from the Adjutant-General, giving cover to a return showing the effect on the lieutenant-colonels of the local service of the brevet promotions made under paragraph 69 of the Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, No. 194, dated 17th June 1864.

(Military.—No. 71.)

To His Excellency the Honourable the Governor in Council,
Fort St. George.

SIR, India Office, London, 22 June 1865.

Para. 1. I have considered in Council your letter, No. 114, dated the 8th April last, forwarding copy of a letter from the Adjutant-General of the Army, together with a statement showing the effect, on certain lieutenant-colonels of the local service, of the brevet promotions made under para. 69 of my Despatch, No. 194, dated 17th June 1864.

2. With the letter above mentioned, his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief at your Presidency has caused a

return to be submitted, containing the names of 32 lieutenant-colonels of the Madras Army who have been variously affected by the measure in question.

3. Upon this return his Excellency remarks as follows: "Out of the 32 officers whose cases are given, 23 are now far worse off than they were, or could ever be, consequent on the promotions under the Staff Corps warrant, and of the whole number five only are in a better position than they would have been without the amalgamation changes, and the benefit that these five have gained has been by superseding those whom they ought not to have passed over, for they never could have superseded them had the old Indian service remained unchanged."

4. Your Government are aware that the system of brevet promotion, the operation of which is here complained of, was adopted with a view to remedy the complaint made by many officers of the Indian army, and recognised as valid by the Royal Commission, in the following words, viz., that the rules under which the Staff Corps were formed, were complained of as "unjustly giving superior rank to many of the officers selected for those corps, and so causing extensive supersession of the officers remaining with the regiments."

5. The promotion in the Staff Corps was given according to the length of service, and the extended application of that rule to the whole army, has not only remedied the evil mainly complained of, viz., the supersession of officers in the regimental cadres by others of the same regiment who had joined the Staff Corps, but has introduced a system giving promotion upon one and the same principle to every officer in the service.

6. The cases of the 32 lieutenant-colonels brought forward by the Commander-in-Chief of your Presidency as evidence of the unequal working of the rule, are exceptional.

7. In order to meet the general complaint of the officers of the army, it was necessary that the remedial measure should take effect from the date of the formation of the Staff Corps. The brevet promotions consequently made under the operation of my Despatch, No. 194, of 17th June 1864, date from the 18th February 1861, while the whole of these 32 officers are lieutenant-colonels of a subsequent date. Having been, in most cases, as a result of recent orders, unusually fortunate in their promotion and not entitled to further or retrospective promotion by length of service, many of these officers have been, to a greater or less extent, superseded by officers of longer standing than themselves in the army, who have been promoted from a prior date by length of service.

8. I must remind your Government, that in considering the extent to which the interests of the officers of the army have been affected by the very extensive changes which it has been found necessary to make in the re-organisation of the Indian army, no just or sound conclusion can be arrived at, by a partial view of the operation of those measures.

9. I find, on looking over the list of the 32 lieutenant-colonels forwarded by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that there are very few who have not benefited largely by the several recent measures, that eleven of them received promotion to the substantive rank of major as a consequence of the retiring scheme published in 1861, and their attainment to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, in every case in less than three years from that time, has been the result of further measures carried out by Government and calculated to expedite promotion.

10. The average time in which an officer of the Madras army passed through the grade of major, prior to 1861, is, as you will find by reference to the Army List of that year, seven years. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the substantial advantages conferred upon these officers by the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government in connection with the reduction and re-organisation of the army in India.

11. Of the remaining 21 officers, all have had their promotion to the substantive rank of lieutenant-colonel expedited by recent measures, and many of them have been less than three years in the grade of major. Indeed, it ought to have attracted the notice of your Government, that two of the officers named in the list as having suffered great supersession (viz., 45 places on the general list), by the recent orders, Lieutenant-Colonels Radcliffe and Stainforth, were regimental captains in your Army List in July 1864, and have been raised through the grade of major to that of regimental lieutenant-colonel within the year, solely by the operation of those measures.

12. With this fact before me, it is not without surprise that I have observed in the letter from the Adjutant-General, forwarded with your Despatch, the expression of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's opinion, that of these 32

officers five only are in a better position than they would have been without the amalgamation changes.

13. I presume the meaning of the extraordinary statement made in the Adjutant-General's Memorandum, forwarded on this occasion by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, "that the great grievance, supersession, has been aggravated 20, 40, and even 50 fold by the brevet promotions," to be that in a few such cases as the above, where the officers had already received unprecedented promotion as a consequence of recent measures, the operation of the further measures ordered by my Despatch of the 17th June 1864, has been such as to cause a loss of 20, 40, or even 50 places on the general list, but it is obvious that the terms in which the statement is made are so general as to lead to the very different and extremely erroneous conclusion that the amount of supersession experienced by the officers at large by the formation of the Staff Corps has been thus largely aggravated by the very measures that were introduced with a view to remedying that supersession.

14. I must observe, moreover, that it was at the present time especially incumbent upon your Government to have inquired carefully into the accuracy of statements of this nature, before giving to them tacit sanction and support, by submitting them to Her Majesty's Government for their consideration.

15. As far as the interests of the army at large are concerned, a system of army promotion by length of service, such as has been now introduced, is perhaps less open to objection than any other that could have been adopted under the circumstances.

16. Objections of a nature similar to those now forwarded by your Government were submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Government of India in September 1864.

17. On that occasion Sir William Mansfield, then Commander-in-Chief of Bombay, remarked, "Now this order, as respects rank, puts all officers remaining with their regiments on a par with the Staff Corps officers, and provides the remedy for the regimental supersession complained of and acknowledged to have been a breach of the guarantee."

18. Sir Hugh Rose, then Commander-in-Chief in India, after pointing out the general effects of the recent measure, observed, "These calculations may not be absolutely exact, as they are taken from an Army List, dated 1st April last; but they suffice to illustrate the favourable working of the new arrangements in regard to officers who have remained with their regiments, and they show to the satisfaction of the Commander-in-Chief, that the local officers gain very important and solid advantages under the recently sanctioned regulations;" and the Government of India justly added, "It is scarcely possible that extensive changes in the army should ever be made without unfavourably affecting the position of some individuals relatively, i.e., as compared with that of some others, and the instance in question is no exception to this rule. But we think that there can be no doubt that by the measures ordered in your Despatch substantial hardship in the matter of promotion is avoided."

19. Your Government will, I trust, also discover that the general effect of recent measures has been favourable to the officers of the army as a body, and that, so long as this is the case, the circumstance of a few officers having gained or lost a few places on the general list of promotion, a circumstance that may probably never tell upon their substantial interests, cannot be considered as a valid objection to great and comprehensive measures designed for the benefit of the whole body.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES WOOD.

No. 388 of 1864.—Military Department.

(Separate.)

To the Right Honourable Sir CHARLES WOOD, Bart., G.C.B., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Sir,

WITH their letter, No. 55, dated 6th September 1864, the Bombay Government forwarded to you copy of their Military Secretary's letter, No. 2,411, of the same date, with annexures, from which you will have learned that in their opinion, the rule of promotion laid down in the 69th paragraph of your Despatch, No. 194, dated 17th June last, would fail to effect the object it was intended to secure, as expressed in the preceding paragraph, viz., the restoration to all officers of the Indian Military Services who had been superseded owing to the rules of promotion in the Staff Corps, the relative position as regards the officers of those corps which they held before the formation of the latter.

APPENDIX C.

2. We have now the honour to forward copy of a letter (and of our orders on it) from the Adjutant-General, No. 1,038 E., dated 29th September, communicating the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief of India on the representations of the Bombay Government, from which you will learn that, as supersession of officers of one regiment by those of another has been constantly occurring ever since the army has existed, and could indeed only be avoided by placing the whole in one general list for promotion, and as it is not asserted that your orders will not effectually prevent the supersession of every officer in the cadre of his own regiment, his Excellency cannot concur in the objections raised. So far from it, Sir Hugh Rose expresses his conviction that no more equitable scheme than the one adopted could have been devised to remedy the grievances complained of, without cancelling the amalgamation arrangements altogether.

3. It is scarcely possible that extensive changes in the army should ever be made without unfavourably affecting the position of some individuals relatively, *i.e.*, as compared with that of some others; and the instance in question is no exception to this rule. But we think there can be no doubt that, by the measures ordered in your Despatch, substantial hardship in the matter of promotion is avoided; and we therefore requested the Bombay Government not to delay the publication of the promotions in the Bombay army.

We have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN LAWRENCE.
H. B. HARRINGTON.
HENRY S. MAINE.
C. E. TREVELYAN.
W. GREY.

Fort William, 8 November, 1864.

From Colonel E. HAYTHORNE, Adjutant-General, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, No. 1,038 E., dated Head Quarters, Simla, 29th September, 1864.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the correspondence referred to in your docket, No. 67, dated the 19th instant, and I am in reply to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that the Commander-in-Chief does not think the Government of Bombay has in these papers shown a sufficient reason for suspending the positive instructions of Her Majesty's Government for the relief and benefit of the officers of the Indian armies, who consider themselves aggrieved by the arrangements consequent on the amalgamation.

Some officers who have been fortunate in their regimental promotion, will doubtless suffer supersession under the new arrangements, but the mass of the army will benefit largely.

Under the measures directed by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, the chief cause of complaint, as frequently brought to the notice of Government by his Excellency, *viz.*, the supersession of regimental officers by their juniors of the Staff Corps, has been removed entirely.

It may at the same time be observed that whilst some officers will continue to suffer supersession, the privileges now conferred on the army generally are specially advantageous to the officers who have not joined the Staff Corps, and to those who have been unfortunate in their promotion.

It is not for the Commander-in-Chief to question or discuss the measures deliberately sanctioned and directed by Her Majesty's Government in redress of the grievances of the officers of the Indian service, but his Excellency may be permitted to say that without cancelling the amalgamation arrangements altogether, he does not think that a more equitable scheme could have been devised than that which the Bombay authorities desire to suspend.

The Bombay Government adduce instances in which officers who remained with their regiments will be superseded by officers of the Staff Corps, but in no instance is it shown that any officer is or can be now superseded by a Staff Corps' officer of his own cadre. Since the army has existed officers of one regiment have superseded their less fortunate brother officers in other regiments, but this kind of supersession it would be impossible to obviate unless the whole of the officers of the army were placed on one general list for promotion.

Whilst bringing prominently to notice cases in which field officers of the local service will be superseded by officers of the Staff Corps in army and local rank,* the Bombay Government appears to lose sight of the cases in which Staff Corps officers will now be superseded by officers who have remained with their regiments.

For instance, Lieutenant-Colonel Richards, of the 3rd Native Infantry, supersedes (60) sixty Staff Corps field officers, besides field officers of other branches.

Lieutenant-Colonel Beale, of the 22nd Native Infantry, supersedes (12) twelve Staff Corps lieutenant-colonels.

Lieutenant-Colonel Adams, of the 12th Native Infantry, supersedes (7) seven Staff Corps lieutenant-colonels.

Lieutenant-Colonel Grant, of the 3rd Native Infantry, supersedes (69) sixty-nine Staff Corps field officers.

Lieutenant-Colonel Anderson, of the 1st Cavalry, supersedes (14) fourteen Staff Corps field officers.

Lieutenant-Colonel Ashburner, of the 3rd Cavalry, supersedes (58) fifty-eight Staff Corps field officers.

Lieutenant-Colonel Graves, of the 3rd Cavalry, supersedes (7) seven Staff Corps field officers.

Lieutenant-Colonel Boyd, 11th Native Infantry, supersedes (45) forty-five Staff Corps field officers.

And Lieutenant-Colonel Combe (at present 2nd Captain in his cadre) of the 18th Native Infantry, supersedes every major in the Bombay Staff Corps and two Lieutenant-Colonels.

These calculations may not be absolutely exact, as they are taken from an Army List dated 1st April last, but they suffice to illustrate the favourable working of the new arrangements in regard to officers who have remained with their regiments, and they show to the satisfaction of the Commander-in-Chief that the local officers gain very important and solid advantages under the recently sanctioned regulations.

The enclosures received with your docket under reply are herewith returned.

* Remark by Commission of 1865.—

These lieut.-colonels have also superseded regimental officers as follows:—

Lieut-Colonel Richards	-	-	41
" Beale	-	-	7
" Adams	-	-	4
" Grant	-	-	49
" Anderson	-	-	14
" Ashburner	-	-	11
" Graves	-	-	10
" Boyd	-	-	28
" Combe	-	-	The whole of the majors and 6 lieut.-colonels.

APPENDIX D.

No. 1.

MEMORANDUM by Lieut.-General GRIFFITH, R.A.

Lieut.-General Julius George Griffith, Colonel Commandant of Royal Artillery (21st Brigade), begs respectfully to submit his case for the consideration of the Royal Commission assembled under the authority of H.M. warrant dated India Office, 27th of June 1865, to obtain redress for his grievance, in consequence of his promotion being suspended without just cause.

Lieut.-General Griffith's commission bears date 4th February 1859. He was the senior Lieut.-General of Artillery of the Indian army at the date of General Ahmuty's death on 12th January 1864. He therefore claims, as he was entitled to by the rules and custom of the British army, to be promoted to the rank of General on the first vacancy occurring in the list of General Officers of Artillery.

By the 7th para. of H.M. warrant of the 1st January 1862, the following establishment of General Officers was fixed for the Indian Artillery, viz. :

5 Generals.
8 Lieut.-Generals.
13 Major-Generals.

26 Total.

But this proportion was altered and reduced by the 6th para. of H.M. warrant of 15th of June 1864 from 26 to 24 officers of those ranks.

Both these numbers have been assumed on false calculations, by which he is deprived of his proper rank and position in the Royal Army according to the established rules and regulations of the Ordnance Department of the British Army from the earliest date, as well as by the 74th paragraph of the Report of Royal Commissioners on the memorials of the officers of the Indian Army dated 9th November 1863, which fixes the number of General Officers, being Commandants of Artillery, in the proportion of 1 to 28 officers of subordinate ranks, which is now considered the strength of a battalion of Artillery.

He is therefore losing rank daily from the date of General Ahmuty's death on the 12th January 1864, as the accompanying correspondence plainly shows.*

He begs to append the proper calculation for regulating the number of officers of each rank, both in the separate list of General Officers for the Indian service, or in the amalgamated list from the date of amalgamation, viz., 18th February 1861, fixed by Act of Parliament, 21 & 22 of Vict., section 56, chap. 106, by which his promotion was

* Not appended, having reference to the claim to promotion only.

secured to him so long as he was borne on the strength of his regiment.

Any reduction required to be made in the artillery service should be made, according to custom, from the latest increase to the corps at large, at home or in India, and not partially, to affect the Indian corps only, affecting Lieut.-General Griffith's promotion in particular, as one of the oldest Commandants in the service, his commission as Commandant bearing date the 3d July 1845.

JULIUS GEORGE GRIFFITH,
Lieut.-General and Col. Commandant,
Boulogne-sur-Mer,
25th July 1865.

NOTE.

Lieut.-Gen. Griffith claims, as Senior Lieutenant-General of Artillery, under the allotment of general officers fixed for artillery in para. 7, of warrant of the 1st January, 1862, to be promoted in place of General Ahmuty of the Artillery.

By 1st clause of the above quoted warrant Lieut.-Gen. Griffith's position and further progress are left *in statu quo*.

Lieut.-General Griffith rose in due succession on the general gradation list of the three presidencies to be a major-general in the Indian army, and has so continued to rise to be, as he now now is, 7 on the list of lieutenant-generals, and on which list he will by seniority become a General.

He now claims promotion in place of General Ahmuty, a deceased General of artillery, but in whose place the Senior Lieut.-Gen. (Anderson) on the gradation list of the Indian Army has been promoted.

Lieut.-Gen. Griffith has subsequently quoted what he considers a parallel case to his own, viz., that Maj.-Gen. Conran of the Madras Artillery has been promoted on the vacancy of Lieut.-Gen. Powney of the Bengal Artillery; the fact of these two officers both belonging to the artillery was quite accidental. Maj.-Gen. Conran was the Senior Maj.-Gen. of the Indian army, and any vacancy amongst the lieut.-generals, whether of the engineers, artillery, cavalry, or infantry, would have given him his promotion. Lieut.-Gen. Griffith refers to the War Office army list, 7th September, 1865, page 53, as showing that the artillery officers rise in four distinct lists. This is the case for regimental promotion—3 Indian, 1 British—but this is quite irrespective of the promotion in the Indian army on the general gradation list.

R. CREWE,
Secretary.

No. 2.

PETITION by LIEUT.-COL. T. BROUGHAM, R.A.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of Lieutenant-Colonel T. Brougham, of the Royal Artillery,
Sheweth,

1. That your petitioner was for twenty-six years an officer in the Bengal Artillery of the Honourable East India Company.

2. That since the amalgamation of the forces of the Company with Her Majesty's your petitioner has been, and now is, an officer in the Royal Artillery, holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

3. That your petitioner was led to believe that in the execution of all measures for effecting the amalgamation of the forces of the Company with those of Her Majesty, the organization of the new (old Indian) brigades of Royal Artillery would be precisely similar to that of the old brigades, but in several respects this has not been done.

4. That the number of general officers of the late Indian artilleries is at present only 25, although a fixed establishment of 26 has been ordered; but this order is not to come into operation until all colonels, whose commissions as such bear date prior to the 18th February 1861, shall have been promoted to the rank of general officer, that is to say, in about six years from the present time; thereby still further delaying the intended assimilation of the now united regiment.

5. That by the above delay promotion has been retarded, and four lieutenant-colonels, and an equal number of each

of the lower grades, have been deprived of a position which they would otherwise have attained.

6. That since the amalgamation in February 1861, the grade of colonel in the new brigades has never been completed to the authorized number; and your petitioner, and all other officers of the lower grades, have in consequence suffered supersession, and loss of pay and rank, from not having been promoted to fill existing vacancies.

7. That whilst the pay of a lieutenant-colonel of the Royal Artillery is less, and that of a colonel greater than the pay of similar grades in the Indian Artillery, and the pay of a lieutenant-colonel serving in England having been reduced to that of a lieutenant-colonel of Royal Artillery, the pay of a colonel residing in England has not in like manner been raised to that of an unemployed colonel of Royal Artillery.

8. To secure equality of promotion in two corps, in which there are an equal number of lieutenant-colonels, captains, and lieutenants, it needs no demonstration to show that the number of superior officers (colonels and general officers) must be in the same proportion in both corps. In the old Royal Artillery (17 brigades) the number of superior officers, by casualties amongst whom the junior officers obtain promotion, is (86) eighty-six, while in the old Indian Artilleries (14 brigades) the number is only (44) forty-four; the proportion for the latter to give an equal chance of promotion should be (71) seventy-one.

9. The remedy for such a disparity of superior officers would be the formation of a fixed establishment of (26)

APPENDIX D.

No. 1.

No. 2.

APPENDIX D.
No. 2.

twenty-six general officers on a separate list from the line (the number recommended by the Royal Commission), with effect from the date of amalgamation, and the grant of a certain proportion of annuities to colonels on the same scale as in the Royal Artillery.

10. In consequence of a reduction in the number of "colonels' allowances" in the line of the Indian armies it has been ruled, that officers of the staff corps and local officers shall obtain those emoluments in twelve years after they attain the rank of lieutenant-colonel; and it is therefore only fair that the same boon, which does not in any way affect promotion, should be extended to the officers of the late Indian Artillery, more especially as their "colonels' allowances" have been reduced in a greater proportionate degree.

11. That the regimental retiring fund, to which your pe-

tioner subscribed for 26 years, has been extinguished by the amalgamation; your petitioner would in his present position have been entitled to receive from that fund a sum of 3,000*l.* on retiring from the service, but no compensation whatever has been afforded to him for this great pecuniary loss.

12. Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your honourable House that inquiries may be made into these matters, either by the appointment of a Select Committee of your honourable House for such purpose, or by such other means as to your honourable House shall seem fit; and your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c. &c.

(True copy.)

T. BROUGHAM, Lieut.-Col.,

Royal Artillery.

-30th April, 1865.

No. 3.

No. 3.

WARRANTS of 1st January 1862, and 15th June 1864.

7641/117

735.

VICTORIA R.

WHEREAS We have judged it expedient to approve of the amalgamation of the General and Field Officers of Our Indian Armies with the General and Field Officers of Our Regular Army; Our will and pleasure is that such amalgamation, and the promotion of the Officers to higher rank, shall be carried into effect in the manner prescribed in the Regulations hereunto annexed.

Given at Our Court at St. James's, this First day of January 1862, in the Twenty-fifth year of Our Reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,
G. C. LEWIS.

REGULATIONS.

1. The existing General Officers of either Army shall continue, as at present, on separate lists.

2. All Colonels of either Army who attained that rank prior to the 17th February 1861 shall be continued on separate lists as at present, and shall succeed on separate lists to the rank of Major-General, Lieutenant-General, and General, under the Regulations now in force for each Army respectively; but if all the Colonels on one of the separate lists shall have become Major-Generals, while some of the Colonels on the other separate list are still unpromoted, those Colonels shall have the benefit of vacancies occurring in the lists of Generals of either Army, and Colonels so promoted shall be placed on an amalgamated list of Major-Generals, from which promotion shall be made by seniority in succession to all vacancies in the higher grades, whether of the British or Indian service.

3. All Officers in either Army who shall have attained the rank of Colonel on or after the 17th day of February 1861, shall at once be placed according to the dates of their commissions, as Colonels on one general list, from which, so soon as the separate lists of Colonels are exhausted, promotion shall be made according to seniority in succession to all vacancies in the establishments of General Officers, whether of the British or the Indian Service, and Colonels so promoted shall enter upon the amalgamated list above provided, from which promotion shall be made by seniority in succession to all vacancies in the higher grades, whether of the British or Indian Service.

4. All promotions in the lower grades, in consequence of vacancies amongst General Officers shall, until the general fusion herein-after provided, fall in each case to that service to which the Officer creating the vacancy belonged; and such promotions shall be made under the Regulations now in force in either service.

5. When all the Colonels on the separate list of the Cavalry, Guards, and Line of the British Army, and on that of the Indian Army, shall have become Major-Generals, the whole of the Field Officers, including those of the Artillery and Engineers of both Armies, as well as Field Officer of the Royal Marines, shall be placed on one general list, from which all promotions shall be made up to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel inclusive, in succession to vacancies on the General Officer list; and from that time the senior Captain of the United Army and Royal Marines shall succeed to a Brevet Majority, under the 15th clause of the Warrant of the 14th October 1858.

6. Promotion to the rank of General Officer in the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers will continue to be carried on under the Regulations now in force, until all the Colonels of Artillery and Engineers, as the case may be, on the separate list of the Indian Armies, shall have become Major-

Generals; then the General Officers of the Artillery of the Indian Army shall be amalgamated with those of the Royal Artillery; and in like manner, the General Officers of the Engineers of the Indian Army, with those of the Royal Engineers; promotions to the rank of General Officer in the Ordnance Corps being made subsequently to their respective amalgamations from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian Artillery, and from one list of Colonels of the Royal and Indian Engineers.

7. The present Establishment of General Officers of Her Majesty's Indian Artillery and Engineers was fixed at the rate of one Officer for each Battalion,* but as these Corps are now being incorporated with the Royal Artillery and Engineers respectively, it is necessary that the proportion of Generals to combatant Officers, adopted for Her Majesty's Forces, should be extended to the Brigades and Battalions now being added to the Artillery and Engineers respectively. Eventually,

therefore, the Establishment of General Officers of the Brigades and Battalions now being transferred from the Indian Service, will be fixed at twenty-six for the Artillery and twelve for the Engineers respectively.†

8. If at the time of the amalgamation of the General Officers of Artillery and Engineers provided in the 5th paragraph of this Warrant there shall be more General Officers of the Indian Artillery or Engineers than the proportion fixed as their establishment, viz., 26 for the Artillery and 12 for the Engineers (a circumstance which might arise, from all promotions to the rank of General Officers in the Indian Service being now made on one general list, which includes officers of all branches of the Service), the excess shall be absorbed before a Colonel of the branch concerned can be promoted; or, if there be less than the established number, promotions shall be made to supply the deficiency from the general lists above mentioned of Colonels of Royal and Indian Artillery and Engineers respectively.

9. Upon the transfer of the present twelve Regiments of European Cavalry and Infantry of the Indian Army to the British Army, a like number of General Officers will be taken off the Indian Establishment, and will, as Colonels of such regiments, be transferred, according to the dates of their Commissions, to the fixed Establishment of General Officers of the British Army.

But as the number (12) of General Officers thus brought from the Indian Establishment is less than the proportion (15) of General Officers due to the number of combatant Officers belonging to the transferred Regiments, an addition of three General Officers shall on this account be made to the unattached list of the British Army at the time referred to in paragraph 8 of this Warrant.

And in making these additions to the list of General Officers, the proportions of the different grades of General Officers now on the Establishment of the British Army shall be maintained.

10. The Field Officers coming to the British Army with these Regiments shall take their position on the General list of Field Officers according to the date of their Army rank, by which their future promotion shall be governed.

11. The amalgamation of the Lists of General Officers, in accordance with these provisions, will in no wise affect

<i>Indian Artillery.</i>	<i>Artillery.</i>
4 Generals.	5 Generals.
8 Lieut.-Gens.	8 Lieut.-Gens.
13 Major-Gens.	13 Major-Gens.
—	—
*24	†26
<i>Indian Engineers.</i>	<i>Engineers.</i>
2 Generals.	2 Generals.
3 Lieut.-Gens.	4 Lieut.-Gens.
6 Major-Gens.	6 Major-Gens.
—	—
11	†12
*35	38

the system which regulates the succession to the Colonelcies of Regiments of the British Army, or to the Colonelcies' allowances of Her Majesty's Indian Forces.

12. The present Establishment of General Officers of the Indian Army, inclusive of Artillery and Engineers, consists of 25 Generals, 50 Lieutenant-Generals, 145 Major-Generals, which numbers are, however, liable to reduction.

But the proportion of Generals maintained on account of the Indian Establishment shall at all times be governed by the principles adopted in respect to the British Forces, both as to numbers and gradation.

And reduction shall be made by gradual absorption, and by the promotion of not less than one Colonel for three vacancies amongst General Officers, until Supernumeraries are exhausted.

VICTORIA R. War Office, 15th June 1864.

WHEREAS it has been represented to Us that it is expedient to cancel the Regulations (except Clauses 9 and 10 thereof) established by Our Royal Warrant of 1st January 1862, for the amalgamation of the General and Field Officers of Our Indian Armies with the General and Field Officers of Our Regular Army, and for the promotion of the Officers to higher rank: Our will and pleasure is, that instead of the provisions contained in Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 of the before-mentioned Regulations, which are hereby cancelled; those contained in the Regulations annexed to this Our Royal Warrant shall be established, and shall govern the promotion to the rank of General of the Officers of the Cavalry and Infantry of Our Indian Forces, the Officers of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers lately belonging to Our Indian Forces, and the Officers of Our several Staff Corps.

Given at our Court at St. James's, this 15th day of June 1864, in the 27th year of Our reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,
DE GREY AND RIPON.

REGULATIONS.

1. The whole of the Officers of Cavalry and Infantry of Her Majesty's Indian Army shall remain on the Indian General List as before the Warrant of 1st January 1862, and shall rise on that List to the rank of General Officer; the establishment of General Officers of the Indian Army being, from time to time, reduced in the manner herein after provided.

2. The Colonels of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers late of the Indian Army, who had attained that rank previously to the 18th February 1861, will continue to rise to the rank of General Officer on the Indian List; but when the last of such Colonels of Artillery or Engineers, as the case may be, is promoted to the rank of Major-General, the promotion of Officers in that branch of the service to the rank of General Officer upon the Indian General List shall in each case cease.

3. The whole of the General Officers of the Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers, as the case may be, on the Indian List of the three Presidencies will in each case be then removed from that List, and placed upon separate Lists for

ARTILLERY.	
Generals	8
Lieut-Generals	8
Major-Generals	10
	26
ENGINEERS.	
Generals	2
Lieut-Generals	4
Major-Generals	6
	12

Indian Royal Artillery and Indian Royal Engineers respectively, with an establishment of 26 General Officers for the former Corps, and 12 for the latter. If at the time of the creation of these Lists there shall be an excess in any grade of the General Officers of either arm above the prescribed establishment, the Supernumeraries shall be reduced by the absorption of one vacancy in every

three; and if the numbers of Generals of either arm shall be less than the establishment, the numbers shall be completed by the promotion of the senior Colonels of Artillery or Engineers, as the case may be, on the united Lists of the three Presidencies, according to their army rank.

4. Vacancies in each of these Lists will be filled as they rise by the promotion of the senior Colonel on the Indian Lists of Artillery or Engineers, as the case may be, according to army rank, and this shall continue until all the officers of the late Indian Artillery or Engineers respectively have risen to the rank of Major-General on their separate Lists. Then the General Officers on the Indian (Royal) Artillery List shall be incorporated with the General Officers of the British Royal Artillery, according to dates of commissions, and the General Officers of the Indian (Royal) Engineers with the General Officers of the British Royal Engineers. Thenceforward

ROYAL ARTILLERY.	
Generals	11
Lieut-Generals	18
Major-Generals	29
	58
ROYAL ENGINEERS.	
Generals	5
Lieut-Generals	9
Major-Generals	14
	28

the establishment of General Officers of the Royal Artillery will consist of 58, and the establishment of General Officers of the Royal Engineers of 28; and vacancies will be filled by the promotion of the senior Colonel of either Corps, according to army rank, under the Regulations of the British Service.

5. On the formation of separate lists of General Officers for (Royal) Indian Artillery or Engineers respectively, the whole of the Officers of the Indian Artillery or Engineers, as the case may be, including General Officers, will be removed from the List of the Indian Army and placed on the General List of the British Army; upon which the promotion up to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel inclusive will be made, indiscriminately with that of Officers of the Guards, Line, Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and Royal Marines, in succession to vacancies on the General Officers' List of the British Army and Royal Marines, and the Indian Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers thus amalgamated.

6. The number of General Officers on the present Indian establishment on account of the Ordnance Corps is 24 for the Artillery and 11 for the Engineers. The Indian establishment of General Officers will therefore be reduced to this extent on the transfer of Generals of Artillery and Engineers to separate Lists. If at the time of transfer there shall be upon the Indian General List more than 24 Generals of Artillery, promotions shall be made from the Colonels on the General List of the Indian Army to the extent of the excess; if there shall be less than 24 Generals of Artillery at the time of transfer, the establishment of Generals on the Indian List shall be gradually reduced by the absorption of one out of every three vacancies until the reduction of 24 on account of the transfer of Officers of Artillery shall be effected. The same course will be pursued in adjusting the transfer of Generals of Engineers.

7. Officers of the several Indian Staff Corps, who had attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel prior to the 18th February 1861, shall be promoted under Indian Regulations to the rank of Major-General on the Indian List, and shall rise on that List until they are transferred to the British establishment in the manner herein-after provided.

8. Officers of the several Staff Corps who had not attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel previously to the 18th February 1861, shall, as they respectively attain the rank of Colonel, be placed according to the dates of their Commissions on the General List of Colonels of the British Army, from which promotions shall be made, according to seniority, in succession to vacancies on the British establishment of General Officers, under the Regulations of the British Service; and the Colonels so promoted shall continue to rise on that establishment from the rank of Major-General, by seniority, in succession to all vacancies in the higher grades.

9. In order to provide for the promotion of officers of the Staff Corps so brought upon the General List of the Officers of the Army, the establishment of General Officers of the British Army shall be increased, and the establishment of General Officers of the Indian Army, upon which the Colonels of the Staff Corps of this class will no longer rise, shall be reduced in the manner following.

10. Whenever a Colonel of the Staff Corps whose name is borne on the Amalgamated List, would, if he had remained on the List of Colonels of the Indian Army, have attained the rank of Major-General, an addition of one shall be made to the British establishment of General Officers by the promotion of the senior Colonel on the Amalgamated List, whether he be a British Officer or an Officer brought in from the Staff Corps; and no promotion shall in such case be made to the rank of Major-General on the Indian List, which will be thus reduced by one General Officer for every such increase given to the British establishment.

11. By this means the British List of General Officers will, from time to time, be increased, and the Indian List of General Officers will, from time to time, be diminished, until the number of Officers reduced on the List of General Officers of the Indian Army, and the number added to the List of the British Army, shall amount to one for every 28 combatant Officers on the aggregate strength of the three Staff Corps; and thenceforward all vacancies amongst General Officers on the British List, by whomsoever occasioned, shall be filled by the promotion of the senior Colonel on the Amalgamated List of the British Army, whether of the Guards, Line, or Staff Corps, as the case may be.

12. On the first addition of a Major-General to the British establishment being made, in the manner laid down in paragraph 10, the whole of the Officers of the Staff Corps on the Indian List (including the General Officers) shall be transferred to, and take their places on, the General List of the British Army, according to the dates of their respective commissions, and shall rise thereon to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel inclusive, in succession to vacancies on the General Officers' List, indiscriminately with Officers of the

	Colonel.	Lieut.-Colonel.	No. of years served in rank of Lieut.-Col.
A. Tulloch	9 Nov. 1846	6 Mar. 1836	10
A. R. Dyce	9 " "	6 " "	10
J. W. Cleveland	9 " "	10 Apr. "	10
C. M. Bird	9 " "	16 Nov. "	10
T. G. Newell	18 Mar. 1847	3 Apr. 1837	10
P. Whannell	6 Nov. 1848	5 Mar. 1838	10
S. W. Steel	8 Mar. 1849	9 Apr. "	11
J. Leggett	8 " "	2 June "	11
M. Tweddle	19 " "	6 Sept. "	11
C. D. Dun	16 July "	4 May 1839	10
H. Dowker	14 Nov. "	28 Aug. "	10
B. Sergeant	14 " "	2 Sept. "	10
W. Watson	28 Mar. 1850	8 Oct. "	11
J. Garnault	28 " "	8 " "	11
J. Bell	28 " "	15 Feb 1840	10
W. Taylor	28 Sept. "	13 June "	10
W. Watkins	17 Feb. 1851	31 July "	11
J. Laurie	6 June "	4 Aug. "	11
J. E. Williams	30 " "	24 Sept. "	11
R. Alexander	16 Aug. "	23 Jan. 1841	10
J. D. Stokes	29 " "	6 Apr. "	10
J. B. Butterworth	6 Oct. "	17 June "	10
J. K. Luard	24 Mar. 1852	23 " "	11
G. Hutchinsson	15 Apr. 1853	1 Sept. "	12
A. Derville	20 " "	10 " "	12
R. H. J. Vivian	30 June "	15 Oct. "	12
T. L. Green	11 Oct. "	31 " "	12
J. Yaldwyn	15 Nov. "	5 Mar. 1842	11
B. B. Hutchins	2 Jan. 1854	12 May "	12
W. L. G. Williams	29 " "	28 June "	12
E. E. Bruce	5 July "	29 " "	12
W. Justice	28 Oct. "	29 Sept. "	12
John Clough	16 Nov. "	2 Oct. "	12
T. B. Forster	13 Apr. 1855	28 Dec. "	13
J. A. Howden	29 June 1855	2 Jan. 1843	12
A. Clarke	4 July 1856	6 Jan. 1843	13
E. Armstrong	15 Sept. "	19 " "	13
G. Grantham	4 Nov. "	17 Aug. "	13
			64) 736
Average No. of Years -			11

MADRAS CAVALRY.

Jno. Collett	12 Aug. 1839	1 May 1824	15
P. Cameron	12 Apr. 1843	1 " "	19
F. L. Doveton	18 Feb. 1845	31 May 1833	12
Geo. Sandys	7 Nov. 1847	13 " 1837	10
D. Macleod	19 Mar. 1849	19 Mar. 1839	10
			5) 66
Average No. of Years -			13

BOMBAY INFANTRY.

	Colonel.	Lieut.-Colonels.	No. of years served in rank of Lieut.-Col.
V. Kennedy	4 Sept. 1837	1 May 1824	13
E. Frederick	28 June 1838	1 " "	14
G. Brooks	8 Oct. 1839	1 " "	15
A. Robertson	12 Mar. 1840	1 " "	16
P. Lodwick	9 Nov. "	21 " "	16
J. Morse	15 Jan. 1841	2 June "	17
T. Morgan	27 Dec. 1843	2 Apr. 1827	16
D. Barr	4 July 1844	11 " 1828	16
F. Farquharson	8 Mar. 1845	21 Jan. 1829	16
Sir H. Pottinger	4 June "	17 Mar. "	16
J. Gibbon	9 " "	25 May "	16
S. Hughes	16 Aug "	9 Feb. 1830	15
J. Sherriff	21 Jan. 1846	7 April "	16
R. Taylor	21 " "	7 Sept. 1831	15
M. Bagnold	21 " "	7 Oct. 1832	14
C. James	2 Mar. "	8 July 1833	13
J. Dunsterville	29 Dec. "	10 " "	13
C. Payne	9 June 1847	16 Sept. "	14
C. Ovals	15 Aug. "	5 " "	12
D. Capon	26 Feb. 1848	30 May 1836	12
W. Robertson	28 " "	25 July "	12
M. Soppitt	3 July "	26 Jan 1838	10
W. Spiller	21 June 1849	28 June "	11
G. Moore	9 July "	28 " "	11
T. Leighton	20 Sept. "	28 " "	11
F. Stalker	15 May 1850	28 " "	12
G. Wilson	21 Oct. "	8 Oct. 1839	11
F. Farrell	2 Feb. 1851	29 Nov. 1840	11
H. Roberts	17 Feb. 1852	23 " 1841	11
W. Casage	25 June "	23 " "	11
D. Forbes	17 Nov. "	23 " "	11
H. Cracklow	27 Nov. 1853	19 Aug 1843	10
A. Reid	11 Feb 1855	20 Sept 1844	11
H. Hancock	27 Mar 1855	6 June 1845	10
W. Smee	15 Sept. 1855	21 Jan. 1846	9
			36) 457
Average No. of Years -			12½

BOMBAY CAVALRY.

B. Sandwith	29 Apr. 1839	7 Nov. 1837	2
D. Cunninghame	19 Oct. 1849	29 Apr. 1839	10
M. Stack	7 Dec. 1850	24 June 1848	2
			3) 14
Average No. of Years -			4½

No. 2.

STATEMENT showing the actual NUMBER of OFF RECKONINGS in CAVALRY and INFANTRY Regiments in 1856.

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
BENGAL	10	78
MADRAS	8	56
BOMBAY	3	33
		21
		167

STATEMENT showing the NUMBER of OFFICERS in receipt of OFF RECKONINGS in 1865.

No fixed establishment in 1865.

	Cavalry.	Infantry.
BENGAL	8	65
MADRAS	6	50
BOMBAY	3	29
		17
		144

No. 3.

STATEMENT showing the NUMBER of Regimental LIEUTENANT-COLONELS and MAJORS retired on increased pension in December 1861.

	Cavalry.		Infantry.	
	Lt.-Colonel.	Major.	Lt.-Colonel.	Major.
BENGAL	9	4	47	42
MADRAS	7	8	42	25
BOMBAY	—	1	21	13
		16	13	110
		13	80	

MAJORS made LIEUTENANT-COLONELS consequent upon the retirements.

	* Cavalry.		Infantry.	
	Cavalry.	Infantry.	Cavalry.	Infantry.
BENGAL	6	24	9	47
MADRAS	4	21	7	42
BOMBAY	0	11	0	21
		10	56	16
		16	110	

* Inclusive of one Major-General. Exclusive of Artillery and Engineers.

Promotions were made in every case in the room of those officers who first received the 50% bonus and afterwards the special annuities.

India Office, 21st July 1865.

T. T. P.

L 3

APPENDIX E.

No. 4.

No. 4.

EXTRACT from a MINUTE by his Excellency Sir W. MANSFIELD, dated 30 November 1862.

"The ten (10) years' scheme will require much working out with regard to its effect with staff corps officers, who are entitled to claim the rank of lieutenant-colonel after a certain number of years on the staff, and 26 years from the date of entering the army. Thus, if this be conceded an officer will succeed to the colonel's allowance in 36 years, whereas I believe the average under the old arrangement to be just (39) thirty-nine years—*vide* last Army List, and services of colonels of infantry from date of appointment. The average taken of the lieutenant-colonels of European

Infantry, and of the 22nd Regiment to which Colonel Sir Charles Stewart was appointed recently, that not being entered in the Army List."
(Signed) "W. R. MANSFIELD."

EXTRACT from further MINUTE by his Excellency Sir W. MANSFIELD, dated 7 January 1862.

"The average alluded to in my last Minute was calculated from the October Army List, with the exceptions noted by me.

(Signed) "W. R. MANSFIELD."
"7 January 1862."

APPENDIX F.

APPENDIX F.

ILLUSTRATIONS of SERVICE of CAPTAINS in the THREE PRESIDENCIES who have completed 25 years Service.

Regiment.	Rank.	Name.	Present Service.	Probable period to Lieutenant-Colonel.	To Colonel's allowance.	Will have a Total Service.
13th Bengal N. I.	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	T. P. Waterman	27	Major 67 on list	{ 4 years to Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 48
22nd "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	W. Hicks	27	Major 21 on list	{ 2 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 46
23rd "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	E. Bradford	26	Major 39 on list	{ 2½ " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 45½
27th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	T. W. Seager	26	Major 45 on list	{ 3 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 46
34th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	P. H. K. Dewaal	28	Major 1 on list	{ 5 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 43
39th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	C Jackson	27	Major 17 on list	{ 2 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 46
43rd "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	W. Q. Pogson	27	Major 43 on list	{ 3 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 47
25th Madras, N.I.	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	G. Harkness	28½	Major 18 on list	{ 2 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 47½
"	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	C. P. Malony	27½	Major 18 on list	{ 5 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 49½
11th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	C. J. Fullerton	27½	Major 7 on list	{ 1 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 45½
34th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt. Col.	N. T. French	27½	Major 38 on list	{ 2 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 35½
"	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	A. F. Place	27½	Major 38 on list	{ 5 " Major 5 " Lt. Col.	12 49½
6th "	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	W. Swinton	27	Major 8 on list	{ 6 " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 50
7th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Lt.-Col.	B. Hodson	27	Major 19 on list	{ 2½ " Major 5 " Lt.-Col.	12 46
3rd Bombay, N.I.	{ 1st Captain Bt. Major	E. Grant	26	Major 29 on list	{ 2 " Major 4 " Lt.-Col.	12 44
"	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Major	W. A. Neal	25	"	{ 4 " Major 4 " Lt.-Col.	12 45
11th "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Major	W. L. Kahusue	25	Major 15 on list	{ 2 " Major 2 " Lt.-Col.	12 41
18th "	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Major	H. E. Jacob	25	Major 35 on list	{ 7 " Major 4 " Lt.-Col.	12 48
19th "	{ 2nd Captain Bt. Major	H. J. Day	25	Major 10 on list	{ 5 " Major 4 " Lt.-Col.	12 46
22nd "	{ 1st Captain Bt. Major	J. G. Scott	26	Major 5 on list	{ 1 " Major 4 " Lt.-Col.	12 43

APPENDIX G.

APPENDIX G.

No. 1.

No. 1.

EXAMPLES by 14 PETITIONS, showing the SUPERSESSION of different Classes of OFFICERS.

To the Honourable The Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of Gordon Sutherland Morris, a Captain in Her Majesty's Indian Army, Bombay Presidency.

Showeth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East India Company in the year 1852; consequently the pay,

privileges, pension, advantages, &c. of the service have been guaranteed to him by Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106.

2. That in the year 1863 Her Majesty was graciously pleased to nominate a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on several subjects complained of in sundry memorials made by officers of the late East India Company's service.

3. The Commissioners so nominated decided and reported that the guarantee given by your Honourable House had in several instances been departed from; consequent on which decision and report, after very considerable delay,

the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India was pleased to grant concessions which he considered would meet all requirements. That they will by no means do so is evident from the following example.

4. According to para. 68 of the despatch of the Secretary of State for India, dated 17th June 1864, conveying these concessions, all officers of the Indian army should retain the relative position as regards Staff Corps officers, which they held before the formation of those corps. Your petitioner was promoted to his present rank of captain on the 13th June 1860, after having served for eight years, and elected to remain in the Local Indian Service on its transfer to the Crown. Your petitioner, therefore, under the operations of the Amalgamation Scheme cannot possibly retain the position in the army which he held previous to the formation of the Staff Corps, as on the 14th June 1865 two officers now junior to your petitioner in the army as captains will be promoted to the rank of major for length of service, and from that date until the 13th June 1872, when your petitioner will become entitled to a brevet majority, he will be continually retrograding by the promotion of others over his head, who will during these seven years be promoted in the army for length of service. The number of officers in the Bombay army alone who will thus supersede your petitioner amounts to 132, of whom 15 were lieutenants when the above-mentioned despatch was published.

5. Your petitioner has patiently sought redress of this injury, but up to this period has sought in vain, and he therefore must now trust to your Honourable House insisting on the guarantee, so considerably and judiciously given, being thoroughly fulfilled. This injury is entirely attributable to the formation of the Indian Staff Corps, in the organization of which measures were introduced which unfortunately completely upset the rules regarding promotion formerly in force, and guaranteed to the service by Parliament. The formation of these corps, whilst conferring considerable benefit on some officers, caused serious injury to the prospects of from 1,000 to 1,500 captains and senior lieutenants, and it is as one of these so seriously injured that your petitioner seeks redress.

Your petitioner humbly begs your Honourable House to take the case of your petitioner into favourable consideration, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

G. S. MORRIS,
Captain 15th Regiment Bombay
Native Infantry.

Camp Mhow,
22nd March 1865,

From Captain W. M. Frazer, 25th Regiment M. N. I., to
Colonel Crewe, Secretary to Royal Commission, Cannon Row, London.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to annex a list showing the names of 73 officers (51 in the Staff Corps and 22 in Native Regiments) who have superseded me by joining the Staff Corps or received brevet rank given to remedy such supersession, and shall feel obliged by your bringing my case to the notice of the Royal Commission.

The Madras quarterly army list, corrected to 31st March 1865, will satisfy you as to the correctness of this statement:—

Officers in the Staff Corps.

Capt. A. V. Gordon.	Capt. G. A. Walker.
" W. H. R. Godfrey.	" W. Munro.
" A. S. Hearn.	" C. J. Smith.
" W. A. Worsop.	" C. C. Minchin.
" T. C. Georges.	" F. C. Taylor.
" F. A. Fenton.	" W. Hands.
" F. J. Millar.	" J. C. Bailie.
" R. C. A. Marshall.	" F. T. Pollok.
" T. W. Stansfeld.	" W. C. Palmer.
" W. M. Williams.	" G. M. Payne.
" J. Simpson.	" J. V. Morris.
" W. P. Harrison.	" C. B. L. Smith.
" A. M. Davies.	" E. L. Hankin.
" C. S. B. Walton.	" D. Standen.
" R. K. Marquoid.	" E. Hill.
" I. L. Benwell.	" F. M. Raynsford.
" B. H. W. Magrath.	" W. A. Mesham.
" C. G. Blomfield.	" H. H. Foord.
" B. F. Hegshaw.	" F. G. Hawkin.
" H. Fraser.	" J. C. Middleton.
" S. Galbraith.	" H. T. Stuart.
" H. D. B. Smith.	" H. C. Menzies.
" J. P. Pedler.	" J. D. Vallance.
" C. H. Beldek.	" H. J. A. Teed.
" H. T. Duncan.	" J. A. Campbell.

Officers in Native Regiments.

-Capt. R. Brown.	Capt. W. H. L. Fuller.
" R. Farrar.	" W. Mercer.
" D. C. G. Strettell.	" A. R. T. Passingham.
" W. M. Parrott.	" R. C. Lavie.
" A. H. M. Dickey.	" J. Swiney.
" T. R. Griffith.	" C. J. K. Bell.
" P. Salter.	" W. Huddleston.
" E. Cave.	" F. J. H. Burnes.
" T. O. Neill.	" F. T. Miller.
" W. Cunningham.	" A. T. Searle.
" H. C. Le B. Newbery.	" A. Drury.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
W. M. FRAZER,
Capt. 20th Regt. M.N.I.

97, Lower Gardiner Street, Dublin,
27th July 1865.

APPENDIX C

No. 1.

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and
and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of Kenneth Macaulay, a
major in Her Majesty's Indian Army, Madras
Presidency.

Showeth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East India Company in the year 1841, consequently the pay, pension, privileges, advantages, &c. of that service have been guaranteed to him by Act 21 & 22 Vict. cap. 106.

2. That in the year 1863 Her Majesty was graciously pleased to nominate a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the several subjects complained of in sundry memorials made by officers of the late East India Company's service.

3. That the Commissioners so nominated did report on the several subjects submitted for their consideration, but some of the points were decided on an ex parte statement from the India Office. Your petitioner alludes more particularly to the regimental bonus system, as it existed in the Indian army previous to the amalgamation, in referring to which statements were made by the India office authorities, which statements, in all fairness, should, before the final report of the Commission have been referred to the Committee nominated to act in your petitioner's behalf, when they would have been easily refuted. By the sudden compulsory abolition of these benefit funds your petitioner has been entirely deprived of that provision for the future, to secure which your petitioner had, with the full knowledge and more than tacit concurrence of his late masters, long submitted to pecuniary privations.

4. By the operation of a scheme of redress, embodied in the Despatch of the Secretary of State for India, No. 194, dated 17th June 1864, his principal grievances are actually aggravated to a most extraordinary degree. When your petitioner last appealed to your honourable House against supersession he had been superseded by several junior officers, one of whom a junior captain in his own regiment, who had gone over his head as substantive major in the Staff Corps. The effect of Sir Charles Wood's scheme of redress is, that your petitioner has been superseded by a number of captains being made majors and even lieutenant-colonels over his head by brevet. Your petitioner thus suffers in a similar manner as if he had been sentenced by court-martial to a loss of army rank.

5. Your petitioner begs further to bring to notice that the retired lieutenant-colonels of 1861 are still borne on the effective lists to "regulate" promotion, as it is termed. This measure is most extraordinary; no nation in the world retains on its effective lists of officers the names of those who are borne on the pension lists.

6. Your petitioner has patiently sought redress of grievances which he has now been suffering from for nearly four years, but up to this period has sought in vain, and he, therefore, must now trust to your honourable House insisting on the guarantee so considerably given being thoroughly fulfilled. Nearly all the injuries sustained are attributable entirely to the formation of the Indian Staff Corps, in the organization of which measures were introduced which unfortunately completely upset the rules regarding promotion formerly in force, and guaranteed to the service by Parliament. Redress can only be effectually obtained by either the thorough dissolution of the several Staff Corps, or by extending to all officers who were in the service previous to the amalgamation promotion to substantive rank, with all retrospective advantages, on the same terms as is granted to officers of those corps.

APPENDIX G.
No. 1.

Your petitioner humbly begs your honourable House to take the case of your petitioner into favourable consideration, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(Signed) K. MACAULAY,
Major, 23rd Regiment, L.I.

Trichinopoly, 15th November 1864.

The Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of Henry Earl Read, a captain and brevet-major in H.M.'s Indian army, Bengal Presidency;

Showeth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East India Company in the year 1839, consequently the pay, pension, privileges, advantages, &c. of that service have been guaranteed to him by Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.

2. That your petitioner humbly begs to lay before your honourable House that he considers these guarantees to have been departed from, as will appear below.

3. Your petitioner would beg to point out in the first instance that, by the decision of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, active employment on the staff was not allowed to count for the term of staff service necessary to qualify him for admission to the Bengal Staff Corps, in the superior grade of major; secondly, though from his then length of service your petitioner was in a condition to have joined the Staff Corps as major, yet his having only 5 years 10 months and 5 days of permanent staff employ up to the actual date of his making over charge, precluded his joining the Staff Corps in that grade, though he had acted for 9 months with his regiment as adjutant, and 5 months on the brigade staff, or a total of 7 years continuous staff employ; thirdly, that though your petitioner's permanent service was only reckoned to the 10th August 1853, his name did not appear in G.O. as relieved from civil employ until the month of December 1853, as being placed at the disposal of the military department, yet none of that period was allowed to count by the construction of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, although it had been ruled as service by his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India; and, fourthly, that in consequence of this your petitioner was superseded by his next regimental junior, who was allowed to enter the Staff Corps as a major, thereby violating the pledge given that all rights and privileges should be continued to the officers of the late armies of the three presidencies. And further, though by the late warrant your petitioner has been promoted to the rank of major by brevet, from the date of formation of the Staff Corps, that your petitioner's position as a captain with mere captain's pay remains unaltered; whilst his more fortunate junior has been enjoying all the benefits of substantive pay and promotion, during that period.

4. And further, your petitioner begs to bring to the notice of your honourable House that, by the retention on the cadre of his regiment of the names of officers removed to the Staff Corps, his promotion has been retarded, and though these three officers so retained are all entitled by their service to be lieutenant-colonels in the Staff Corps with full pay of their rank, your petitioner, though from his service he will be entitled to his brevet-lieutenant-colonelcy, in July next (1865), will only have the mere pay of a captain, whilst his junior has been drawing the substantive pay of a major since the 18th February 1861.

5. Your petitioner would further beg humbly to lay before your honourable House that though he has been honoured with the thanks of Her most gracious Majesty, and was recommended for a brevet-majority for his service during the mutiny (as the copies of documents A and B* attached will prove), he is still in the position of a captain, and drawing the bare pay of that rank, and has sustained heavy pecuniary loss, inasmuch as had the amalgamation of the Bengal army not taken place he would have been entitled to receive from the junior officers of his regiment a sum of money which would have enabled him to retire on a competency, which he cannot now do, though he has contributed to the buying out of officers senior to himself.

6. Your petitioner has patiently sought redress of injuries which he has now been suffering from for nearly four years, but up to this period has sought in vain, and he, therefore, must now trust to your honourable House, insisting on the guarantee so considerably and judiciously given being thoroughly fulfilled; and this he humbly submits can only be carried out by putting him on the same footing as his more fortunate brethren in the Staff Corps, in point of

regimental pay, as well as rank, or by giving your petitioner his standing in the Staff Corps from the date of its formation, he having been precluded from joining it for the reasons stated in para. 3.

Your petitioner humbly begs your honourable House to take the case of your petitioner into favourable consideration, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

H. E. READ,
Captain and Brevet-Major,
Late 50th Regiment, Bengal N.I.

Roorkee,
4th February, 1865.

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of John Penrose Coode, a lieutenant-colonel in Her Majesty's 37th regiment, Madras army;

Showeth,—

I. That your petitioner entered the service of the Honourable East India Company on the 6th day of October 1838, and has therefore served in Her Majesty's Indian Army for a period of 26 years.

II. That your petitioner, having risen to the rank of regimental major on the 30th of November 1856 at a considerable pecuniary sacrifice, fully expected to rise by seniority to the higher ranks and consequent benefits, as all his former rights and privileges were guaranteed to him, by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106; 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100. ss. 38, 56, & 58; but your petitioner humbly represents this guarantee has been infringed—

Firstly, by the promotion of majors, your petitioner's juniors in that rank at the time of the formation of the Staff Corps, to the rank of lieutenant-colonel in that corps, thereby superseding him.

Secondly, by the operation of the despatch dated 17th June 1864, No. 194, by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, whereby your petitioner has been further superseded by 26 officers of the Madras army, some of whom were captains and only promoted to major on the date your petitioner obtained his promotion to lieutenant-colonel.

Thirdly, that your petitioner commanded the station of Vizianagram for some months, and has now been obliged, owing to the operation of the despatch dated 17th June 1864, No. 194, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to hand over the command to an officer whose army rank as major was, previous to the receipt of the said despatch and consequent promotions, not only junior to that of your petitioner, but who has actually been serving under him during his command.

III. The above, together with sundry other innovations which the amalgamation of the two services brought about, have most seriously and injuriously affected your petitioner's future prospects, both professional and pecuniary, by enabling officers, who, under the old régime could not by any possibility have commanded your petitioner, now to do so, by placing them over his head.

IV. That the carrying out of the provisions of para. 69, of the despatch dated 17th June 1864, No. 194, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, has failed to effect the object proposed in para. 68 of the same despatch, whereby your petitioner should have been reinstated in the position he held before the formation of the Staff Corps.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your honourable House to cause such steps to be taken as in your wisdom you may deem fit, for relieving your petitioner of the grievous injuries he is now suffering from, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

JOHN PENROSE COODE,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
37th Regiment
Madras

Vizianagram,
1st October 1864.

To the honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of William Taylor, a lieutenant-colonel in Her Majesty's Indian Army, Madras Presidency.

Showeth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East India Company in the year 1836, consequently the pay, pension, privileges, advantages, &c. of that service have been guaranteed to him by Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.

2. That in the year 1863 Her Majesty was graciously pleased to nominate a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the several subjects complained of in sundry

* These documents not received.—R.C.

memorials, made by officers of the late East India Company's service.

3. The Royal Commission above alluded to decided and reported that the guarantee given by your honourable House had in several instances been departed from; consequent on which decision and report, after very considerable delay, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India was pleased to grant concessions, which he considered would meet all requirements; but they have by no means done so.

4. Your petitioner has already memorialized your honourable House regarding his supersession by officers in the Staff Corps; but now, owing to the late rules giving brevet rank for length of service, he is also superseded by 12 officers of the local service, not one of whom could by any possibility, have superseded your petitioner under the old rules.

5. Your petitioner paid large sums of money in order to obtain his present position in the service; and he now by the above-mentioned supersession finds himself deprived of those advantages he paid so dearly to obtain, and his chance of a brigade has become so remote as to be hopeless.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your honourable House to cause such steps to be taken as in your wisdom you may deem fit for relieving your petitioner of the grievous injury he is now suffering from, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

W. T. MONEY,
Lieutenant-colonel,
31st Regiment, T. L. I.

Waltair,
21st November 1864.

Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co.'s Agency, 45, Pall Mall,
London.

From Major A. Y. Sinclair, H.M.'s 26th Regiment
Bombay N.I.

21st August 1865.

To Colonel Crewe, Secretary Royal Commission, Cannon
Row, London, S.W.

Memorandum.

The under-mentioned officers on the cadre of my regiment will supersede me in the substantive rank of major on the dates opposite their respective names:—

Captain F. P. Mignon - - - 13 June 1866.
" C. A. Collier - - - 3 August 1866.
" C. F. F. Chamberlain - 13 June 1866.
" L. M. Davies - - - 17 February 1867.

I am a brevet-major of the 1st February 1864, but shall not be a substantive major till Major J. T. Annesley is promoted to lieutenant-colonel, 15th October 1868.

A. Y. SINCLAIR,
Major H.M.'s Bombay Army.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom
of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of Alfred Becher, a captain
and brevet-major in Her Majesty's Indian
Army, Bombay Presidency.

Sheweth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East
India Company in the year 1842, consequently the pay, pen-

sions, privileges, advantages, &c. of that service have been guaranteed to him by Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.

II. That in the year 1863 Her Majesty was graciously pleased to nominate a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the several subjects complained of in sundry memorials made by officers of the late East India Company's service.

III. That the Commissioners so nominated did report on the several subjects submitted for their consideration, but some of the points were decided on ex parte statement from the India Office. Your petitioner alludes more particularly to the regimental bonus system, as it existed in the Indian army previous to the amalgamation, in referring to which statements were made by the India Office authorities, which statements in all fairness should, before the final report of the Commission, have been referred to the Committee nominated to act in your petitioner's behalf, when they would have been easily refuted. By the sudden compulsory abolition of these benefit funds, your petitioner and his family have been entirely deprived of that provision for the future, to secure which your petitioner had, with the full knowledge and avowed concurrence of his late masters, long submitted to pecuniary privations.

IV. The Royal Commission above alluded to decided and reported that the guarantee given by your honourable House had in several instances been departed from; consequent on which decision and report, after very considerable delay, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India was pleased to grant concessions which he considered would meet all requirements. That they will by no means do so, is evident from the following examples.

V. Previous to the formation of the Staff Corps, all promotion in the service was made on the uniform principle of rise by regimental seniority; and under no circumstance whatever could substantive rank and pay be otherwise obtained. Now, however, many officers are constantly promoted, through length of service only, to higher substantive rank and pay, while their seniors have been granted only brevet rank without additional pay. It has been urged by the Government of India, and concurred in by the Secretary of

State for India, "that it is desirable that all officers holding similar appointments in respect to rank, position, and duties, should be on the same footing as regards emoluments," yet in the face of this very just opinion, so clearly expressed, your petitioner is liable at any time to serve regimentally with a Staff Corps junior of the same grade, but who will nevertheless receive very much more pay than your petitioner, in consequence of the Staff Corps rank being substantive, whilst that granted to your petitioner is only brevet. It is needless to point out what jealousies, discontent, and ill feeling such glaring contrasts must necessarily engender.

VI. The following list of officers, as they now stand on the cadres of the 7th and 8th regiments Native Infantry, also of the latter corps as it is now composed under the new organization, with dates of rank of the officers, will show at a glance how unfairly the present system works, and that the grant of brevet rank by no means removes the infringements of which your petitioner complained last session to your honourable House.

Cadre H.M. 7th Regiment Bombay N. I.

Cadre H.M. 8th Regiment Bombay N. I.

Cadre H.M. 7th Regiment Bombay N. I.					Cadre H.M. 8th Regiment Bombay N. I.						
Rank.	Names.	Date of rank as Ensign.	Date of rank as Lieutenant.	Date of rank as Captain.	Remarks.	Rank.	Names.	Date of rank as Ensign.	Date of rank as Lieutenant.	Date of rank as Captain.	Remarks.
Capt.	A. W. Lucas -	—	—	—		Capt.	J. W. Young- husband -	—	—	—	
	J. A. Collier -	11 June 1842	21 Jan. 1846	21 June 1856		2	J. Bates - -	—	—	—	
	C. O. Maude -	—	—	—		3	A. Becher -	22 Dec. 1842	3 Jan. 1846	25 Feb. 1858	
4	W. Widdicombe	—	—	—		4	T. C. Alban -	—	—	—	
5	R. M. Bonnor -	—	—	—		5	H. Beville -	—	—	—	
6	J. R. G. G. Shortt	—	—	—		6	G. J. Melliss -	—	—	—	
7	T. Waddington-	—	—	—		7	C. J. Richardson	7 Feb. 1847	15 Feb. 1853	17 July 1864	
Lieut.	H. A. Wood- house - -	3 Aug. 1847	15 Nov. 1853	—		Lieut.	W. Dickinson -	—	—	—	

APPENDIX G.

H.M. 8th Regiment N.I., under the new organization,

No. 1.

Rank and Names.	Dates of			Amount of Monthly Pay and Allowances.	Remarks.
	Army Rank.	Substantive Rank in Cadre.	Substantive Rank in Staff Corps.		
Major J. A. Collier	Brevet Major, 19th Jan. 1858	Captain, 21st Jan. 1856	Major, 11th June 1862	Rupees. as. ps. 1,240 14 6	Commandant Staff Corps.
Brevet-Major A. Becher	Brevet-Major, 22nd Dec. 1862	Captain, 25th Feb. 1858	—	644 1 0	2nd in command, Local, and draws Company's allowances. Wing officers, staff corps, and draws Company's allowances
Capt. H. A. Woodhouse	Captain, 18th Feb. 1861	Lieutenant, 15th Nov. 1853	Captain, 18th Feb. 1861	604 1 0	
Capt. C. J. Richardson	Captain, 18th Feb. 1861	Captain, 17th July 1864	—	415 6 0	Attached to his own regiment, and senior to Capt. Woodhouse, Local, also draws Company's allowances.
Lieut. E. H. Ashe	Lieutenant, 23rd Nov. 1856	Lieutenant, 23rd Nov. 1856	Lieutenant, 23rd Nov. 1856	428 10 0	Quartermaster, Staff Corps
Lieut. R. M. Lloyd	Lieutenant, 12th June 1858	Lieutenant, 12th June 1858	Lieutenant, 12th June 1858	425 12 0	Adjutant, Staff Corps
Lieut. A. R. T. McRae	Lieutenant, 30th July 1862	Lieutenant, 30th July 1862	—	325 12 0	Doing duty officer, Local

From the above it will be observed that Major Collier holds the anomalous position of captain in the cadre of the 7th Regiment, thereby hindering the promotion in it, is a substantive major in the Staff Corps, and a brevet major in the army; he is six months only senior to your petitioner in the army, but in virtue of his substantive rank in the Staff Corps he has been in receipt of the pay of that rank, also of command allowance, for upwards of two (2) years, and is sent from the 7th regiment Native Infantry to the command of your petitioner's corps, in which your petitioner has served for more than twenty-one (21) years, a contingency that could not have happened prior to the amalgamation. Captain Woodhouse again, more than four (4) years junior to your petitioner in the army, and only a lieutenant in the cadre of the 7th regiment, but a captain in the Staff Corps, will in August 1867 obtain the substantive rank and pay of major, and although holding a junior position in the corps, will be in receipt of monthly, rupees two hundred and sixty-six, annas thirteen, and pice six (rs. 266 13 6) more than your petitioner, who will in 1868 become lieutenant-colonel by brevet, and unless some redress be conceded, it is more than probable that your petitioner will be a lieutenant-colonel drawing only captain's pay, while his junior in the same regiment will be in receipt of majors'.

VII. Your petitioner begs to draw the attention of your honourable House to the fact, that whereas the names of such officers in the line regiments, including the Bombay Engineers and Artillery, who joined the Staff Corps, have been removed and promotion made in their places, yet the names of those who have joined the Staff Corps from your petitioner's regiment are, contrary to all precedent and in violation of the rights and privileges, promised, by your honourable House, still retained, thereby depriving your petitioner of promotion justly his due in the seniority service to which he belongs.

VIII. Before the amalgamation of the two armies, an officer on obtaining the substantive rank of major succeeded

to the command of his regiment, unless employed in an appointment yielding equal or better emoluments; this privilege has been completely set aside by the formation of the Staff Corps, and by a late order, dated 9th March 1864, which decrees that "In all cases the officer appointed to command a regiment organized under the new system, the commandant, in virtue of his appointment, commands the regiment; the 2nd in command will rank next in the corps, the others taking rank regimentally according to army standing." Your petitioner can, under the operation of this order, be placed regimentally under the command of a junior. An instance of this has already occurred, viz., Captain Richardson (cadre 8th regiment), but attached to the 8th regiment N.I. under the new organization, after 17 years' service in his own regiment, senior in rank and service, doing duty in the same corps, is regimentally declared by the authorities as junior to Captain Woodhouse, though senior to him in army rank. Captain Woodhouse is a lieutenant in the cadre of the 7th regiment N.I., but a captain in the Staff Corps. This latter officer is now drawing the contingent allowance of two companies, while his senior, Captain Richardson, has been deprived of the extra company which he would have succeeded to, prior to the amalgamation, thus nullifying the intention of Her Gracious Majesty's Warrant in granting brevet rank, as conveyed in a letter from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, dated 17th June 1864.

IX. The following is a list of sixteen (16) officers in the Staff Corps, junior to your petitioner, who are enjoying the substantive rank and pay of major, and are in receipt of rupees two hundred and sixty-six, annas thirteen, and pice six (rs. 266 13 6) more than your petitioner, who, holding brevet rank, only receives captain's pay. Scarcely a month passes that does not add to the list, to the runation of the future prospects in service of your petitioner, as they may at any time be sent to command his regiment:—

Rank and Names.	Date of Rank of 1st Commission.	Date of Rank as Major in Staff Corps.	Remarks.
1 Major J. Black	29th January 1843	29th January 1863	Belongs to Bombay Staff Corps.
2 " C. O. Maude	1st February 1843	1st February 1863	Do. do.
3 " J. A. M. MacDonald	21st February 1843	21st February 1863	Do. do.
4 " W. G. Manwaring	1st March 1843	1st March 1863	Do. do.
5 " T. Thacker	10th June 1843	10th June 1863	Do. do.
6 " W. L. Briggs	1st July 1843	1st July 1863	Do. do.
7 " G. E. Everard	26th August 1843	26th August 1863	Do. do.
8 " W. C. Parr	1st September 1843	1st September 1863	Do. do.
9 " H. H. A. Wood	9th December 1843	9th December 1863	Do. do.
10 " J. Ashburner	1st January 1844	1st January 1864	Do. do.
11 " A. Y. Short	1st February 1844	1st February 1864	Do. do.
12 " W. Widdicombe	7th June 1844	7th June 1864	Do. do.
13 " F. S. Hewett	9th June 1843	9th June 1864	Do. do.
14 " J. E. Westropp	1st February 1843	9th June 1864	Do. do.
15 " I. H. Henderson	10th June 1844	10th June 1864	Do. do.
16 " F. T. Ross	4th August 1844	4th August 1864	Do. do.

X. Your petitioner begs further to point out the contrast that, under the new organization, exists in the pension which officers' widows are entitled to receive from the "Military Fund." The widow of a lieutenant-colonel in the Staff Corps is entitled to the pension pertaining to

the rank her husband held, whereas the widow of a brevet lieutenant-colonel, who may have subscribed to the fund a much longer period, is very possibly entitled to the much smaller pension of a captain, or at most of a major's widow. These contracts, of which there must be neces-

sarily very many instances, have been brought about entirely by the amalgamation.

XI. Your petitioner has patiently sought redress of injuries which he has now been suffering from for nearly four (4) years, but to this period has sought in vain, and he therefore must now trust to your honourable House, insisting on the guarantee so considerably and judiciously given being thoroughly fulfilled. Nearly all the injuries sustained are attributable entirely to the formation of the Indian Staff Corps, in the organization of which measures were introduced which, unfortunately, completely upset the rules regarding promotion formerly in force, and guaranteed to the service by Parliament. The formation of these corps, whilst conferring considerable benefit on some officers, caused serious injury to the prospects of from 1,000 to 1,500 captains and senior lieutenants, and it is as one of those so seriously injured that your petitioner seeks redress. This can only be effectually obtained by either the thorough dissolution of the several Staff Corps (which will necessarily engender great discontent amongst those officers who have derived benefit by their organization), or by extending to all officers who were in the Indian Army previous to the amalgamation promotion to substantive rank, with all retrospective advantages, on the same terms as is granted to officers of those corps.

Your petitioner humbly begs your honourable House to take the case of your petitioner into favourable consideration, and your petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

A. BECHER, Major,
H.M. 8th Regiment N.I.
Bombay Presidency.

Camp Neemuch,
1st December 1864.

To Colonel Crewe, Secretary to Royal Commission.

Dorking, 24th July 1865.

SIR, (Received 24th July 1865.)

I SEE by letter from Major-General North, in the Homeward Mail, I am permitted to state my grievances to you for the information of the Royal Commission.

They are as follows:—

1st. Having served 26 years, and being a major in the cadre of my regiment, the 19th Bengal N.I., I am desirous of retiring if I can obtain a suitable bonus, such as in my regiment I have always contributed to give to a major wishing to retire, and which we were justified in doing by the order of the late Court of Directors, of February 1837, published in India General Order of May 1838, but which I am now entirely excluded from by the constitution of the Staff Corps, which most of the officers of my regiment have been admitted to and thereby became independent of promotion by my retiring, and so of course decline contributing. Some compensation for this loss caused by the Indian Secretary of State's measure would appear recognizable.

2nd. My promotion is retarded by the retention on the Army List or the regimental lieutenant-colonels who retired with annuities in 1861, and by promotions being only made by one step for two of these officers.

3rd. I am superseded by Staff Corps institution in respect to substantive rank and qualifying service for colonel's allowances. As an instance I may quote Captain Layard, 2nd captain of the regiment of which I am major, who is in Staff Corps, a substantive lieutenant-colonel in supersession of me, his regimental senior, who am only brevet lieutenant-colonel. He, therefore, is qualifying by service for colonel's allowances, which I cannot with brevet rank. He also would, on furlough, draw lieutenant-colonel's substantive allowances, while I, his regimental senior, draw only those of major.

4th. The late brevet rank conferred on all to equalize their promotion with Staff Corps fixes no corresponding equalizing pay.

5th. This general brevet entirely obliterates the advantage of brevets received for service, thereby uniting with Staff Corps to supersede. For instance, I received a brevet for hardly-earned service before Delhi, which gave me three years' advantage in promotion, which has been cancelled by my contemporaries' promotion by Staff Corps and this general equalizing brevet.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D. C. SHUTE,
Major late 19th Bengal, N.I., and
Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel.

From Major Wheeler, 2nd in Command and Wing Officer
32nd N.I. Punjab Pioneers.

To the Adjutant General of the Army, Head Quarters,
Simla.

SIR, Ferozepore, 4th May 1865.

I HAVE the honour to request that you will kindly lay this letter before Sir Wm. Mansfield, K.C.B., and solicit his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to view with favour this my respectful representation and appeal, and cause me redress for the loss of army rank which I am sustaining from time to time.

2. So numerous are the supersessions that I will only trouble you with a few instances sufficient to show just cause for complaint.

1st. Captain Blackall, 1st battalion 7th Royal Fusiliers, was only a few months ago doing duty in this station as a regimental captain, having no brevet rank whatever; now, under the provisions of paragraph 70 of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State's despatch, published in G.G.O., No. 632, of 4th August 1864, he is promoted to the rank of local lieutenant-colonel.

2nd. Major Mercer, 94th Foot, is a local lieutenant-colonel; his commission as a brevet major is 13th December 1861.

3rd. Major W. T. Betts, of the Connaught Rangers, is now a lieutenant-colonel (local); the dates of his commissions as major are brevet 31st February 1860, and regimental 5th November 1861.

3. Their promotions made in G.O.C.C., dated Umballa, 10th April 1865 (in addition to others previously made under other circumstances), are an injustice to me, as my war brevet rank of major dates as far back as 26th April 1859.

4. I have the honour most respectfully to solicit his Excellency's powerful influence as the head of the army in India to cause rectification of the evil referred to.

I have, &c.

(Signed) TREVOR WHEELER,
Captain and Brevet Major, late
1st European Bengal Fusiliers.

To Colonel Crewe, Secretary to Royal Commission, Cannon Row, S.W.

From Major J. H. Champion, Bombay Staff Corps,
Assistant Adjutant General of Division.

London, 17, Harewood Square, Regent's Park, N.W.,
SIR, 5th August 1865.

BEING at present at home on sick leave, I have the honour to request that you will submit my name to the Royal Commission, as I have been superseded in army rank by a number of lieutenant-colonels in the Staff Corps, and in the local army, who lately received brevet promotion for the purpose of placing themselves in equality with the Staff Corps officers.

I received a brevet majority for services in the field on the 7th December 1858, and I am by the late promotions superseded by upwards of 25 officers in the Bombay army, and, I suppose, more than 100 in the other Presidencies. I recently submitted to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, a memorial on the subject of a breach of the conditions of the 9th paragraph of the Royal Warrant, by which I am a sufferer in regard to pension, and conceive my rights and privileges to pension under the Indian Service rules were infringed by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India. I requested that legal opinion might be taken on the point at issue. This has not been complied with, nor has redress or satisfactory answer been accorded.

Probably an infraction of the rights of Staff Corps officers, who retain all the rights and privileges of local officers in respect to pensions, military funds, &c., is a subject within the scope of inquiry of the Royal Commission.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. H. CHAMPION,
Major, H.M.'s Bombay Staff Corps.

The Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and
Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of Francis John Oldfield, a
Captain and Brevet-Major in Her Majesty's
3rd Light Cavalry, Bombay Presidency.

Showeth,—

That your petitioner entered the service of the East India
Company in the year 1842, consequently the pay, pension,

Majesty was graciously pleased, on the recommendation of the general officers in command to confer on me for service in the field had placed me in such an advantageous position in the list of lieutenant-colonels as to make it quite within the bounds of probability that, notwithstanding my slow promotion regimentally, I should attain to the rank of a general officer at an average age, and would then be able, according to the rules of the Indian service, to reside as an unemployed general officer in England or elsewhere, remaining on the effective list until I became entitled to the off reckoning on colonel's allowance.

These prospects the recent brevet has most seriously damaged. By its operation all the lieutenant-colonels promoted under its provisions between 18th February 186 and 14th February 1864, numbering nearly 100, will become my seniors on the colonel's list, and thus my promotion to the rank of major-general will be retarded by many years.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. TEMPLE,
Lieut.-Colonel Madras Army.

APPENDIX G.

No. 1.

No. 2.

A RETURN showing the Effects of the PROMOTIONS to LOCAL RANK in INDIA, granted to OFFICERS of HER MAJESTY'S LINE REGIMENTS in LONDON GAZETTE of 4th July 1865.

Regiment.	Names.	Rank.		Superseding in						Total.			Passing over	
				their own Regiments			Regiments serving in India.						Lt.-Cols. promoted for Field Service.	Majors promoted for Field Service.
		Regimental.	Local.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Cap-tains.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Cap-tains.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Cap-tains.		
93rd	J. M. Brown	Major	Lt.-Col	2	34	40	..	36	40	..	1	33
94th	F. S. Mercer	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	..	1	..	36	68	..	36	69	..	1	50
88th	W. T. Betts	Major	"	..	1	..	33	59	..	33	60	..	1	45
107th	R. Patton	Lt.-Col.	"	1	1
1st	J. P. Gore	Major	"	30	6	..	30	6	..	1	6
11th	H. Gray	"	"	..	1	..	30	5	..	30	6	..	1	6
10th	H. W. Welman	"	"	30	22	..	30	22	..	1	18
4th	T. Martin	"	"	..	1	..	29	16	..	29	17	..	1	13
36th	E. C. Butler	"	"	26	13	..	26	13	..	1	12
98th	E. J. Ellerman	"	"	23	54	..	23	54	..	1	42
97th	J. F. Murray	"	"	..	1	..	18	33	..	18	34	..	1	31
7th	R. Blackall	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	1	1	..	15	130	..	16	131	..	1	61
82nd	C. Banbury	Major	"	5	14	..	5	14	13
94th	S. Lyster	"	"	3	16	..	3	16	13
76th	H. H. Lacy	Captain	"	..	2	..	2	136	8	2	138	8	..	62
76th	C. L. De Winton	Major	"	..	1	..	2	41	..	2	42	38
27th	J. S. Manly	Captain	"	..	2	1	2	132	5	2	134	6	..	62
45th	H. W. Parish	Major	"	..	1	..	1	4	..	1	5	5
107th	J. D. Baring	Major	Major	9	9	2
104th	G. Gaynor	"	"	14	14	4
35th	C. Armstrong	"	"	9	9	2
104th	J. Bleaymre	"	"	15	15	5
103rd	F. S. Kempf	"	"	19	19	5
21st Hrs.	R. B. M'Leod	"	"	15	15	5
72nd	D. Hastings	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	..	1	1	..	55	56	1	..	10
60th	T. Biggs	Major	"	28	28	6
106th	H. T. Tyacke	"	"	15	15	5
20th Hrs.	E. C. Warner	"	"	15	15	5
76th	C. O'Donoghue	Captain	"	..	1	56	11	..	57	11	..	11
103rd	G. E. Herne	Major	"	46	46	9
107th	A. L. Nicholson	Captain	"	..	1	59	76	..	60	76	..	11
108th	A. J. Shuldham	Major	"	16	16	5
36th	R. Lloyd	Captain	"	54	7	..	54	7	..	11
60th	A. J. Fitzgerald	"	"	47	24	..	47	24	..	5
109th	T. Welsh	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	..	2	18	20	5
109th	J. B. Campbell	Captain	"	..	2	49	23	..	51	23	..	11
56th	W. G. Margesson	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	12	12	5
98th	E. Grantham	Major	"	29	29	7
98th	S. H. Edwards	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	28	28	5
20th Hrs.	C. M. Cotton	Captain	"	39	68	..	39	68	..	6
33rd	R. Lacy	"	"	..	1	38	8	..	39	8	..	6
97th	E. D. Harvést	"	"	39	14	..	39	14	..	6
12th	E. Foster	"	"	2	..	39	19	..	39	21	..	6
45th	J. M'Crear	"	"	39	7	..	39	7	..	6
3rd D.Gs.	J. Miller	Major	"	10	10	1
12th	T. Dundas	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	1	..	17	17	1	..	4
54th	J. S. Fowke	Capt. and Bt. Major	"	26	26	5
3rd D.Gs.	F. McFarlane	Captain	"	..	1	31	33	..	32	33	..	6
21st Hrs.	H. E. Forbes	"	"	26	62	..	26	62	..	5
98th	R. Reid	"	"	25	68	..	25	68	..	5
51st	S. A. Madden	Major	"	2	2
21st Hrs.	A. V. Dumbleton	Captain	"	21	64	..	21	64	..	5
54th	J. J. Gordon	"	"	21	35	..	21	35	..	5
82nd	C. R. Richardson	"	"	15	43	..	15	43	..	2
35th	W. H. Ballingall	"	"	2	..	14	71	..	14	73	..	2
46th	J. G. Clarke	"	"	12	2	..	12	2	..	2

INDIA OFFICERS' COMMISSION.

Regiment.	Names.	Rank.		Superseding in						Total.			Passing over	
				their own Regiments			Regiments serving in India.						Lt.-Cols. promoted for Field Service.	Majors promoted for Field Service.
		Regimental.	Local.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Captains.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Captains.	Lt.-Cols.	Majrs.	Captains.		
46th	A Nicholas	Captain	Major	5	3	..	5	3	..	1
11th	R. W. Cardiff	"	"	2	..	5	97	..	5	99	..	1
104th	C Clark	"	"	1	..	5	229	..	5	230	..	1
107th	C M. Fellowes	"	"	5	154	..	5	154	..	1
101st	H. C Moller	"	"	2	..	5	347	..	5	349	..	1
27th	W. Croker	"	"	5	3	..	5	3	..	1
10th	R. W. Davies	"	"	5	102	..	5	102	..	1
34th	C. Nedham	"	"	3	..	5	143	..	5	146	..	1
107th	E. Higgins	"	"	2	..	5	345	..	5	347	..	1
76th	J. C. Clarke	"	"	1	..	5	103	..	5	104	..	1
103rd	R. A. Taylor	"	Captain	49	49
103rd	E. A. Law	"	"	66	66
21st Hrs.	W. C S. Clarke	"	"	25	25
107th	R. E. Anderson	"	"	2	2
107th	W. C. Stirling	"	"	47	47
105th	W. H. Hart	"	"	1	82	83
107th	D. B. Lockhart	"	"	48	48
101st	S. A. Hunter	"	"	84	84
103rd	J. de Vitre	"	"	90	90
103rd	E. Brandt	"	"	93	93
106th	G. Maunsell	"	"	3	104	107
103rd	W. Williams	"	"	101	101
20th	G. Priestley	"	"	67	67
34th	L. F. Kennedy	"	"	6	184	190
106th	R. R. Gillespie	"	"	1	71	72
106th	N. Kirkland	"	"	41	41
108th	H. C. McDonald	"	"	28	28
105th	T. B. Glover	"	"	20	20
27th	W. Twemlow	"	"	103	103
107th	T. Harrison	"	"	25	25
105th	H. J. Bell	"	"	8	8
97th	W. M. Harnett	"	"	1	184	185
56th	J. W. Huskisson	Lieut.	"	3	196	199
81st	G. W. Harmer	Captain	"	37	37
80th	F. B. Craufurd	"	"	43	43
81st	J. A. Deans	Lieut.	"	52	52
80th	W. P. Morimer	"	"	40	40
82nd	C. S. Maunsell	"	"	1	23	24

Horse Guards,
4th September 1865.

E. B. JOHNSON,
Colonel for Military Secretary.

No. 3.

No. 3.

A few EXAMPLES of SUPERSESSION out of the great Number caused by the Brevet.

In Bengal Army;					Remarks.	several Lieutenant-colonels who stood above them in 1864; amongst them local Lieutenant-colonels and Majors, as follows:—	
	Standing on Gradation List	Loss of Places on Infantry Gradation List.					
		1864.	1865.				
Lt.-Col. Allgood	s.c.	54	65	11	Field Service Brevet.	Lt.-Col. Terrott	39
" Faddy	"	66	55	11		" Waterman	34
" Brooke	s.c.	59	73	14		" Hicks	24
" Gott	"	62	76	14		" Pogson	20
" Barrett	"	63	77	14		" Tulloch	16
" Watson	"	72	81	9		" Basden	16
" Tytler	"	73	82	9			
" Wroughton	"	74	83	9			
" Gordon	"	75	84	9			
" Fisher	"	76	85	9			
" Duffin	"	77	86	9			
" Hall	"	78	87	9			
" Macdonnell	"	79	88	9			
" Smith	"	80	89	9			
" Bagott	"	82	94	12			
" Moffatt	"	184	206	22			
" Briggs	"	200	207	7			
" Sheriff	"	201	208	7			
" Nicholets	"	272	298	26			
" Lyster	"	304	344	40			

Lt.-Col. Crossman rose from* 17th Infantry Major to Lt.-Col. in 1865, superseding all Infantry Majors and some Lt.-Cols.

" Meade superseded 22 Majors; 14 being Staff Corps, 8 Local Officers.

" Plowden superseded 24 Majors; 13 being Staff Corps, 11 Local Officers.

" Layard superseded 53 Majors; 35 being Staff Corps, 18 Local Officers.

" Cookson superseded 169 Majors; 151 being Staff Corps, 18 Local Officers.

" Philpots superseded 100 Majors; about

" Manwaring superseded 172 Majors; about

* These numbers vary to a certain extent, according to date of Army List from which they are taken.

In Madras Army:

Regimental Officers superseded by regimental officers and also by Staff Corps officers:—

Lt.-Col. Silver loses 26 steps.

" Coode " 25 "

" Hamilton " 23 "

" Brown " 21 "

" Dobbie " 21 "

The following officers, promoted by the brevet from Captains to Lieutenant-colonels, superseded all Captains and Majors and

Officers who, being regimental captains, and captains in the army also prior to the brevet, have become by the brevet lieutenant-colonels, and therefore have superseded the whole of the majors, and several lieutenant-colonels also.

Harkness.	Place.
Fullerton.	Simpson.
Malony.	Swinton.
Ffrench.	Cooper.

Staff Corps officers, who have now superseded regimental officers:—

Lt.-Col Snow	supersedes	11	regimental officers.
" Miller	"	11	" "
" Wyndham	"	9	" "
" Man	"	9	" "
" Greenlaw	"	8	" "

Major Vine, S C., stood 63rd as major, and now stands 37th as lieutenant-colonel.

In Bombay Army.

		Standing on Gradation List.		Loss of Places.
		1864.	1865.	
Lt.-Col. Vincent	- s.c.	18	22	4
" Schneider	-	32	37	5
" Stonley	-	33	38	5
" Gell	-	34	39	5
" Phayre	- s.c.	51	57	6
Major Francis	-	171	175	4
" Brown	-	198	212	14

Captain Thompson - promoted to Major, superseded all Captains and 45 Majors who stood above him.
 " Anderson - promoted to Major, superseded all Captains and 43 Majors who stood above him.
 " Cahusac - promoted to Major, superseded all Captains and 42 Majors who stood above him.

APPENDIX G.

No. 3.

APPENDIX H.

APPENDIX H

EXTRACT FROM REPORT BY LORD HOTHAM'S COMMITTEE.

" Par. 5. We do not understand in what manner any change can be introduced into the existing system of promotion in the Local Army of India without an infringement upon the guarantee contained in the 56th and 58th clauses of the "Government of India" Act of 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106.)

Every officer of the Indian Army (excepting only the ensigns appointed during the last year) is on the rolls of a regiment; and whether the regiment be standing complete and perfect in all parts, as in the Armies of Madras and Bombay, or consist of nothing more than a "cadre" of officers without men, as is the case to a large extent in the Army of Bengal, still the right of all the officers to the "like advantages as regards promotion and otherwise as if they had continued in the service of the Company" has been deliberately and comprehensively guaranteed, and cannot now be denied.

We consider that under this pledge the promotion of the officers of the three Armies, after the staff corps has been formed, must of necessity be allowed to proceed exactly on the same principles as before; nor can the volunteering of individuals here and there into the Line cause any difference. The "cadres" must be preserved throughout the entire Army, and promotion must go forward regularly and in the established order. We conclude that new appointments will be made only at the bottom of the list, and under different conditions. The local system, therefore, will be gradually approaching towards its ultimate extinction; the process will be slow, but, though very possibly means may hereafter be found of hastening it, we can at the present moment only suggest that it be left to itself, and to work itself out in the course of time.

The formation of the staff corps will of course occasion a great number of vacancies in every regiment, and it may be a question whether these should be wholly or only partially filled up in the ordinary course of promotion.

We consider that it is necessary for the efficiency of the service to keep the regimental establishments complete. It should be observed, however, that, of the captains, two in each native infantry regiment, and four in each European, have been allowed specially for staff and detached service; and, when the non-regimental duties are otherwise provided for, a reduction of the established number of captains to five in the native, and to one for each troop or company in the European regiments, may very properly be effected.*

In filling up the vacancies occasioned by the drafting off to the staff list, regard must be paid to the inequality of promotion in the several regiments that must arise if arrangements be not made to meet and correct it. Probably the Indian Government will be able to effect such arrangements without much difficulty, by applying the principles which have been laid down and are well understood in raising new regiments, and generally in all Army augmentations."

* Note by Commission of 1865.—Allowing for this reduction the promotions required, as calculated from the India Office Army List, for January 1865, would be—

	Captains to Majors.	Lieutenants to Captains
BENGAL:—Cavalry	4	12
Infantry	45	253
MADRAS:—Cavalry	5	—
Infantry	25	109
BOMBAY:—Cavalry	1	—
Infantry	15	93
	95	467

LONDON :
Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty,
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.