EAST INDIA (MR. WILLIAM TAYLER).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons, dated 12 March 1880;—*for*,

"COPY of a MEMORIAL addressed to the Secretary of State for *India* by Mr. *William Tayler*, late Commissioner of *Patna*, being his REPLY to a MINUTE of Sir *Frederick Halliday* on the subject of the INDIAN MUTINY, 1857, presented to Parliament at the close of last Session."

India Office,
15 March 1880.

EDWARD STANHOPE,
Under Secretary of State for India.

(*Sir Eardley Wilmot.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed*, 18 *March* 1880.

COPY of a MEMORIAL addressed to the Secretary of State for *India* by Mr. *William Tayler*, late Commissioner of *Patna*, being his REPLY to a MINUTE of Sir *Frederick Halliday* on the subject of the INDIAN MUTINY, 1857, presented to Parliament at the close of last Session.

INTRODUCTION.

BEFORE I enter upon a detailed refutation of Sir F. Halliday's "Memorandum," which has now been printed in the House of Commons, and to some extent circulated among the Members, I would wish to offer a few brief preliminary remarks on the character of the document.

It is, of course, natural and reasonable that Sir F. Halliday, under the present circumstances, should be desirous to substantiate his accusations against me, and defend himself from the serious charges, which, in self-vindication, I have thought it my duty to bring against him, charges which have been on record, in the India Office, ever since 1868, when my second Memorial was submitted to the Secretary of State; but that, after this lapse of time, and in spite of the official rejection of the great majority of his accusations, and the public refutation of his views, he should reproduce the same accusations, and reiterate the same opinions, is, to say the least, embarrassing.

To explain a little more fully what I mean, and render it intelligible to all who read this refutation, I will give a concise outline of the broad facts, as they stand.

In 1857 Mr. Halliday summarily removed me from my high appointment at Patna, on the ground specially set forth, that "under the influence of panic, "I had issued a disgraceful order for the withdrawal of the Christian officers "from the outlying stations."

After this dismissal, he recorded, in vindication of his act (which had caused general indignation in the Province) a long list of "*ex-post facto*" charges against me.

After vainly seeking for justice from Lord Canning, who was necessarily at the time dependent on the representations of Mr. Halliday, and whose *à priori* concurrence Mr. Halliday had wisely secured, I submitted an appeal to the Court of Directors.

The Court declined to restore me to the Commissionership, concurring at the time in disapproving of my withdrawal order as represented, but *exonerated me from all the serious charges brought against me*, warmly praised my administration, and gave me high praise and commendation for many of the very acts which Mr. Halliday had made grounds of complaint.

Subsequently to this, in 1864-65 events occurred which established, on several most important points, the accuracy of my views, and the entire inaccuracy of Mr. Halliday's. The men whom I had placed under precautionary arrest, as dangerous from their fanaticism, and whom *he* declared to be "inno-"cent and inoffensive bookmen," were subsequently proved to be dangerous traitors, and their leader sentenced to death. The loyal men, who co-operated with me, and whom he had disparaged and dishonoured as traitors whom I unwisely trusted, were both a few years afterwards decorated for their loyalty.

Two members of the Supreme Council of Calcutta, Sir John Low and Mr. Dorin, who, misled by Mr. Halliday's representations in India at the time, had concurred in my condemnation, publicly retracted their opinions; the former expressing his regret, and bearing warm testimony as to the value of my services; the latter, his satisfaction that time had proved me to have been right.

Many other distinguished statesmen, and a host of honourable and able individuals, more or less connected with India, have since united in warm and hearty approval of all my acts, which had already been gratefully testified to by the residents of the Province; and when I returned to England, the Secretary of State, Sir S. Northcote, after due investigation of a memorial, which, by the advice of Sir John Lawrence, I had submitted to him, upheld and warmly lauded me on all important points of my administration, and was only deterred from recommending me for honours to Her Majesty in 1867, on account of two supposed errors which had been suggested to him by a third party, under circumstances which, when known, deprive the suggestion of any weight

Since then the entire press of England and India has warmly and continuously espoused my cause. The two distinguished historians of the Indian Mutiny, Sir John Kaye and Colonel Malleson, have ratified the verdict, and honoured me with warm and enthusiastic approval; 58 distinguished Members of Parliament, from both sides of the House, have presented a memorial to Lord Beaconsfield, and petitions signed by 174 individuals, connected with, or interested in, India, headed by Lord Napier and Ettrick, the Duke of Sutherland, Sir John Low, and many other distinguished individuals, have been presented, one to Sir S. Northcote, and the other to the House of Commons, on my behalf.

Such an accumulation of evidence is a matter of fact which cannot be contradicted or questioned.

And now, how does Sir F. Halliday deal with these facts? Does he, as an ordinary controversialist would, even while maintaining his own views, does he give *some little* credit for all this overwhelming testimony? Some slight admission, that *possibly* Sir John Low, Sir Herbert Edwardes, Sir George Clerk, General Colin Mackenzie, Sir Vincent Eyre, Dr. Alexander Duff, and the many other experienced and competent judges, *may* be right in their views? Does he pay any deference to the authoritative decisions of the Court of Directors, in regard to the charges from which they exculpated me? Does he show the slightest respect to the recorded conclusions of the Secretary of State, Sir Stafford Northcote, or the universal consensus of the Press? Under such a weight of testimony, does he abate anything from the severity and bitterness of his indictment against me, or express the smallest doubt as to the soundness of his own opinions, or the justice of his denouncement of mine?

None in the least; Statesmen, Members of the Indian Council, Directors, Newspapers, History, Members of Parliament, and Governors of India, are all contemptuously ignored. Disproved charges are reiterated in stronger terms; the distinguished statesmen who have so warmly, and I may say, so enthusiastically upheld me, are described as "persons who have been content to accept "Mr. Tayler's assertions, without ever suspecting that there *could be any other* "*version of the story*," and it is generously admitted that they "*may* have in-"cautiously committed themselves to vouch for Mr. Tayler's unrequited "merits."

Among these "persons" who "may have thus committed themselves, without "suspecting that there could be any other version," is General Sir John Low, who had special *cognisance of my case in Calcutta*, and in reliance on this "other "version," condemned me, and who has since reversed his judgment, and declared my services to have been of "immense benefit to Government."

Sir Stafford Northcote, also, must be enrolled among the unhappy "persons" "who never suspected that there could be any other version of the story," as also Dr. Duff, Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Herbert Edwardes, and a few other such ignorant and simple-minded men.

Then as to history, to which Sir F. Halliday refers, in the same tone of contempt, Sir John Kaye, the first author of the "History of the Sepoy War," himself Political Secretary to the India Office, who dwelt for years on the subject, with all the documents on both sides at his disposal.

What does Sir F. Halliday say of him? He actually leaves him out altogether! Does not even mention his name, or his history! While, as to Colonel Malleson, whose truthful, brilliant, and outspoken history has been accepted with general admiration, *him*, Sir F. Halliday styles a "*soi-disant* "historian," who, from the same material (*i.e.*, my assertions), "constructed a "history without even seeking to examine the records of the period."

Such

Such is the strange character of this statement, in itself so utterly bewilder ing, that it is difficult to know how to deal with it; and, however much I may wish to abbreviate my own reply, the multiplicity of statements, the reproduction of disproved charges, and resuscitation of irrelevant matter render it a most difficult task. A charge of blood-thirstiness can be made in a single line; its refutation may require pages.

Although, therefore, I am deeply impressed with the importance of condensation and brevity, yet the subjects necessary to be dealt with are so numerous, the details so intricate, and the accusations so grave, that each must be carefully discussed, while the plan adopted for years past by Sir F. Halliday, of presenting his charge to our mutual superiors in minutes and other papers which I *had not the privilege of seeing*, is, as I shall hereafter show, so ingenious and plausible, that without careful analysis his statements are, of course, calculated to make some impression on the reader until the actual facts are exposed.

Under these circumstances I shall be compelled to deal with every charge, old and new, in separate chapters, most of which will be brief, but two or three unavoidably longer.

I must not, however, omit to remind my readers that the only two charges which now, judicially speaking, require refutation, are the two errors of judg ment suggested by interested parties to Sir Stafford Northcote in 1867, and which alone prevented him from recommending me to the Queen for honours, and this, as he then kindly recorded, to his "sincere regret."

CHAPTER I.

Alleged Displeasure of the "Sudder Board."

The first question which is referred to by Sir Frederick Halliday is the alleged displeasure of the "Sudder Board."

It may be useful for those who are not familiar with the administrative organisation in Bengal, to mention that the Board of Revenue, usually called the "Sudder Board" (or chief), is a department, consisting of two members and a secretary, and is a sort of intermediate office between the Government of Bengal and the several Commissioners in revenue matters only.

In 1857 Mr. Dampier was the senior member of the Board, and was the leading authority, more especially in all that concerned Patna.

When, then, Sir Frederick Halliday mentions "the Board" in regard to the present case, he means in truth Mr. Dampier. Now Mr. Dampier had himself three years before been Commissioner of Patna, and a great friend of Mr. J. Bardoe Elliot, living there at that time, a gentleman of rather peculiar habits, who, for various reasons, not necessary to mention, had, as was notorious at the time, become highly antagonistic to me. When I entered upon my several schemes for the improvement of the people, the spread of education, and other measures, this gentleman consequently exerted all his influence to thwart and disparage my efforts.

In this scheme he found a powerful coadjutor in Mr. Dampier, and from that time their concerted operations became a matter of notoriety.

While then, as senior member of the Board, this gentleman devised frivolous occasions to find fault, Mr. Elliot was incessant and unremitting in his endeavours to calumniate me, and, in furtherance of his designs, eventually, at the outbreak of the mutiny, sent in to the Lieutenant Governor (a fact which only accidentally came to my knowledge) a letter, accusing me of all manner of evil deeds—a letter which was accepted and acted upon by Mr. Halliday, *but which I have never seen to this day!*

How Mr. Halliday could have been induced to bring forward this trifling and petty matter, I cannot imagine, more especially as he was himself fully aware of Mr. Dampier's jealousy and ill-feeling towards me, which he always treated as a subject of ridicule and contempt, himself informing me that Mr. Dampier was the one person in Calcutta desirous of "scratching my back!"

CHAPTER II.

Industrial Institution.

The subject of the Industrial Institution, although ingeniously introduced by Sir F. Halliday as a part of the general question at issue, has, in fact, no connection whatever with the merit or demerit of my administration during the crisis at Patna; but, at the same time, it is of importance, as affording a key to the sudden antagonism of Mr. Halliday, and the unrelenting bitterness of his subsequent treatment.

On this ground, therefore, it is desirable that I should, as briefly as possible, narrate the rise and origin of the scheme referred to; and it will not be inappropriate, while offering the narrative, to say a few words regarding my own appointment as Commissioner of Patna, and the incidents which led to it.

The sudden transition from warm approval, and enthusiastic support, to bitter and unsparing animosity, has, I am well aware, been for years a source of perplexity, even to my friends; and at the present crisis, its explanation will be seasonable.

In 1850, after having been five years Postmaster General of Bengal, I was, at my own request, appointed Civil and Sessions Judge of Shahabad, one of the districts of the Patna Division, now celebrated for the siege of the Arrah house.

Some four years afterwards, in 1854, Mr. Halliday, who had for many years been Secretary to the Bengal Government, was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Bengal.

In 1855, the new Lieutenant Governor made his first official visit to the Patna province, and while at Chuprah (a district of the province) wrote to inform me of his intention to visit Arrah, where I was residing.

In the course of the communications which took place, before his actual arrival, I wrote to inform him of an enterprise in which I was deeply interested, viz., the establishment of a charitable dispensary, to be erected through the subscriptions of the wealthy natives, and for which I had already received the large sum of 20,000 rupees.

In his reply, he expressed his great satisfaction; and in a subsequent letter authorised me to promise what the natives call "neknamee," or "khoosh-"noodee perwanehs," *i.e.*, certificates of good name, to all those who should give more than 200 rupees (20*l.*). Shortly after he arrived at Arrah, and, at my request, Mr. Halliday laid the first stone of the projected dispensary.

I ventured to address the assembly in Hindostanee, and Mr. Halliday replied by an able speech in English, in the course of which he emphatically lauded me, in the gratifying words,—

"Honour be to Mr. Tayler, who, through his *influence*, has succeeded in "organising this important scheme, &c., &c."

Some short time afterwards, having been informed that I was desirous of obtaining the Commissionership, he made special arrangements for my appointment, and eventually conferred it upon me.

The appointment I gladly accepted, preferring it even to a seat on the Bench of the Sudder Court (which I might have obtained), because I was deeply interested in the welfare of the people of Behar, among whom I had lived for five years, and was moved (foolishly, as it turned out) with an ardent desire to accomplish something for their benefit.

I had not been long in the Commissionership before I turned my attention to the subject of popular education.

The first conclusion I came to was that the Government system, then in force, was totally unsuited to the Behar people, and, while doing little in the way of real instruction, was giving rise to a feeling of general irritation and widespread belief that the object of the proceedings was to interfere indirectly with their religion.

On these grounds I proposed, and submitted to the Lieutenant Governor a plan for the organisation of a special system of industrial education, and, at the same time, suggested that I should use my influence with the wealthy landowners (zemindars) to establish separate village schools on their estates.

The expenses of the Industrial Institution, which would in its results be of great

great service to the landowners and ryots, I proposed should be aided, if not altogether furnished, by the wealthy classes, and, as I had ever cultivated the most friendly intercourse with them, I felt sanguine that by the exercise of legitimate and friendly influence (a practical instance of which Mr. Halliday had witnessed and warmly praised) I could obtain sufficient funds for the undertaking.

As, however, I was aware that on the subject of asking for subscriptions from the natives there were two opinions, I carefully laid my plans and principles before Mr. Halliday beforehand, and *did not move in the matter until I had received his deliberate and cordial approval.*

While this was in progress, and my proposals had met with most hearty and liberal response, a small clique of three persons, of one of whom I will say no more but that he was under Mahomedan influence to an extent which I should be ashamed to describe; the other, Mr. Halliday's brother-in-law, commenced a secret and underhand system of gossip and detraction behind my back, and being assisted by Mr. Dampier, the member of the Sudder Board, who is referred to at the commencement (Chapter I.) of this statement, succeeded in impressing Mr. Halliday with their own ungenerous notions regarding my proceedings, as false and unfounded as they were malicious.

Unfortunately, at the same time, a whisper was heard of possible disapproval on the part of the Supreme Government (with one member of which Mr. Halliday was no favourite), and even in England, in regard to the system of native subscriptions.

Under the pressure of these influences Mr. Halliday, whose weakness on such occasions even Mr. Samuells, his friend, pointed out (*see* letter), apparently thinking only of himself, and in feverish apprehension of possible censure, at once issued an extraordinary proclamation to the effect that if the subscriptions in support of my undertaking were not *purely* spontaneous and *disinterested, without any reference to the wishes of the Government or the authorities, and without any idea of gaining favour or credit to themselves, they were very wrong!* and Government would give them no assistance.

The exact words I have not by me, but the above quotation is, if anything, within the mark.

This proclamation he directed to be translated into English, and widely circulated throughout the province.

Those who have paid the smallest attention to the previous narrative will not require to be shown that this proclamation not only stultified all Mr. Halliday's previous proceedings, but held me up to the whole province and the outward world as an imposter and charlatan.

I at once, both privately and demi-officially, entreated Mr. Halliday to withdraw and modify this strange notice, even for his own sake, but it was too late. Copies had fallen into the hands of his enemies, who were too glad to make use of them.

Finding all private remonstrance useless, I held it to be my bounden duty, in the cause of truth and justice, to submit a serious protest to the Lieutenant Governor for submission to the Governor General.

At this crisis the mutiny broke upon us. The painful discussion was necessarily suspended for a time, but Mr. Halliday well knew that when matters settled down it would be renewed. His own more sober reflections and the opinions of his most intimate friends must have shown him what a terrible blunder he had made, and he knew enough of me to feel that I should not be wanting to myself in the controversy.

What was to be done?

Nothing, but on some plausible pretext to transfer me to another commissionership.

This would, he well knew, put a stop to the whole affair.

No other public officer was so silly as to devote his time and thoughts to such a subject, especially after such a *dénouement.* The institution would die a natural death, and all further discussion be avoided.

The letters appended will show what followed. It will be seen there that he had removed me, but was prevented from carrying out the arrangement at the time. The determination, however, remained in his mind, intensified by the interference, and led to all the subsequent proceedings.

I have stated these particulars at some little length, because it is of im-

portance that all should know and understand what it was that suddenly caused such a change in Mr. Halliday's feelings, and so marvellous a metamorphosis in my character.

The narrative, especially if considered in connection with the letters, will, I think, afford satisfactory proof, at least, to all who know Sir F. Halliday's character, as indicated by his intimate friend Mr. Samuells (*vide* letter, page 11), of the real cause of his sudden antagonism.

While on this subject I will solicit the careful attention of my readers to the following circumstances, affording, as they do, a rather amusing comment on Mr. Halliday's novel principle regarding subscriptions:—

Six or seven years after the discussion of 1857, the then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, Mr. Beadon, was anxious to build a college at Patna, the very city in which the public had been informed by the official proclamation of Mr. Halliday that "if they gave their money with any reference to the wishes of Government, "or with any idea of gaining favour or credit for themselves, they were very "wrong, and Government would give them no assistance."

One paragraph of the proclamation issued I here give:—

"The halls of the college would receive the names of the chief donors, and the "names of all the subscribers who contributed not less than 2,500 rupees would "be cut on marble slabs and placed in conspicuous parts of the building, to per-"petuate the names and titles of the numerous persons who may subscribe "liberally towards the erection of the college."

The thorough absurdity of this flat contradiction by one Lieutenant Governor of the public views so emphatically set forth in the same district by his predecessor did not, however, escape the notice of the then Commissioner, Mr. G. F. Cockburn, and that gentleman, remembering my treatment by a former Government, wisely took precautions to save himself from similar risks.

When the notices were received, Mr. Cockburn thus wrote to the Secretary of the Committee at Patna:—

"My dear ——

"I have received a supply of the printed papers.

"In order to make quite sure in regard to the Government intentions and approval, I will send one copy on Monday to Government with request that I may be authorised to give 5,000 rupees from the Durbhunga estate, which Mr. Forlong and I have recommended, as the young rajah's *credit will be kept up by being one of the foremost to support so worthy an undertaking*, and on the receipt of the Government reply I will move energetically, but at first I want to be cautious *in case I am thrown overboard, as Tayler was.*"

Mr. Cockburn was wise in his generation, but it is easy to be wise "after the event."

What was thought of Mr. Halliday's proclamation, even by one of my opponents, the Judge of Patna, may be seen by the following letter.

The proclamation alluded to was sent to him and other judges for circulation. It was in reference to this procedure that even Mr. Samuells, alluding to his intention to remove me from Patna, thus wrote in his letter of the 11th June before quoted:—

"After the pains he has taken to destroy your influence at Patna it was pro-"bably the only course left him."

Mr. Samuells was Mr. Halliday's particular friend and *protegé*, and was afterwards appointed to succeed me as Commissioner of Patna.

EXTRACT from Mr. *Farquharson's* Letter.

"My dear Tayler, "Patna City Court, 29 March 1857.

"I send you my translator's rendering of the Government letter for your approval. If you see anything exaggerated or mistaken in it, please mention the same, in returning the paper to me, for promulgation, as an Ishtehar, which is, I suppose, the object of the Lieutenant Governor in furnishing copies to the judicial authorities.

"I am quite at a loss to understand the tactics of the Government in thus ignoring your subscription and frustrating your scheme, after the amount of encouragement and fostering you say it has received at the hands of the Lieutenant Governor. Blowing hot and cold, tying with one hand while loosing with the other, pouring water through a sieve, are all clear utilities compared with this tirade about voluntary subscriptions, which the Lieutenant Governor and all the world know, as well as we do, to be the result of official influence pretty thickly laid on.

"Yours, &c.

(signed) "*R. N. Farquharson.*"

COPY of my LETTER to Mr. *Beadon*, Secretary to the Governor General, regarding the report of my Removal from Patna to Burdwan, for the consideration of Lord Canning.

"My dear Beadon, "7 June 1857.

"I feel myself in such a *very* peculiar position, that I do not hesitate to waive the usual restrictions of etiquette. I write these lines to represent the state of things which, at a grave and imminent crisis like the present, ought, I think, to be at once made known.

"There can be no doubt that the charge and management of the province of Behar, at this moment, is one of no little responsibility and importance.

"Everyone looks to me for orders, advice, and instructions. Information is daily sent me, *not* only from outside alarmists, but public officials, containing serious matter, and showing, that spite of all my efforts to re-assure people's hearts, there is a genuine and deep-seated alarm throughout all the district, and that none trusts a black man, in any shape.

"The whole English community at Tirhoot have demanded *protection*, as they believe that the people will rise, and the Nujeebs mutiny.

"All Buxar and Shahabad, as I mentioned, fled like sheep, the other day, and flocked into Dinapore. The materials at my disposal for protecting others are themselves objects of distrust.

"Wake begged me *not* to send Sikhs; others equally fear the national guard, and *thus* general *mistrust* and excitement render the position of all dangerous in the extreme.

"Richardson, of Chuprah, writes, that the whole country opposite Cutcherry, in the Ghazeepore Doab, and the people of *all* of the *districts to the west of Chuprah, are in open revolt*, and all this you will admit forms a serious state of things, a state which *may*, and please God will, subside into security, if *properly dealt with*; and I am quite game to handle the Provinces, if I am allowed to bring all the means at my disposal into play, and am known and felt to be paramount.

"But here is the screw; in the midst of all this I hear, though not from the Lieutenant Governor himself, that I have been or am to be removed to Burdwan. As this has been told to me, I doubt not it has been told to others, and will soon be bruited about. On what ground the removal is to be made, God knows (though from the fact of Mr. Garrett's unfounded attack upon me, I can guess)! But putting aside all personal consideration, I deem it my positive duty to protest against any *weakening* of my authority or prestige, at the present moment, when life, property, and all our dearest interests are at stake. However I may, in the estimation of some, have sinned by enthusiasm in a great cause, *no one doubts* the extent of my influence amongst the natives, or their regard or respect for me, and I think I may appeal to all in the Division, official and non-official, covenanted and uncovenanted (always excepting the small knot who have maligned me at Mr. Garrett's bidding), for the assurance that at this trying moment I have their respect and confidence; and from my knowledge of the native character, my personal acquaintance, and intimacy with so many of them, and the notorious fact that I have always striven to *prevent* any interference with their religious and social customs, I am in a position *peculiarly suited* to carry this great and now restless province through the present crisis.

"This is not the time for false delicacy or mock humility, and what I say, I say under a deep and solemn sense of the gravity of the case.

"The Lieutenant Governor is too much inclined, I fear, to make light of the crisis; he says it is 'inconceivable that the troops should mutiny in the face of the European forces,' and *yet* there is *no doubt whatever* that a matured plot for a rise *was* laid, and barely staved off, the other day.

Loot and outrage are raging up to the edge of our districts, and there is nothing but the police of the country to oppose them. The Rajahs, all at my request, have sent men to aid the authorities, and the moral effect throughout the district of such support and good *feeling* of the landed proprietors, is at this time most valuable, but the Lieutenant Governor tells me not to accept it; I mention this merely because I think it is of national importance, that the danger should *not be made light of*.

"I am, perhaps, *too much* the opposite of an *alarmist*, but in such a strife, which hundreds are intriguing to make *general, too great confidence* is folly.

"I have expressed the same sentiment to Mr. Halliday himself, and am therefore not wrong, I hope, in expressing them to the Governor General.

"But however this may be, I consider it my duty to *all*, as well as to myself, to demand that if I am to be removed, *I may be removed at once*, and not left with an aggrieved heart, and a paralysed authority, to preserve the whole province, keep hundreds of English in heart, and provide for every variety of difficult dilemma.

"If I am *not* to be removed, I *pray* that the report may be authoritatively contradicted.

"I consider that I have been so unfairly treated by the Lieutenant Governor in the late business of the Industrial Institution, that I can no longer reveal my feelings with confidence.

"Did this matter affect me only, however painful, mortifying, or unjust it might be, I would not have presumed upon his Lordship, as it is with the lives and safety of hundreds in my keeping, *I dare not hesitate to lay the matter before him.*"

COPY of a LETTER from *C. Beadon*, Esq.

"My dear Tayler,

"Your letter of the 17th reached me yesterday; I lost no time in ascertaining from the Lieutenant Governor whether the removal to Burdwan was contemplated, and was happy to receive an answer in the negative; change of any kind among high officers at such a time as this is much to be deprecated, *and in your case would be peculiarly mischievous.* (The *Italics* are mine. *W. T.*)

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*C. Beadon.*"

This was, of course, Mr. Beadon's delicate way of announcing the real facts, of which there was no doubt, viz., that my removal was prohibited by the Governor General; the previous intention being proved by Mr. Samuells' letter.

I now consider it due to myself, while discussing the question of the Industrial Institution, to append the copies of letters written to me by Mr. Halliday himself, Mr. Samuells, and Mr. Beadon, his special friends and associates, Dr. Duff, Dr. Mouatt, and other influential men.

That in return for the labour, anxiety, and trouble that I voluntarily incurred for the promotion of education and the advancement of the people, I should have met with low and petty spite, false accusations, and personal abuse, is, I am thankful to believe, unusual.

That opposition should have influenced Mr. Halliday to stultify himself, and throw me over, can only in charity be accounted for by the trait in his character pointed out by Mr. Samuells, and to which I have already referred, viz., "weakness," and fear of public or official disapproval.

I have numerous other letters written by the residents of the province, as well as by many distinguished officials expressing their strong approval and admiration of the educational scheme which I had proposed, their indignation at the treatment I had experienced, and their ridicule at the novelty of the idea, propounded for the first time by Mr. Halliday, of "disinterested sub-"scriptions."

My limited space will only admit of my inserting a very few of these gratifying letters, but those I select will, I fancy, be more than sufficient to settle the question. I will here only add the remark made by an intelligent Mahomedan old gentleman, who when he was asked whether he had any interested motive for subscribing to the Institution, it being stated in Mr. Halliday's proclamation that such motive was very wrong, &c., replied: Kya (what), give money without a motive, Insballa! When we reach Behisht (Paradise), we shall see such things.

LETTER from Mr. *Halliday.*

"Para. 18. The establishment of Zillah schools in these zemindaries, which by the judiciously used influence and encouragement of the Commissioner is about to be undertaken, or has already been partly entered upon by certain great zemindars in Patna, Behar, Shahabad, and Chuprah, is of the highest importance. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Tayler, that it is of infinite moment to enlist on the side of vernacular education the all-powerful and influential zemindars of the province of Behar; and to have done this will be, on Mr. Tayler's part, one of the greatest services to the cause of education that could possibly be rendered, and will redound to his credit in all parts of the province.

"Para. 20. I congratulate Mr. Tayler on the great field he has before him, and on the excellent spirit in which he is beginning to work upon it; I augur nothing but credit to himself, and benefit to the people, from the gradual development of his plans and purposes.

Para. 21. I would transmit a copy of this Paper to Mr. Tayler as the best evidence that I do not lightly consider his exertions, and that I desire to encourage him to advance and prosper.

(signed) "*Frederick James Halliday.*"

LETTER from Mr. *Halliday.*

"I have a great value for your plan, and think it may become a thing of vast importance. At all events, I look upon it, that the idea is a creditable one, creditable to you as the originator, and one of which I shall be proud to 'partake the triumph, and pursue the gale.'"

"LETTERS from various Individuals regarding the Industrial Institution.

No. 1.

EXTRACT from *E. A. Samuells*, Esq., to *W. Tayler*, Esq.

"My dear Tayler, "27 May 1857.

"I have read with much interest the letter to Halliday, which you sent me last week, and your private letter to Gordon Young, which I have just received. I did not advert in my former letter to the matter of the subscriptions to which these papers relate, because I had then no information regarding it. The impression left on my mind by a perusal of the correspondence, I may briefly state as follows:—

"Firstly. The correctness of the general principle which you lay down as to the propriety of inducing wealthy natives to expend their money on works of public utility, and assuring them of the approval of the ruling authority in the event of their doing so, is quite undesirable.

"If I am not mistaken you will find the principle distinctly enunciated in the notice or circular which the Government issued when they commenced the publication of the Gazette of the names of those who had assisted or subscribed to public undertakings during the preceding year.

"Secondly. I gather from your letter that you have kept Halliday fully informed of every step you have taken in the matter, and notified to him, from time to time, the amount of the subscriptions you have succeeded in obtaining from the different individuals who have contributed to your scheme. That being the case, it was his duty to have interfered at that time if he thought you were pressing too hard on the subscribers. To allow you to go on, and to express his tacit, if not his active, approval of your proceedings, so long as they excited no opposition, and then, at the first breath of popular clamour, to discredit an officer in your high position, by issuing a proclamation as that you mention, and directing the judges to report on your conduct (for in fact it amounts to that), was, unquestionably, injudicious, to use a mild phrase, in the Lieutenant Governor, and most unfair to you.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

No. 2.

"My dear Tayler, Jnne 1857.

"We* all think that you would be justified in demanding that Garrett should be required to prove that he had a valid foundation for his 'conscientious belief,' and that he has not been aspersing your character upon light grounds. Your letters both to Garrett and Halliday are quite proper, and Garrett, in my opinion, cuts a very poor figure in the correspondence.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

No. 3.

"My dear Tayler, June 1857.

"You have of course heard ere this that Halliday has removed you to Burdwan after the pains he has taken to destroy your influence at Patna; it was probably the only course left him.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

The following further extracts from letters written by Mr. Samuells, while living with Mr. Halliday's secretary, Mr. A. Young, and Mr. Beadon, and in great favour with Mr. Halliday, are significant:—

"W. Tayler, Esq., 9 May 1857.

"I think the opinion is general that you have been perfectly successful in showing that you used no improper means to obtain subscriptions; and, secondly, that you acted throughout with the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor. I trust, therefore, that this blast of calumny which has assailed you will blow over soon innocuously, and that Halliday will not suffer himself to be influenced by popular clamour, though, between ourselves, that is one of his weak points.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

Again, when referring to one of the largest subscribers, Mr. Samuells, after strongly

* *I.e.*, evidently all those living together, viz., A. Young, Mr. Halliday's private secretary, E. A. Samuells, and C. Beadon, Secretary to the Government of India.

strongly condemning Mr. Halliday's conduct towards me, in the letter quoted above, writes,—

"In the case of Modenarain, you appear to have acted under the direct sanction of the Lieutenant Governor, and if there is anything wrong in that transaction the blame clearly does not lie at your door.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

"My dear Tayler, "Calcutta, 4 April 1857.

"I received your phamphlet on Industrial Education, and read it with much interest. All the objects which you propose to attain by the establishment of an Industrial Institution are most excellent, and I sincerely hope that your experiment may be attended with all the success you desire * * * * * I think your object is a very noble one, and one which must secure you the sympathy and good wishes of every philanthropic mind. *I say, therefore, go on, and pay no heed to idle and envious clamour.* Even if your experiment fail it cannot but do some good, while it lasts, in awakening the native mind * * * * * I should apologise, however, for venturing to make my suggestion on the details of a measure which you have doubtless studied far more deeply than I have. I shall say nothing further than that I shall take a warm interest in the success of your scheme, and trust to see it live down the doubt of those who think least hopefully of it.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells*, B.C.S."*

The following letter will be read with interest, as coming from an intelligent Mahomedan gentleman, who was one of the Arrah garrison, and was subsequently decorated with the Star of India :—

"To *W. Tayler*, Esq., from *Syud Azeem-ood-deen*, Deputy Collector.

"My dear Sir, "Arrah, 5 April 1857.

"Many thanks for the perusal of the papers connected with the School of Industry. If I were to enumerate the blessings it would confer on the province of Behar, my letter would exceed the limits I have assigned to it.

"Allow me to assure you that if your well-considered scheme succeed, which it must under your able guidance, it would work a change in the destiny of India, and bring it to a level with the more civilised countries on the face of the globe.

"Persevere, my dear sir, with the same philanthropic spirit which has prompted you to undertake the vast scheme of improvement, and success will attend you in every step which you take to carry it out.

"I was highly disgusted to see some scandalous letters published in the 'Englishman,' but let not the base malice of the enemy to the amelioration of India direct you from your noble pursuit, and let the enemy have the mortification to see that the seed you have sown has become a tree, the wholesome fruits of which are destined for India to reap.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*Syud Azeem-ood-deen*, Khan."

EXTRACT of a LETTER from *H. Richardson*, Esq., Magistrate of Tirhoot.

"I cannot, myself, see how Halliday, after ordering all the world to beg for schools and the like, can now turn against *you, one man*, for begging for a better institution than any school."

EXTRACT of a LETTER from the Hon. *J. R. Colvin*, afterwards Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces.

"Your schemes are sure to turn to some considerable good when you have nearly two lakhs of rupees to work them with. I look with most hope to your vernacular school and your industrial department. It is through such efforts and through many failures, that we may in all ways finally achieve some real success."

EXTRACT from a LETTER from the Rev. *J. Long*.

"Calcutta, 25 January 1858.

"* * * * * * I read your 'protest' about the Behar Industrial Institution, and must express to you my full sympathy with your views. You have tapped what is the great *mine* of Behar, agricultural education. I hope you will not be deterred by the opposition, but that you will hold this latter forward as one of the greatest measures needed for India.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*J. Long.*"

* Afterwards appointed my successor at Patna.

COPY of a LETTER from Dr. *Duff*.

"My dear Mr. Tayler, "1857.

"Your protest I read this morning, and can cordially respond to every sentiment in it respecting the best mode of dealing with the natives, &c. &c.

"And now I have to thank you for the sketch. From what I had learned from others, and your own vivid account of yesterday, my impression accords with that of others, who regarded it as singularly adapted to the peculiar exigencies of the people.

"With a noble object in view, with noble philanthropic motives in the pursuit of it, and a conscientious rectitude of aim and purpose throughout, you may well lift up your head in the assurance that, *sooner* or *later*, you will vindicate the right.

"Yea, under a new régime of things in India I would fain hope that you may yet be in a position to work so noble a scheme to a glorious consummation.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*Alexander Duff*."

LETTER from the Honourable *E. Drummond*, B.C.S., afterwards Lieutenant General of the North West Provinces.

"My dear Tayler,

"I return the pamphlet with many thanks. I have never seen the scheme of your Industrial School, but that all parties appear to concur in praising, and whatever the difference of opinion as respects the extent to which official influence may properly be used for the promotion of objects, depending upon voluntary contributions, I think you have good reason to complain of the manner in which your position and influence as Commissioner appears to have been compromised.

"Yours, &c.
"16 November 1857." (signed) "*Edmund Drummond*."

LETTER from Major *Holmes*, Commanding Irregular Cavalry at Segoubee.

"My dear Tayler,

"I find it hard to express the real pleasure I have felt in the perusal of the papers connected with the Industrial Institution. The whole thing comes to me like the accomplishment of a long-cherished dream.

"If this your great work is allowed free course, and carried out with steady patience, perseverance and industry, not deterred by little failures, and the cavilling of the crowd (for without these no great scheme has ever been brought to perfection), I am strongly persuaded that such a success will follow as has never yet been attained by any similar enterprise (I will not say in India, for no like work has yet been attempted in India), but *in the whole world*.

"As a pactical proof of my strong approbation of your scheme, may I request your acceptance of a merino ram and four merino ewes, imported from the Cape for the Agricultural and Pastoral Department; and to your Orphan Asylum I would gladly transfer two parentless children of six and eight years, with 50 rupees per annum to be paid by me until their education enable them to provide for themselves.

"Should I happily be able to assist your scheme at any time with my individual exertions, I need hardly say that they will be most heartily at your service."

LETTER from Dr. *Mouat*, Superintendent of Public Education.

"My dear Tayler, "3 February 1857.

"I have gone through the papers which you kindly sent me, with the interest of one who has for many years advocated similar views, but was not so fortunately placed as you are for carrying them into effect.

"The outline of your plan is complete, and admits of no addition; the details will necessarily work themselves out, as the institution gradually expands. I hope you will print all these papers, as a small pamphlet for general distribution, and if I can aid you in Calcutta or elsewhere, my poor services are entirely at your command. I have no hesitation in declaring my belief, that if fully and fairly carried out, and developed to the extent of what it is susceptible, the blessings capable of being conferred in your province by your plan will not be surpassed by those of any great measure yet conceived and executed for the benefit of those entrusted by Providence to the rule of Great Britain.

"With the most hearty wishes for your entire success.

"I am, &c."

EXTRACT from a LETTER from *C. Beadon*, Esq., Calcutta.

"My Dear Tayler,

"Samuells has shown me your letter to the Lieutenant Governor about your Industrial School; it disposes of the question of '*undue influence*.'*

"Yours &c.
"23 May 1857." (signed) "*Cecil Beadon*."

* An important admission, coming from the Secretary to Government, and Mr. Halliday's friend, Mr., now Sir, Cecil Beadon.—*W. T.*

One more letter I am tempted to add, as it affords an amusing comment on Mr. Halliday's celebrated proclamation. The scene described took place on the occasion of Mr. Halliday's first visit as Lieutenant Governor to Mozufferpore. It is written by a public officer, an eye witness to the entire proceeding. How Mr. Halliday, a few months afterwards, could bring himself to promulgate his new ideas respecting "disinterested subscriptions," it is impossible to understand.

"I do not write to you often, because I know that having to carry on an extensive correspondence you cannot have much leisure, but you must not suppose from my silence that my ardour for the prosperity of the institution has at all cooled.

"*Martin* made out the list and specified the sum each party was expected to pay on the occasion of the Lieutenant Governor's visit. The Raja gave 5,000, and Nundeput and his brother, 4,000. The total collections amounted to 16,000.

"*Young* (the present Secretary), and *Irwin*, the Collector, asked the people to subscribe to the school. The Raja gave 5,000 in cash and lands, for which he had paid upwards of 5,500; the total collections were 18,000, I think.

"At the municipal meeting, *Martin* went round with pen and paper in his hand in the hall of the school-room, where there was a large collection of people, and himself begged of them to put down their names as subscribers. This fuss is quite ridiculous. The natives have always been asked, and as long as they continue what they are, they must always be asked, and they know it is expected from them to contribute towards laudable objects.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*J. Davies.*"

CHAPTER III.

My Proposed Removal.

In my first two chapters I have dealt with the first two subjects alluded to in the "Memorandum" of Sir Frederick Halliday, viz., the alleged "displeasure 'of the Sudder Board" (or, to speak more correctly, of Mr. Dampier), and the incidents connected with my projected scheme of an "Industrial Institution" for the Province of Behar.

Whether the facts disclosed justify the dishonouring comments of Sir F. Halliday, I leave to the impartial consideration of my readers.

After briefly touching upon another of my supposed sins, viz., the "con-"cealing as much as possible my acts and intentions" (a subject which I have discussed in a separate chapter), he refers to his desire to remove me from the Commissionership, but subsequently says that, as I was "undoubtedly "intelligent, active, and energetic," he determined to "endeavour to bring "about a change in the manner of conducting my duties," and adds a sentence to which I would desire to direct particular attention; it is as follows:—

"I was in hopes that by insisting on constant and frequent communications, "and, with the aid of the electric telegraph, I should be able to *direct and* "*control*" (the *italics* are mine) "all that was done by the Commissioner." He then goes on to the detailed description of, what he terms, "wilful dis-"obedience," in the face of positive orders, "in a matter of life or death, when "obedience has not happened to suit his" (my) "purpose, or opinion, of what "was to be done."

This grave accusation will be fully dealt with in my next chapter. I will here only offer some remarks on what may be called the preface to Sir F. Halliday's formidable indictment.

He represents himself as anxious, on public grounds, to remove me, but that he refrained from doing so for sundry reasons, and specially because he thought, *by insisting on constant and frequent communications*, he could "direct "and control" all that I did.

This description is plausible, and represents Mr. Halliday as exhibiting charitable kindness and consideration towards an erring subordinate.

But is it a true representation? How does it tally with the following letter written by his confidential friend and protégé, Mr. E. A. Samuells, who was living at the time in the very hot-bed of Secretariat's officialism—in the same house with

with Mr. A. Young, and Mr. Beadon, the Secretary to the Supreme Government:—

"My dear Tayler, "Calcutta, 11 June.

"You have, of course, heard that Halliday has removed you to Burdwan; after the pains he has taken to destroy your influence at Patna, it was probably the only course left him.

"Yours, &c.

(signed) "*E. A. Samuells.*"

In a subsequent letter he told me the name of my successor.

This, then, was the real fact; but, before the transfer was actually carried out I had written the letter to the Secretary of the Governor General, which I have transcribed at length in my chapter on the "Industrial Institution," and which I hope will be carefully read.

And here I will venture to ask how the facts thus established are consistent with the statements deliberately recorded by Mr. Halliday, that "it was "notorious that he had so aggrieved the zemindars by his collection for the "Industrial School as to excite no little discontent and disclination to listen to "his applications."

No language that I can decorously or decently use, would fitly describe this unfounded statement.

But to examine it logically, and dispassionately, may I not ask that if this had really been the case, how could my projected removal have been in the highest quarters regarded as "peculiarly mischievous," as declared by Lord Canning's secretary. (*See* Mr. Beadon's letter.)

Again, Mr. Halliday, in his elaborate Minute of 1858, said that Lord Canning had "nothing to do with the question."

Was then the deliberate purpose and determination of the Lieutenant Governor founded on such serious and important facts as Mr. Halliday represented, and carried so far into execution, as Mr. Samuells stated, at once, and, in a few hours, over-ridden and nullified by the single opinion of a junior secretary?

If Mr. Halliday had really been convinced, as he asserts, that I had so materially weakened my influence with the leading landholders, would he not—would it not have been his duty to have at once rejected the advice given by Mr. Beadon? Would he not have communicated to Mr. Beadon a fact so important to the public interests, and so damaging to my character; so fatal to my efficiency, and so fraught with danger to the province?

And if he had thus communicated his feelings and convictions, which, if real, he *must* have done, would not Mr. Beadon, who was in friendly and familiar communication with me, have mentioned or made some allusion to the fact, instead of at once placing on record, in open disregard and contempt of Mr. Halliday's view, the dictum that my removal "would be peculiarly "mischievous."

Need I say more to expose the hollowness, the unreality, of the whole story?

I now come to paragraph 4 of Sir F. Halliday's Memorandum, in which, quoting his former words, he repeats: "I was in hopes that in insisting on "constant and frequent communications, and with the aid of the electric "telegraph, I should be able to direct and control all that was done by the "Commissioner."

The expression sounds considerate, and almost paternal, and if such a kind and reasonable purpose had only been communicated to me would doubtless have excited my gratitude and hearty acquiescence.

But not a single word of such a sentiment or wish was imparted to me, and the whole story becomes almost painfully absurd when Mr. Halliday's early communications, which laid down the mode and character of our future correspondence, are read.

The following is the first letter of *direction and control*,—a letter carefully excluded from Mr. Halliday's special Blue Book, as elsewhere exposed.

"My dear Tayler, "Darjeeling, 27 May 1857.

"I send you my letter of the 25th May last year, which you wrote for.

"I am glad to hear that all is quiet at Patna. *The less fuss made the better.*

"Yours, &c.

(signed) "*Fred. Jas. Halliday.*"

The next letter ran thus—

"My dear Tayler, "Darjeeling, 28 May 1857.

"I have just received yours of the 23rd. As soon as the telegraph is open, I request you will *send me* (*to Calcutta*) *a daily message, brief*, just to say 'all's well,' till further notice."

Whether these letters indicate any great anxiety to exercise "constant direc-"tion and control," I leave my readers to decide.

As to *any* "direction or control" from that time up to the 25th June, it amounted to little more than repeating, for decency's sake, the puerile order not to *ask* the zemindars for assistance, but to thank them if they gave it.

With regard, however, to my own communications, I need only refer to the pamphlet which contains all my letters which appeared in the special Blue Book, published by Mr. Halliday for his own purposes, and which was submitted to the Secretary of State in 1868, with my memorial. Also to the additional letters, which I pointed out in that memorial as having been withheld; and, lastly, to a further batch of letters, which I have only lately discovered, and which, though printed in the general Blue Book, have been entirely omitted in the special volume. I need, I say, only refer to this mass of letters to prove the groundlessness of the charge here again referred to of concealing my acts and intentions.

This subject is treated at length in my chapter devoted to it.

I will in the following chapter deal with the most serious accusation in Sir Frederick Halliday's Minute, viz., the wilful disobedience of positive orders in the trial of Captain Rattray's trooper.

The general question as to the propriety or otherwise at such a crisis of mixing myself up with the operations of the police, I treated at the time in my memorial to the Court of Directors.

The subject is not without importance in connection with the present controversy, as it was introduced by Mr. Halliday into his Minute in 1857, when recording the grounds of my removal, and there represented as a crime which caused "public discontent and scandal."

How the Government could expect at such a time that events, plots, and conspiracies could be safely discovered and followed up without such "mixing "up," it passes my imagination to conceive; when they appointed the Commissioner (himself superintendent of police), and the magistrate to act under the special law of XIV. of 1857, and try offenders, as judges in the last resort.

When my next chapter (No. V.) is read, my readers will not, I imagine, consider me far wrong when I suggest that the whole fable connected with this subject was concocted to furnish some apparently decent ground for my condemnation.

I think I may say, *si non vero*; it was *ben trovato*, for it was conveyed even to the Secretary of State, and forms a principal ground of Lord Stanley's censure.

CHAPTER IV.

Wilful Disobedience.—Trial of Captain Rattray's Trooper.

This charge, now reproduced by Sir Frederick Halliday in his "Memorandum," under consideration, was thus described in his Minute of 17th March 1857, written in vindication of his summary order for my removal from the Patna Commissionership.

After stating that "frequent interruptions in the communication by tele-"graph had prevented me from keeping that watch over his actions which I had "proposed!" he continues: "Moreover, I have discovered that Mr. Tayler has "not hesitated to disobey my orders (and that, too, in a matter of life or death) "when obedience has not happened to suit his purpose, or his own opinion of "what was to be done.

"I look upon Mr. Tayler's conduct in the case here alluded to in a very "serious light. He had already, in the cases of 15 or 16 persons, capitally "convicted,

"convicted, largely mixed himself up with the operations of the police magis-
"trate and public prosecutor against persons whom he was afterwards to try,
"and actually did try, as a judge in the last resort. To prevent this indecorum,
"which might, perhaps, almost be called injustice, and which was occasioning
"public scandal and discontent, I gave him positive orders not to sit as judge
"in the case of anyone against whom he had been concerned in the previous
"examination and inquiries, but to commit such persons for trial, to the more
"impartial tribunal of the sessions judge. In the face of these orders Mr.
"Tayler did not hesitate to try, and condemn to death, a trooper of Captain
"Rattray's Police Corps, in whose case he had been previously concerned in
"the operations of the police, and upon whose trial he could not possibly be
"considered impartial."

Now, as this grave accusation was one of those to which I referred in my second Memorial to the Court of Directors, the Memorial which, without any intimation to me, was withheld for several months by Mr. Halliday, on the plea that the complaint of "misrepresentation" which I had submitted to the Court, was "intolerably offensive," the subject is one of special importance, and the more so because the censure thus passed upon me was accepted and endorsed by Lord Stanley in his Minute of 1st June 1859.

The accusation itself, I venture here, with the utmost confidence, to affirm, is untrue in every point, as I shall clearly show.

Before, however, I proceed to the full exposure of the utter untruthfulness of the narration, I must first point to the fact which, as in all Sir F. Halliday's mis-statements, forms the small substratum of the story.

The following, then, are the precise facts which took place in connection with the subject:—

The trial, conviction, and sentence in the two cases referred to by Mr. Halliday, in the sentence above quoted; the one connected with the *émeute* in the city, in which Dr. Lyell was murdered; the other with the treachery of Captain Rattray's trooper, had been completed and duly reported to Government in June and July, and the reports had been received with approbation.

On the 3rd August the following letter was written to me:—

"From *A. R. Young*, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Bengal, to the Commissioner of the Patna Division.

"Sir, "Fort William, 3 August 1857.

"It having been brought to the notice of the Lieutenant Governor by the Judge of Patna, that you tried and condemned to death, under the provisions of Act XIV., of 1857, a trooper of Captain Rattray's corps, after the receipt of my letter, No. 1,167, dated the 11th ultimo, I am directed to request that you will submit an immediate explanation of your reasons for acting in opposition to the orders therein conveyed.

"2. Pending the decision which his Honor may arrive at, on receipt of your explanation, you are requested not to hold any trials under the Act referred to.

"I have, &c.
"*A. R. Young.*"

On the day following the date of this letter, Mr. Halliday passed his order for my removal, but, as some little delay occurred in the transmission of that order, I may have received the first letter regarding the trooper, above quoted, two or three days before I made over charge of the office.

It is, of course, difficult at this length of time to say exactly what steps I took in respect to the requisition regarding the trial, but it is evident, from the letters which I subjoin, and the copies of which are in my possession, that on the 9th of August, after my removal, I thus wrote, after some inquiry made:—

"From *W. Tayler*, Esq., *late* Commissioner of Patna, to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

"Sir, "Patna, 9 August 1857.

"In reply to your letter, No. 1,519, of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to observe that I was not aware the sessions judge of Patna was empowered to try cases under Act XIV., of 1857, nor has any intimation been received to that effect.

"2. I have been informed that the present Commissioner has made a representation to Government on the subject.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*W. Tayler*, late Commissioner."

This answer was written after inquiry by me from Mr. Hanvey, the assistant to the Commissioner, who, during the entire crisis had remained at the office, while I, for cogent reasons, which I have elsewhere explained, conducted all my duties in my house.

The reason that I was compelled to consult him was, as will be seen, that I was in happy ignorance of the existence of any order *at all*; the reason why Mr. Hanvey did not bring such order as there was to my notice, will be explained in another letter from him, which I have transcribed below.

Meanwhile, to show that he was correct in his information, I subjoin a letter from my successor, Mr. Samuells, written some days afterwards.

"From the Commissioner of the Patna Division to the Secretary of the Government of Bengal, Calcutta.

"Sir, "Patna, 22 August 1857.

"There being no Commissioner under Section 7, Act XIV., of 1857, in this district, with the exception of myself, I have the honour to request that Mr. R. N. Farquharson,* who has expressed his willingness to officiate, may also be nominated.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*E. A. Samuells,*
"Commissioner of Circuit."

*Mr. Farquharson was the judge.

I now give the second letter from the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Hanvey, written some months afterwards, in reply, apparently, to a further requisition which I made, probably when I found that Mr. Halliday had made a serious charge against me.

The original letter is in my possession.

"To *W. Tayler*, Esq.

"Sir,

"Having been suffering from fever when your letter reached me, I was unable to reply to the same immediately; being now somewhat better, I hasten to furnish the information required.

"On receipt of the Government letter, regarding the trial (*i.e.*, the letter of the 3rd August, which I have quoted) of Captain Rattray's trooper, I carried over to your house the whole of the letters regarding the trials of offences under Act XIV., of 1857. When I was questioned why the manuscript circular, No. 1,167, of the 11th July 1857, in which the sessions judges were directed to try all cases committed, should they be present at the station, and be vested with the powers of Commissioners—(here there must be some unintentional omission; I imagine, 'was not shown you, or brought before you'), when the trooper's trial was before you, I replied that the *judge was not vested with the powers,* and that Mr. Samuells had made a reference on the subject.

"You then wrote a reply to the Government letter.

"I trust the above statement will be found to be correct, as it is to the best of my recollection.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*W. Hanvey,*
"Officiating Assistant to the Commissioner.

"Patna, Commissioners' Office,
"31 March 1858."

This is an exact *résumé* of what passed; and here it will be expedient to insert the Circular Order itself, which gave rise to this correspondence. It is taken from the Blue Book.

"Enclosure 800, No. 1.

"The Secretary to Government of Bengal.—To all Officers exercising Powers under Act XIV., of 1857.

"Sir, "11 July 1857.

"In some districts several officers have been vested with powers to try offences under Act XIV., of 1857, and doubts may arise as to which of such officers should be called upon to act when more than one are present at the same time. I am directed to intimate to you that it is to be understood that when two or more officers, *specially empowered* under this Act, happen to be present at the same station, the sessions judge, *should he be one of them,* will try prisoners committed under the Act in question; if the sessions judge be not present, then the Commissioner of Circuit will try the cases, and, in the absence both of the sessions judge and the Commissioner, the senior officer, possessing the requisite power, will hold the trial.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*A. R. Young.*"

These

These then, as clearly shown by the correspondence, are the *facts*, simple and unadorned; and they show this, that some time after I and the magistrate had received special powers to try cases under Act XIV., of 1857, a Circular Order was, on 11th July, issued, prescribing, for general information, certain rules in regard to the practice to be observed in such trials, which, as is clearly shown, in no conceivable way affected the course of proceedings hitherto carried out at Patna, inasmuch as they referred to districts where the sessions judge was "specially empowered under the Act," which the Patna judge *was not;* probably, I may here suggest, because the magistrate had been so empowered beforehand.

This being merely a Circular Order, the Assistant Commissioner, an old and experienced officer, seeing that it in no way affected *my* proceedings, never brought it to my notice, and, consequently, I and the magistrate continued to exercise our duties, under our special appointments, never dreaming that we were acting save under the directions and authority given to us, and never hearing a word from the judge or any one else.

All who read the above pages will, I fancy, admit that this is an accurate statement of the facts.

I now proceed to Mr. Halliday's version of them, and the sensational fables which he has concocted, as set forth in the first page of this chapter.

The subject is a painful one, but must not be evaded.

I venture, then, to affirm, and with little fear of contradiction, that the entire description set forth by Mr. Halliday, in his Minute of 1857, written when ordering my removal, and now deliberately reproduced in his present memorandum, is, from first to last, a *fabrication, of which not one word or syllable is true.*

This is a grave and solemn charge, utterly unpardonable if not well founded.

But I now proceed to the proof of my assertion, and, for that purpose, will examine each sentence; commencing with the incidents detailed in support of his charge of "wilful disobedience," and then concluding with the charge itself.

The incidents, then, as represented by Mr. Halliday, are these; and, for the sake of perspicuity, I will repeat them in order.

The first is thus worded: "I look upon Mr. Tayler's conduct in this case "(viz., the trial of Captain Rattray's trooper) in a very serious light. He had "already, in the cases of 15 or 16 persons capitally convicted, largely mixed "himself up with the operations of the police magistrate and public prosecutor "against persons whom he was afterwards to try as a judge in the last resort."

The "cases" here mentioned were the trials arising out of the great *émeute* in the Patna city, in which Dr. Lyell was murdered and savagely mutilated, the only case in which numbers were implicated.

Now the first specific and incriminatory statement deliberately recorded to my disparagement was that in this case I had "largely mixed myself up with "the police magistrates and public prosecutors." It is by a kind of Nemesis of outraged veracity that this statement has been placed on record, for not only is it *utterly untrue*, but the untruth is, and was at the time, so prominently and satisfactorily shown by the evidence in existence, that it is inconceivable Mr. Halliday should have ventured to make such an assertion.

The *émeute* took place in the heart of the Patna city, several miles from my house. So far from my "mixing myself up with the operations of the police," the *entire preliminary proceedings were conducted throughout by Dewan Mowla Bushh, the deputy magistrate, under special orders of the magistrate, and, with one exception, fully explained at the time; I never saw or communicated with the prisoners till I sat as judge on the trial with the magistrate,* and in presence of all the principal residents in the station.

What makes Mr. Halliday's statement the more unjustifiable is that this fact was specially reported both by myself and the magistrate, and the zealous services of Mowla Buksh in the case were publicly acknowledged and praised by the Lieutenant Governor himself (*vide* letter annexed).

Such is statement the first, and though followed by others equally unfounded, yet, as it lies at the root of the whole matter, is to be specially noted.

Statement No. 2 represents the ground and purpose for which, as he professes, he found it necessary to interfere. The words are, "To prevent this "indecorum, which might, perhaps, almost be called injustice."

Having, however, shown that the action which is supposed to have constituted the alleged "indecorum" did not take place, I need hardly say that no such "indecorum" existed.

But in statement No. 3 he entered on a description of the effects on the public of this imaginary "indecorum," for he says, "which was occasioning "public scandal and discontent."

Criticism on this is superfluous. I will only observe that if it had been true in the slightest particular, Mr. Halliday, who says he was resolved to "watch "and control my proceedings," would surely have vouchsafed *some* intimation or warning on the subject.

No such hint, however, is to be found in the whole correspondence. Full reports of the trials were submitted by me, as may be seen by reference to the pamphlet which I laid before the Secretary of State in Council in 1868, as an appendix to my memorial, and which, having disappeared from the India Office, has now, through the kindness of the Secretary of State, been reprinted from a copy furnished by me.

From this pamphlet it will be seen that the *proceedings in this very trial, which were afterwards described as having produced "public scandal and discontent," were publicly and officially approved by Mr. Halliday.*

What, then, is the upshot of this narrative thus forcibly described to my disgrace and dishonour?

Incidents which never occurred constituted "indecorum," proceedings which had never taken place had produced "public discontent and scandal," though neither the public nor Mr. Halliday, nor any one else, had ever noticed them; while for the express and important purpose of "preventing" what had never occurred, Mr. Halliday sent *me* a "positive order," which he thus describes, with an accuracy which is wonderful, as it never existed! The order was, or is said to have been, "Not to sit as judge in the case of anyone against "whom he had been concerned in the previous examination and inquiries, but "to commit such prisoners for trial to the more impartial tribunal of the "sessions judge."

Well, I have quoted in a former page the only order given, and I think I may safely challenge the warmest friend or partisan of Mr. Halliday to examine it, and to point out (even if it had been applicable to my district, which I have shown it was *not*) in what way and by what cunningness of interpretation such a circular order can be held to correspond, in the smallest degree, with Mr. Halliday's description.

Is there the faintest hint or reference to the "indecorum" or "scandalous "proceedings" which are said to have given rise to it? Is it *conceivable* that if these proceedings *had* caused "public scandal and discontent" to such an extent as to be canvassed by the public, and call for a "positive order," and consequent most positive return, there should be *no sign or token of disapproval to be discovered?*

Does the language of the evidence correspond with the description given by Mr. Halliday?

Is the effect of it (supposing even that it applied to Patna), leaving the Commissioner, as it does, still vested with the authority, in case of the judge's absence, in any way what is represented as its purpose?

Is there a word of allusion to the "previous operations of the police"?

But it is unnecessary, I imagine, to say more, for the climax of the misdescription is shown by the fact, of which I have given unanswerable proof, viz., that the order had no effect whatever on my proceedings; makes no allusion whatever to my previous action, and can in no possible sense be perverted into a "positive order," directed personally to me, or bearing in any single article or word the significance so prominently, and, may I not add, so unjustifiably given to it by Mr. Halliday.

Such, then, being the state of the case, what becomes of the further criminatory statement; the stern rebuke conveyed in the grave words: "In the face "of these orders, Mr. Tayler did not hesitate to try, and condemn to death, a "trooper of Captain Rattray's police, upon whose trial he could not possibly be "impartial."

It is superfluous to say, that as all the preceding items of this elaborate description are fabulous, the final act, the wilful disobedience "in the face" of a "positive order," which had never been given, is fabulous also, existing only in the fertile imagination or heated brain of Mr. Halliday.

Giving

Giving him credit for having believed the statement which Mr. Young made in his letter of the 3rd July, viz., that the Circular Order was applicable to my district, the answer sent by me on the 9th, and the subsequent letter from Mr. Samuells of the 22nd August, *must have undeceived him;* but, under any circumstances, whether it did or not, the sensational description as to the previous trial, with all its affecting details and incidents, is an obvious and indisputable fabrication.

When the reader peruses the account of my second suspension, he will understand why my second memorial, in which this question was described, was detained, for it referred principally to this severe charge, which I had the unpardonable presumption to designate a "misrepresentation," and which, if it had been carefully investigated by the Secretary of State, would have been shown to be something worse.

The remarkable coincidence in this narrative is, that the special point on which the whole of Mr. Halliday's formidable narrative is based, viz., that I had "largely mixed myself up with the operations of the police, in the trial "referred to, is *positively and prominently contradicted by all the reports made "on the case! !*"

Annexed are two letters of mine to the Lieutenant Governor, dated 7th and 10th of July, respectively, distinctly stating the fact that the conduct of the preliminary proceedings and management of the case was left *entirely* in *the hands* of Mowla Buksh, the deputy magistrate. And Mr. Lowis, the magistrate, in his separate report, mentions the same thing! while several months afterwards Mr. Samuells, in the extravagance of his antagonism, refers specially to the fact, as highly censurable on my part, because that excellent man, who has since been decorated with the Star of India, was a Mahomedan! !

My letters, and the extracts alluded to, are here subjoined, with the letter from Government, expressing special approval of Mowla Buksh's services.

No. 485.

"From the Commissioner of the Patna Division to the Secretary of the Government of Bengal.

Sir, "Patna, 7 July 1857.

"Having had incessant occupation for the last two or three days, and not being very well myself, I am only able to send a brief report in continuation of my last letter, to say that 30 of the men concerned in the late disturbance (evidently a religious movement), have been apprehended, and that 14 men, including the man who shot Dr. Lyell, have this day been sentenced to death, and will be hanged this afternoon.

"2. *The case has been ably and most successfully conducted by Dewan Mowla Buksh; the sentence has been passed by Mr. Lowis and myself sitting as Commissioners.*

"3. The plot is a *Lucknow* plot, conducted here by one of their emissaries.

"4. Further particulars will be given hereafter.

"5. I adhere to my plan of keeping the city and people down with a strong hand, though I dare not act as freely as I should wish, because of the warning to 'avoid illegal measures.' I would plead for a full and unrestricted discretion, especially as all my predictions have proved to be true, and the security professed by others to have been utterly unfounded and fraught with peril.

I have, &c.
(signed) "*W. Tayler,* Commissioner of Revenue."

No. 522.

"From the Commissioner of the Patna Division to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

"Sir, "Patna, 10 July 1857.

"In continuation of my letter, No. 489, of the 8th instant, I have the honour to state that the second of the two prisoners whose execution I delayed in hopes of eliciting some information from him, was yesterday hanged.

"2. The man is the zemadar of the great banker, Lootf Ali Khan, and was actively concerned in the outrage.

"3. Several other prisoners have since been arrested and will be immediately brought to trial.

"4. I am preparing a full narrative, which will be forwarded shortly.

"5. A translation of the principal letters found in the house of Peer Ali Khan, will accompany it.

"6. I have ordered his house to be razed to the ground, and a post placed on the spot with a notice, stating that he and 13 of his accomplices have been hanged, and that if such a combination and conspiracy is again discovered, I will make all the ward responsible.

"7. The effect of the detection and prompt retribution in this case has been excellent, and I am credibly informed that many of the ill disposed and designing characters have left the city.

"8. *The greatest credit is due to Dewan Mowla Buksh for his untiring exertions and for the skilful way in which he conducted the case.*

"9. *The inquiry was left entirely in his hands.*

"10. It is a fortunate thing that I insisted upon the wounded man being brought to my house at dawn in the morning, and then sent to the Seikh Soldiers' Hospital, as we thereby elicited valuable information in support of the evidence adduced.

"11. The man was appointed darogah by Peer Ali, and had been on pay for several months.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*W. Tayler,*
"Commissioner of Revenue."

No. 400.

"From the Secretary to the Government of Bengal to the Commissioner of Patna.

"Sir, "Fort William, 15 July 1857.

"I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 522, dated the 10th instant, reporting the execution of the second of the two prisoners referred to in your communication of the 8th idem, as also your proceedings in regard to Peer Ali Khan.

"In reply, I am desired to observe, that so far as the Lieutenant Governor has at present the means of judging, your measures have been well planned and promptly executed. His Honor, however, anxiously awaits the full particulars which you have promised to furnish.

"*His Honor hears with satisfaction the good report you give of the conduct of Dewan Mowla Buksh, whose exertions will not, you may assure him, pass unrewarded.*

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*A. R. Young,*
"Secretary of the Government of Bengal."

"EXTRACT from the LETTER of Mr. *J. Lowis* to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal; dated Patna, 11 July 1857.

"Para. 5.—In conclusion, I would beg to notice, that although I was obliged to bring to the notice of the deputy magistrate, Moulvie Mowla Buksh, his culpable negligence in having permitted men and arms to be collected without molestation in the portion of the city committed to his care, yet the *energy with which he has fulfilled the duty I then committed to him of searching out and bringing to justice the parties* concerned in the riot, entitles him to considerable praise."

"EXTRACT from LETTER from Mr. *E. A. Samuells* to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal; dated Patna, 29 January 1858.

"Para. 67.—Any one who reads the diatribes in which Mr. Tayler, in his anxiety to conciliate the popular favour, has indulged against the Mahomedans, and his deliberate avowal that he and an 'observing few' are convinced that we owe this mutiny to a Mahomedan plot, will not be a little astonished to learn, that notwithstanding the charge brought by the wounded prisoner against Mowla Buksh, *the whole investigation of this case was committed to his hand.*"

And, again, in the continuation of my narrative, submitted to Government on the 21st July, I thus wrote:—

"Para. 28. Of Dewan Mowla Buksh it is difficult to speak too highly. Though now old and in bad health, he has exerted himself night and day in the service of the Government.

"29. *The entire conduct of the preliminary proceedings in the late outbreak had been committed to him by the magistrate,* and he has displayed firmness, zeal, and tact, and an unswerving impartiality in the performance of his duties."

The above extracts will, I imagine, be sufficient to establish beyond all possibility of doubt or question, that Mr. Halliday's deliberate statement in regard to the proceedings of this case are diametrically opposed to the evidence on record, and thus, that the whole narrative and indignant accusation is utterly without foundation! I am much mistaken if a careful perusal of many other statements recorded by Sir Frederick Halliday does not tend to the same conclusion.

CHAPTER V.

"CONCEALING as much as possible his arts and intentions; and has since "avowed that this was done wilfully and purposely, in order to carry out "views of his own, which he thought I should not approve of."

Such is the charge, as formulated by Mr. Halliday, at the time of my removal.

To enhance the criminality of the alleged delinquency, he has in his present memorandum added, "as a rule."

In dealing with this serious accusation which, if true, would have disqualified me for my high position, it is really difficult to find terms, consistent with decorum, which will fairly represent its utter groundlessness.

I certainly did think that Sir Frederick Halliday, after the explanation and defence submitted by me in my memorial submitted to the Secretary of State in Council in 1868, would, in common honesty and fairness, have withdrawn the imputation; but as that memorial has disappeared from the records of the India Office, and he now makes no allusion to the vindication there given, or the evidence which accompanied it, I can only conclude that it was kept from his sight, and that, in ignorance of my refutation, he has been encouraged in the reproduction of the charge, now aggravated by the words "as a rule."

As that memorial has, through the kindness of the present Secretary of State, been printed from a printed copy, which several years afterwards I laid before Lord Salisbury, I will here give one of the appendices (App. F.) in which it is discussed, and although it is to be found in the reprinted copy also, I trust it may also be printed in its proper place, as an appendix to this refutation.

I have no doubt that the perusal of the evidence now submitted, combined with Appendix F. taken from the lost memorial, will be sufficient to satisfy every impartial mind that the charge of general reticence or concealment "as "a rule" of my acts and intentions, is *entirely disproved*, and that the single instance in which such reticence (*i.e.*, action without previous consultation) was, under the circumstances set forth, a solemn and imperative duty!

I have been compelled to deal separately with this question in my chapter on Mr. Halliday's Minute, written some seven months after my removal, a sight of which was refused to me, though specially asked for, because in that Minute Mr. Halliday entered into a long and discursive narrative for the purpose of confirming this unfounded charge.

It is not surprising that he refused to show it to me, as I could at once have pointed out what I have now shown, that the one fact and the one letter which affords the key to the whole incident, and justifies me in acting in *that single* instance on my own convictions, has been suppressed and most unfairly described; while his letter expressing those infatuated opinions, which showed me the imperative necessity of action, prompt and immediate, is left out of the "Special Blue Book" which Mr. Halliday had printed, in evident defence and illustration of his measures.

All this, or the principal portion of it, will be found in the Appendix F. of the missing memorial now reprinted, and the complete annihilation of Mr. Halliday's charge will be confirmed by the list of letters published in the "Special Blue Book" above mentioned, and submitted by me with the missing memorial as Appendix G.*

I venture to challenge my worst enemy to say whether that series of letters does not at once, and entirely, refute the charge of "concealment," "as a rule," or "as much as possible."

It is impossible to doubt that if that memorial had been subjected to impartial investigation before the Secretary of State in Council, as I was assured by Sir Stafford Northcote it would be, and as I may say without offence, it should have been, Sir F. Halliday's position as member of the Indian Council must have been in serious jeopardy.

But it is a most remarkable circumstance that at the time Sir Frederick Halliday was compiling his present memorandum, in which it might have been reasonably

* This Appendix, which consists of a pamphlet of 79 printed pages, containing letters from the 14th of June 1857 to the 2nd August 1857, has, by permission of the Secretary of State, been placed in the Library of the House of Commons for reference.

reasonably expected that he would endeavour at least to offer some rejoinder to the arguments contained in my memorial of 1868, the memorial itself, with five letters, and the pamphlets (App. G.), disappear, and Sir F. Halliday's statement, in opposition apparently to the first intention, as stated by the Honourable Mr. Stanhope in Parliament, is laid before the House, and I am thus enabled to see, for the first time after 22 years, these aggravated statements, and unfair, though plausible explanations, by which of course Sir F. Halliday's partizans, and the successive Secretaries of State, have been necessarily biassed against me.

But, in addition to these remarkable incidents, the delay which has unavoidably occurred has led to further most important discoveries connected with this, as well as with other charges, in the formidable catalogue of my crimes, circumstances which I have set forth in my postscript, written after the great bulk of this refutation had been completed. For these circumstances I would refer the reader to that "postscript," merely here pointing out that this unaccountable suppression from a Blue Book, expressly published to exhibit the "Correspondence connected with the removal of Mr. W. Tayler," and in which all manner of collateral matter, Mr. Samuells' indecent attack, and a long irrelevant statement of an arbitration judgment, &c., are included, is, I venture to say, a most unfair and dishonest procedure.

Let the *real* body of my letters, as shown in the "postscript," as well as those of which no mention was made, but were pointed out in my "missing "memorial," be looked at, and, as I believe I have elsewhere said, I doubt whether any three commissioners wrote so much, so fully, so unreservedly, throughout the entire crisis, as I did.

As to the one series of precautionary measures which I held myself bound as a solemn duty to carry out, without endangering their success, or rendering them impossible by previous fruitless consultation and delay with a Governor 400 miles away, who considered the mutiny "inconceivable," I look with honest pride, and deep gratitude to God, that I had the decision, and was vouchsafed the power to carry them out.

I am fully conscious that all those who were in India at the time, and knew the *real facts*, not garbled and distorted as they are in the long, unseen Minute of 1858, regard those very measures as the measures which saved the province, and the residents at least, of every class, deem themselves indebted to me for their lives, as may be seen by reference to the evidence.

The special verdict of Sir John Low on the particular point, as well as of Sir Arthur Phayre, will be found among them.

The painful circumstances connected with Sir John Lawrence, with reference to this charge, I here narrate, though as briefly as possible.

When I returned from India in 1867, ten years after my removal from the Patna Commissionership, events had in the meantime occurred which proved the correctness of my views regarding the Wahabee fanatics whom I had placed under precautionary arrest, and whom my successor, with the approval of Mr. Halliday, had at the time described as "innocent and inoffensive book-"men," and who afterwards, as Sir John Kaye described it, were "fondled" by the Bengal Government.

The dangerous character and treasonous doings of the sect having thus been judicially exposed by the trials held by Sir Herbert Edwardes in the Punjab, and by Mr. Ainslie at Patna, I at once prepared a memorial setting forth the facts, and praying for reconsideration and justice.

Being at Simla at the time, I showed the memorial, through his private secretary, to Sir John Lawrence, then Governor General.

Sir John Lawrence, after reading the document, authorised Colonel Seymour Blane, his then military secretary, to send me the following assurance:—

"I had a very long conversation with Sir John on the various points to "which you allude, and I think one thing is certain, that so far as his personal "feelings are concerned, it would have given him very sincere pleasure to "forward your memorial; he thinks, however, that it is a matter which would "have to be considered in Council, and for that reason he would not advise "you to bring it forward in India."

Sir John Lawrence himself repeated to me the same advice verbally on wishing me farewell in Calcutta, and believing the advice to be judicious and intended for my good, inasmuch as several members of his Council were notoriously antagonistic to me, I withheld the memorial until I reached England, when I laid

laid it officially before Sir Stafford Northcote, showing him at the same time the extract above quoted, as Sir John Lawrence had specially authorised.

Sir Stafford Northcote, after full inquiry and investigation, found all important points in my favour, but having some scruple in recommending me for honours to the Queen without the concurrence of some high official in office, made a reference to Sir John Lawrence, fully expecting his support.

The subsequent incidents it is painful to relate, but it is absolutely necessary to the full elucidation of this particular point.

Sir John Lawrence, in his reply to Sir Stafford Northcote, admitting that I had been unjustly used, suggested that I had committed two errors of judgment, viz.: "reticence" towards Mr. Halliday, and issuing the order of withdrawal, and Sir Stafford Northcote, *on these grounds alone*, after writing me a highly complimentary letter, expressed his "sincere regret" that he could not, on the grounds of these two supposed errors, follow out his purpose of recommendation to the Queen for honour.

A personal interview with Lord Lawrence in July 1878, 11 years afterwards, showed me that these two so-called errors had been suggested to him in consultation with Sir William Grey, Sir Frederick Halliday's quondam secretary and intimate friend.

The discovery was so important that I thought it my duty to address Lord Lawrence on the subject, remonstrating earnestly against the course pursued.

The whole circumstances were fully represented to Lord Cranbrook. Shortly before Lord Lawrence's death I again wrote to him, but without any satisfactory result.

A few days before this a mutual friend had also written, urging him, as a matter of justice and fair dealing, to read my explanation and defence on the above points, which, as I have before stated, were the only two things which had prevented Sir S. Northcote from recommending me for honours. Lord Lawrence refused to read it, as he subsequently declined in his letter to me.

I will not dwell at present on this painful episode, though there is much more that might be said; but I must, in justice to myself, point out that up to the day of his late lamented death Lord Lawrence had, by his own showing, never seen, and declined to see, my defence and vindication of the two points, which he, in consultation with the quondam secretary and intimate friend of Sir Frederick Halliday, had suggested, and which had unfortunately been accepted by the Secretary of State as a bar to my public recognition.

This fact it is important for me to show, that Lord Lawrence's opinion may not be quoted against me as of any value.

This formed Appendix F. of the lost Memorial.

To this subject I earnestly solicit the most careful attention of the Secretary of State in Council.

The allegations which I find it absolutely necessary now to make in this matter are serious. I would willingly have avoided the exposure, but it is forced upon me.

I have already stated that a special "Blue Book" was printed in Calcutta by the Lieutenant Governor shortly after my removal, which professed to contain the "Correspondence connected with the removal of Mr. W. Tayler."

This book was obviously published to support Mr. Halliday's action against me, and verify his catalogue of *ex post facto* charges, and ought, therefore, in common fairness, to have comprised the whole "Correspondence;" certainly all which bore on his accusations.

The book was sent by him, contrary to all official precedent or custom, to the public journals (for which he was rebuked by the Secretary of State), and officially circulated by himself throughout the Bengal Presidency. It is at this moment on record in all the Commissioners' offices.

A perusal of this book exhibits the following inculpatory facts, *all of them calculated to excite strong prejudice against me*, in connection with this charge of "reticence," which the Right Honourable the Secretary of State has lately declared to have been a "most unfortunate error" on my part, as it produced a "want of harmony" between the Government and myself, and was, in fact, the principal obstacle to his recommendation to the Queen's favour.

First, then, it shows me, writing my *first* communication to the Lieutenant Governor on the 14th of June, though our troubles had commenced about the 18th of May, and

most important incidents, altering my first views and affecting all my future actions, had occurred on the 7th of June.

Secondly. It shows the Lieutenant Governor complaining of my writing "short, meagre, and unsatisfactory" notes, instead of full and formal letters, a procedure which, *if unauthorised*, would naturally be considered reprehensible.

Thirdly. It exhibits me corresponding with the Lieutenant Governor without authority or license, in a familiar, informal, and unceremonious style—"My dear Halliday," &c., &c., while *he* was writing only formal and official letters through his secretary! thus still further prejudicing our superiors by convicting me of disrespect, if not impertinence, a fact which was noticed to my prejudice even by my advocates and friends.

Fourthly. The letters that are printed are so arranged that ordinary perusal, without careful scrutiny of dates, would lead the reader to suppose that *after I had been officially rebuked for so writing in Mr. A. Young's letter of the 25th June, I still disrespectfully and contumaciously continued so to write for several subsequent days.*

Fifthly. It exhibits a *series* of official rebukes, for not writing with sufficient fulness or frequency; as if, after the receipt of the first rebuke, I had wilfully neglected my duty, but which, in fact, followed each other in such immediate succession—making a formidable appearance—that no time was given me to answer or act upon the one before the other reached me.

Sixthly. It shows the Lieutenant Governor rebuking me for arresting the Wahabee Molvees without asking permission, as if the *act* was beyond my competence, and there was a blameable concealment, without justification or reason.

I now proceed to show how, in each several instance of these imputations, direct or implied, I have been unfairly and dishonestly dealt with; how, in fact, I was in each and every particular blameless, and *only made to appear negligent or culpable by misrepresentation and the suppression of evidence.*

On the *first* point, viz., the apparently gross neglect in not giving intelligence to the Lieutenant Governor before the 14th of June, I subjoin four letters from Mr. Halliday, with my explanatory notes appended. These letters will show that I commenced my communications on the 18th or 19th of May, and, by his own admission, sent him "daily intelligence" up to 13th of June.

Not one of these letters have been printed in the Blue Book.

On the *second* point, viz., the brevity of my notes, Mr. Halliday's letters, now seen for the first time, will show, *what he has hitherto studiously concealed*—that it was *his own special desire* that I should send him just "one line, brief, to say—all's well," until further orders; and that it was his wish and belief—probably because he wished to remain at Darjeeling—that the "less fuss the better." They will also show what the Blue Book conceals that he wrote in private form to me.

Both of these letters have been suppressed, and the correspondence printed without them.

On the *fourth* point, if the Secretary of State in Council will turn to the Blue Book, and note the dates of my private letters, which have been inserted after Mr. Young's letter of the 25th June, directing me to write officially and not privately, he will perceive that they are all of previous dates; and that on the 28th of June, the very day I received that letter, I expressed my apologies and regret in a public letter, *and from that moment always wrote in an official form.*

25th June.
25th "
26th "
27th "
29th "

On the *fifth* point I refer to the Blue Book itself, which will show no less than five letters (?) of the dates as per margin, written one after another, without allowing time for me to acknowledge or answer them, and in the same way four letters within as many days, in July, rebuking me for not giving full information of the emeute in the town, the injustice of which I have shown in my narrative (Part 2).—*Vide* extract subjoined.

With regard to the sixth point, viz., the arrest of the Wahabee Molvees, it would, perhaps, be sufficient to observe that, as the measure is now known to have been of important benefit to the province, any informality, even if there were such, in regard to its execution, and any reticence necessary to ensure the success of the measure, is too trifling to be mentioned; but this does not affect the question between Mr. Halliday and myself.

I believe I may safely assert, that as superintendent of police, I was fully competent, without reference to any superior authority whatever, to arrest any suspected persons; but Mr. Halliday, in bringing this charge against me, has wisely withheld from publication the letter, which, in itself, forms a complete justification of my partial, and I submit praiseworthy, reticence on this point, viz., his letter of the 13th of June, in which, after receiving my report of the 8th (*also carefully withheld*), he still declared that there was no danger at Patna, and mutiny of the Sepoys was "inconceivable," thus clearly showing me that if I wished to act effectually and save the province, *I must act on my own responsibility and risk.*

The Lieutenant Governor at the same time never alludes to the fact that the day *before* I took action against the Wahabees, I *did* intimate the probability of my acting against them, and that I reported the fact of their arrest, not eight days afterwards, as Sir John Low supposes, but on the *third* day after the event, having waited for that short time that I might judge of the effect of the measure.

The

The Secretary of State in Council will, I hope, not overlook the facts that the arrest of these men was not a long premeditated measure, nor caused by any overt acts of theirs; I arrested them on suspicion of their characters and intentions, and had no events or incidents to report.

With such ingenious and unfair suppressions, and with such cruel and unfounded misrepresentations, is it a matter of surprise that I was condemned? that the Court of Directors, with this emasculated Blue Book before them, concurred in my condemnation, and that Sir S. Northcote, in ignorance of these startling (perhaps incredible) facts, should hold me guilty of culpable neglect, which produced a want of harmony between myself and the Government?

The facts are now, for the first time, before the Secretary of State in Council, and I solemnly appeal to him for judgment upon them.

As to the charge of "reticence" in a general sense, I beg the Secretary of State in Council to glance over the Appendix (G.) submitted herewith, in which I have reprinted from the Blue Book my letters and reports written between the 14th of June and 4th of August, comprising, as it does, 79 pages of closely printed matter in letters, memorandas, and reports, no less than *fifty* in number, *all my previous letters, as before stated, have been suppressed from the Blue Book.*

Did any other Commissioner write as much?

If the Secretary of State in Council will read the letters contained in that pamphlet, remembering that they were in addition to the numerous letters which Mr. Halliday suppressed, and to the "long," "graphic," and "interesting" letters which I wrote to Mr. Beadon; and exclusive of the incessant correspondence which I kept up with my subordinates in the district, as well as with General Lloyd and Major Holmes, he will, I feel confident, acquit me of the crime of "reticence."

But I ask the Secretary of State in Council to do justice between myself and Mr. Halliday, who, while charging me with this offence, and accusing me of "concealing my acts and intentions as much as possible," omits from the Blue Book, which his position as Lieutenant Governor enabled him to publish, letters which bear closely upon this very question, and which would, in themselves, have nullified his accusations.

The suppressed correspondence, I must here observe, comprises, among other letters, my report of the startling occurrences of 7th June, my earnest remonstrance to Mr. Halliday, to prevent the Board of Revenue from exasperating Koer Singh, and thus driving him, as they did, into the arms of the rebels, as well as my earnest recommendation to disarm the 5th Cavalry, which afterwards did so much mischief in the province, and other important communications.

Was this suppression honourable or fair towards me?

But I cannot close this part of the subject without pointing out a still further instance of unfair misrepresentation on the part of Mr. Halliday, a misrepresentation evidently made for the purpose of prejudicing the Supreme Government against me, and thus preventing an impartial hearing of my appeal.

Very early in the crisis, I received a letter from Mr. Beadon, Home Secretary to the Government of India, requesting me to furnish him with information, of course for the use of Government.

With this request I immediately complied, and from that day kept up a correspondence with him, sending him accounts of all that transpired, as I did also to Mr. Halliday, though my notes to the latter, *under his own order were "brief,"* to make as little "fuss" as possible.

I subjoin extracts from Mr. Beadon's answers to my letters, which will show the nature of my communications.

The Secretary of State in Council will, perhaps, hardly credit me when I say that this extra duty, undertaken at the request of the Governor General's Secretary, amidst all my anxieties and labours, for the benefit of Government, was charged against me by Mr. Halliday as an *additional offence*, not openly (for it would then have carried its own refutation with it), but under the guise of an accusation that I had found time to write to a "private correspondent," while, by concealing the name and position of this person, he led the Supreme Government to suppose that I had been wasting my time for my own purposes and the amusement of a private individual.

Again I venture to ask the Secretary of State in Council whether this proceeding was honourable or just, and whether such a statement was not calculated to prejudice the minds of my judges?

As this charge of reticence did not form an ostensible ground of my removal, I should not have thought it necessary to discuss it at such length, had it not been lately brought forward as an argument against my obtaining justice, and an obstacle to the Queen's favour.

As it is, I have not exhausted the subject, but need I make any further exposures?

---

most important incidents, altering my first views and affecting all my future actions, had occurred on the 7th of June.

Secondly. It shows the Lieutenant Governor complaining of my writing "short, meagre, and unsatisfactory" notes, instead of full and formal letters, a procedure which, *if unauthorised*, would naturally be considered reprehensible.

Thirdly. It exhibits me corresponding with the Lieutenant Governor without authority or license, in a familiar, informal, and unceremonious style—"My dear Halliday," &c., &c., while *he* was writing only formal and official letters through his secretary! thus still further prejudicing our superiors by convicting me of disrespect, if not impertinence, a fact which was noticed to my prejudice even by my advocates and friends.

Fourthly. The letters that are printed are so arranged that ordinary perusal, without careful scrutiny of dates, would lead the reader to suppose that *after I had been officially rebuked for so writing in Mr. A. Young's letter of the 25th June, I still disrespectfully and contumaciously continued so to write for several subsequent days.*

Fifthly. It exhibits a *series* of official rebukes, for not writing with sufficient fulness or frequency; as if, after the receipt of the first rebuke, I had wilfully neglected my duty, but which, in fact, followed each other in such immediate succession—making a formidable appearance—that no time was given me to answer or act upon the one before the other reached me.

Sixthly. It shows the Lieutenant Governor rebuking me for arresting the Wahabee Molvees without asking permission, as if the *act* was beyond my competence, and there was a blameable concealment, without justification or reason.

I now proceed to show how, in each several instance of these imputations, direct or implied, I have been unfairly and dishonestly dealt with; how, in fact, I was in each and every particular blameless, and *only made to appear negligent or culpable by misrepresentation and the suppression of evidence.*

On the *first* point, viz., the apparently gross neglect in not giving intelligence to the Lieutenant Governor before the 14th of June, I subjoin four letters from Mr. Halliday, with my explanatory notes appended. These letters will show that I commenced my communications on the 18th or 19th of May, and, by his own admission, sent him "daily intelligence" up to 13th of June.

Not one of these letters have been printed in the Blue Book.

On the *second* point, viz., the brevity of my notes, Mr. Halliday's letters, now seen for the first time, will show, *what he has hitherto studiously concealed*—that it was *his own special desire* that I should send him just "one line, brief, to say—all's well," until further orders; and that it was his wish and belief—probably because he wished to remain at Darjeeling—that the "less fuss the better." They will also show what the Blue Book conceals that he wrote in private form to me.

Both of these letters have been suppressed, and the correspondence printed without them.

On the *fourth* point, if the Secretary of State in Council will turn to the Blue Book, and note the dates of my private letters, which have been inserted after Mr. Young's letter of the 25th June, directing me to write officially and not privately, he will perceive that they are all of previous dates; and that on the 28th of June, the very day I received that letter, I expressed my apologies and regret in a public letter, *and from that moment always wrote in an official form.*

25th June.
25th "
26th "
27th "
29th "

On the *fifth* point I refer to the Blue Book itself, which will show no less than five letters (?) of the dates as per margin, written one after another, without allowing time for me to acknowledge or answer them, and in the same way four letters within as many days, in July, rebuking me for not giving full information of the emeute in the town, the injustice of which I have shown in my narrative (Part 2).—*Vide* extract subjoined.

With regard to the sixth point, viz., the arrest of the Wahabee Molvees, it would, perhaps, be sufficient to observe that, as the measure is now known to have been of important benefit to the province, any informality, even if there were such, in regard to its execution, and any reticence necessary to ensure the success of the measure, is too trifling to be mentioned; but this does not affect the question between Mr. Halliday and myself.

I believe I may safely assert, that as superintendent of police, I was fully competent, without reference to any superior authority whatever, to arrest any suspected persons; but Mr. Halliday, in bringing this charge against me, has wisely withheld from publication the letter, which, in itself, forms a complete justification of my partial, and I submit praiseworthy, reticence on this point, viz., his letter of the 13th of June, in which, after receiving my report of the 8th (*also carefully withheld*), he still declared that there was no danger at Patna, and mutiny of the Sepoys was "inconceivable," thus clearly showing me that if I wished to act effectually and save the province, *I must act on my own responsibility and risk.*

The Lieutenant Governor at the same time never alludes to the fact that the day *before* I took action against the Wahabees, I *did* intimate the probability of my acting against them, and that I reported the fact of their arrest, not eight days afterwards, as Sir John Low supposes, but on the *third* day after the event, having waited for that short time that I might judge of the effect of the measure.

The

The Secretary of State in Council will, I hope, not overlook the facts that the arrest of these men was not a long premeditated measure, nor caused by any overt acts of theirs; I arrested them on suspicion of their characters and intentions, and had no events or incidents to report.

With such ingenious and unfair suppressions, and with such cruel and unfounded misrepresentations, is it a matter of surprise that I was condemned? that the Court of Directors, with this emasculated Blue Book before them, concurred in my condemnation, and that Sir S. Northcote, in ignorance of these startling (perhaps incredible) facts, should hold me guilty of culpable neglect, which produced a want of harmony between myself and the Government?

The facts are now, for the first time, before the Secretary of State in Council, and I solemnly appeal to him for judgment upon them.

As to the charge of "reticence" in a general sense, I beg the Secretary of State in Council to glance over the Appendix (G.) submitted herewith, in which I have reprinted from the Blue Book my letters and reports written between the 14th of June and 4th of August, comprising, as it does, 79 pages of closely printed matter in letters, memorandas, and reports, no less than *fifty* in number, *all my previous letters, as before stated, have been suppressed from the Blue Book.*

Did any other Commissioner write as much?

If the Secretary of State in Council will read the letters contained in that pamphlet, remembering that they were in addition to the numerous letters which Mr. Halliday suppressed, and to the "long," "graphic," and "interesting" letters which I wrote to Mr. Beadon; and exclusive of the incessant correspondence which I kept up with my subordinates in the district, as well as with General Lloyd and Major Holmes, he will, I feel confident, acquit me of the crime of "reticence."

But I ask the Secretary of State in Council to do justice between myself and Mr. Halliday, who, while charging me with this offence, and accusing me of "concealing my acts and intentions as much as possible," omits from the Blue Book, which his position as Lieutenant Governor enabled him to publish, letters which bear closely upon this very question, and which would, in themselves, have nullified his accusations.

The suppressed correspondence, I must here observe, comprises, among other letters, my report of the startling occurrences of 7th June, my earnest remonstrance to Mr. Halliday, to prevent the Board of Revenue from exasperating Koer Singh, and thus driving him, as they did, into the arms of the rebels, as well as my earnest recommendation to disarm the 5th Cavalry, which afterwards did so much mischief in the province, and other important communications.

Was this suppression honourable or fair towards me?

But I cannot close this part of the subject without pointing out a still further instance of unfair misrepresentation on the part of Mr. Halliday, a misrepresentation evidently made for the purpose of prejudicing the Supreme Government against me, and thus preventing an impartial hearing of my appeal.

Very early in the crisis, I received a letter from Mr. Beadon, Home Secretary to the Government of India, requesting me to furnish him with information, of course for the use of Government.

With this request I immediately complied, and from that day kept up a correspondence with him, sending him accounts of all that transpired, as I did also to Mr. Halliday, though my notes to the latter, *under his own order were "brief,"* to make as little "fuss" as possible.

I subjoin extracts from Mr. Beadon's answers to my letters, which will show the nature of my communications.

The Secretary of State in Council will, perhaps, hardly credit me when I say that this extra duty, undertaken at the request of the Governor General's Secretary, amidst all my anxieties and labours, for the benefit of Government, was charged against me by Mr. Halliday as an *additional offence*, not openly (for it would then have carried its own refutation with it), but under the guise of an accusation that I had found time to write to a "private correspondent," while, by concealing the name and position of this person, he led the Supreme Government to suppose that I had been wasting my time for my own purposes and the amusement of a private individual.

Again I venture to ask the Secretary of State in Council whether this proceeding was honourable or just, and whether such a statement was not calculated to prejudice the minds of my judges?

As this charge of reticence did not form an ostensible ground of my removal, I should not have thought it necessary to discuss it at such length, had it not been lately brought forward as an argument against my obtaining justice, and an obstacle to the Queen's favour.

As it is, I have not exhausted the subject, but need I make any further exposures?

LETTERS from Mr. *Halliday* from 27 May to 13 June.

A.

The letter here acknowledged must have been written about the 18th or 19th May, the post taking eight or nine days between Patna and Darjeeling.—
W. T.

My dear Tayler, Darjeeling, 27 May 1857.

I SEND you my letter of the 25th May last year which you wrote for.

I am glad to hear that all is quiet at Patna.

The less fuss made the better.

Yours, &c.
(signed) *Fred. Jas. Halliday.*

B.

My dear Tayler, Darjeeling, 28 May 1857.

I HAVE just received yours of the 23rd.

As soon as the telegraph is open I request you will send me (to Calcutta) a daily message, brief, just to say "all's well," till further notice.

I should not wonder if I were to pay Patna another visit before long.

I am glad you have stopped expenditure (for the present) on the institution, and funded the money.

I am in hopes that all will go well at Dinapore and Patna. But the example of the 9th at Mynepooree and Allygurh shows how the bad feeling has spread.

Yours, &c.
W. Tayler, Esq. (signed) *Fred. Jas. Halliday.*

C.

This letter shows that I had on the 24th May submitted several important proposals, yet my letter does not appear in the Blue Book.
W. T.

My dear Tayler, Darjeeling, 29 May 1857.

I HAVE received your letter of the 24th, with enclosure from Mr. Wake.

I do not think there is any need at present to call out the veterans. It would do more harm than good. Still worse would be Major Holmes's plan of disarming the people at the Ghat.

A letter to the rajah telling him to take care there is no disturbance would be more useful.

As we differ a good deal about the effect of your recent proceedings in conciliating the zemindars, I see no need for your dragging in that subject. If I were to reply, I could only express what you are aware I feel, and that would not facilitate business.

Keep that business for its own correspondence. It has had, and will have, its full share. Because we differ on that point, it does not follow that we are to differ on other points.

My impression regarding these current events in the north-west is that by this time a blow has been struck which will quiet all insurrection from one end to the other. *This I think is your opinion also.*

Yours, &c.
W. Tayler, Esq. (signed) *Fred. Jas. Halliday.*

D.

My dear Tayler, Allipore, 13 June 1857.

THE day before yesterday I received a letter from you *dated 8th June.*

To day I have another letter with the same date.

There must be some mistake here, and as dates are important just now, it will be well to note the day of the week as well as the date.

I cannot satisfy myself that Patna is in any danger.

It is inconceivable that the sepoys at Dinapore should mutiny in the face of the European force there, and until the sepoys mutiny there can be little fear of a popular commotion in Patna.

I do not approve of your calling in the zemindars for aid in the way you propose.

If you can raise a reliable small body of sowars for patrols, do so at the expense of Government. But circumstances have made it undesirable in my opinion that you should apply to the zemindars, and I particularly desire it may not be done.

I am anxious for daily intelligence from you, *and have had it regularly till the last two days**. I am very glad to hear that the Chuppra treasure is safe.

* The *italics* are mine.

The Gya people are in a great fright; I hope without reason.

You should let your ordinary districts know regularly the state of your affairs. A report came to day by electric telegraph of insurrection at Dinapore, no doubt false or exaggerated.

All well here.

Yours, &c.
W. Tayler, Esq. (signed) *Fred. Jas. Halliday.*

EXTRACTS of Letters from Mr. *Beadon.*

"Calcutta, 20 May 1857.

1. "Informing me that a translation of a proclamation would be made by Mr. Colvin, and sent for me to circulate throughout my province."

"Calcutta, 23 May 1857.

2. "Requesting to be kept 'informed of the state of feeling among the troops at Dinapore, and the people of your division generally.'"

"Calcutta, 25 May 1857.

3. "Forwarding some copies of the translation of the proclamation."

"Calcutta, 2 June 1857.

4. "I have to thank you for your interesting bulletins from the 26th to 30th May. They are of great use."

"Calcutta, 6 June 1857.

5. "Many thanks for your bulletins up to the 2nd."

"Calcutta, 8 June 1857.

6. "Many thanks to yours of 4th June."

"Calcutta, 9 June 1857.

7. "Putting me on my guard against the supposed designs of the Doomraon Rajah—Koei Sing—and thanking me for my 'continued reports.'"

"Calcutta, 22 June 1857.

8. "I am much obliged to you for your letter of the 14th, giving a graphic account of the critical position in which affairs stand at Patna and Dinapore, and of the measures taken to prevent outbreak.

"Your letter of the 17th reached me yesterday."

"Calcutta, 25 June 1857.

9. "Containing information about the rebels in the North Western Provinces."

"Calcutta, 29 June 1857.

10. "I have to thank you for your letter of the 25th, and its very interesting contents."

"Calcutta, 26 July 1857.

11. "I have to thank you for several interesting letters which I have refrained from answering, because I perceived that Halliday did not like your corresponding with me on business matters relating to Bengal," &c.

EXTRACT from my Narrative. Part 2, Page 267.*

Additional Memorandum on the Charge of Reticence regarding Dr. Lyell's Murder.

"The *émeute* in the city took place on the night of the 3rd. The event was one of awful anxiety. The whole of that night was passed by me in the open air. As Commissioner I had the superintendence of everything.

"The struggle in the town took place some six miles from my house at Bankipore, where the whole station, gentlemen, ladies, and children, were assembled in an agony of terror throughout the night. I rode round myself to all the houses, to warn the residents; made arrangements for dispatching one party of Sikhs into the town, posting others at the several approaches to our house; dispatching messengers to Dinapore, and into the town for news; and the other thousand and one pressing matters which those only who have witnessed such a scene, can fully conceive or worthily appreciate.

"The *émeute* was put down without difficulty; *for I had previously disarmed the citizens and arrested the most dangerous men;* but the officers and others did not return from the city till the next morning, and nothing save the *fact* of Dr. Lyell's death and the dispersion of the rebels was known.

"The post went out *early in the morning,* and at that time *I could have stated nothing distinctly beyond these two facts;* so I sent a telegram to both Governments and the

* This Appendix is the pamphlet containing my letters and reports, submitted with this memorial.—*W. T.*

the Commissioner of Bhagulpore, reserving a *letter*, till I could write with some distinct knowledge of what had occurred, of which there were conflicting accounts given by almost every man concerned. But I wrote a letter also that very day (the 4th); as however, the post *went out only early in the morning*, it *could not be* dispatched till the 5th.

" The magistrate, who had nothing but his own duty to attend to, and had no share in the superintendence or management of the many and various matters which engrossed my time, and who was moreover, anxious to bring forward a separate question regarding his Nazir, in which he was interested, managed to dispatch a letter on the 4th; and the udge, who had nothing to do but look after himself, wrote a private note to somebody.

" I had myself telegraphed, as I have stated, a long message to the Government, which was received and dispatched from the telegraphic office, but, owing to a stoppage in the communications somewhere below Patna, which the Government had never intimated to me, they were said by the Lieutenant Governor not to have reached him.

" Mr. Halliday, as usual without inquiry, seized the opportunity to add one more to the censures he was zealously accumulating against me, and wrote four letters of reproof in four days, without allowing even the first of them time to reach me, or waiting for answer or acknowledgment.

" For me to have written down all the idle tales that were current without scrutiny, would have been simply mischievous; and to show this, I need only mention that one of the fables circulated was that Dewan Mowla Buksh was at the head of the movement.

" The facts, then, stand thus:—In spite of my arduous and incessant exertions throughout the whole night, I communicated by telegraph all that it was essential, or, in fact, possible to communicate then, at the earliest possible moment. In the course of that day, which was engrossed with incessant and anxious duties, the examination of the wounded rebels, listening to the several reports of the magistrate, Major Rattray, Mowla Buksh, and others, comparing accounts, and analysing conflicting statements, I still wrote a letter, which, though short, contained all that I could satisfactorily state; and this letter went on the morning of the 5th, that being the only time at which the post left.

" Within the next *two* days *what had I done?* I had arrested and tried 30 of the conspirators, obtained a mass of most important correspondence, and sentenced and executed 14 men, reprieving two for the purposes of eliciting information, and imprisoning the rest. All this I had done, and all this I reported on the 7th, two days after my first letter.

" That letter is short, *i. e.*, it contains matter without verbiage.

" Is it unsatisfactory?

" Had I been idle in action? Could I have said more while inquiries as to the origin and object and details of the plot were still in progress?

" But how much longer did I wait? In my letter of the 7th, I told Mr. Halliday that I had had incessant occupation for the last two or three days" (a fact which my readers will easily understand when they perceive what I had *done* in that interval), " and could therefore only send in a brief report." *But the very next morning*, viz., the 8th, I sent in another letter of 14 paragraphs, in the first sentence of which I stated that, " when all inquiries are completed, a full and detailed narration of the late disturbance at Patna will be forwarded.

" Two days afterwards, viz., on the 10th, I wrote again.

" The next day (the 11th) I again wrote.

" The next day (the 12th) I again addressed the Lieutenant Governor on the same subject; and in this it will be seen that I was *obliged to correct and contradict several premature and mischievous misstatements made by officious correspondents*, thus showing how right I was to wait for details till I could speak with confidence.

" The *next* day I submitted a full report of 39 paragraphs, containing a detail of all the particulars which careful and incessant inquiry enabled me to submit.

" I confidently challenge the most careful investigation into this whole matter, and refer those who doubt to the letters themselves, which are all reprinted in the Appendix."

CHAPTER VI.

Withdrawal Order.

This being one of the charges which has not been *authoritatively* set aside, and being one of the two which Sir S. Northcote quoted, at the suggestion of Sir J. Lawrence, as an error of judgment, which interfered with his own recommendation of me for honours in 1867, deserves the next consideration, after the disposal of the two collateral questions already discussed, and the special charge of reticence.

As first recorded by Mr. Halliday, it was thus worded, viz., that, "under the "obvious influence of a local panic, he had directed the abandonment by "the Civil functionaries of all the stations in his division."

The accusation of "panic," directly it was brought before the Court of Directors, was ignored in the following words :—

Extract from the Despatch of the Court of Directors, 11th August 1858.

"The immediate cause of Mr. Tayler's removal from the Commissionership was his order for the abandonment by the local authorities of the several civil stations within his division on the occurrence of the meeting at Dinapore. The Lieutenant Governor says that this order was given apparently under the influence of panic. This is distinctly denied by Mr. Tayler, who alleges that it was the result of a calm and careful consideration of the then existing state of things. You have expressed your unwillingness to believe that Mr. Tayler was influenced by panic, and we consider his statement upon this point to be entitled to credit, supported as it is *by the tone and tenor of his memorandum of July 31st, in which he reviews in detail the state of the affairs in his division, and records his opinion as to the course which, under the circumstances, should be followed.*"

This part of the charge being rejected, the accusation is reduced at the worst to an error of judgment.

On this subject I have quoted the calm and deliberate judgments of Sir John Kaye and Colonel Malleson, decisions which, with the other evidence, will, I imagine, fully satisfy all those whose opinions are of importance.

Prior to this, I had, to my pain and astonishment, discovered, from Lord Lawrence himself, that in suggesting this, with one other act, as an error of judgment, in reply to a reference from Sir Stafford Northcote, he had done so in consultation with the late Sir William Grey, the special friend and former secretary of Sir Frederick Halliday.

This fact is alone sufficient to deprive the suggestion of any weight, even if it had not been abundantly disproved.

To take an avowed antagonist into confidential consultation on the subject was not the way to ascertain the truth, and cruelly unfair to me.

I will here give the copy of a letter received at the time from a high authority, the late Lord Ellenborough, which will show that, at the very first, he saw that the cause alleged for my removal was, as it was in truth, a pretext. The pretext for accomplishing a foregone conclusion.

Copy of a Letter from the Right Honourable the Earl of *Ellenborough*.

"Sir,

"I received to-day your letter of September 21st, and the printed correspondence relative to your removal from the Commissionership of Patna.

"It seems to me that the question, whether a station was given up or retained, should, from the commencement of an outbreak, have been decided only upon military principles. That it was our policy to diminish as much as we could the number of our disseminated positions, and to concentrate our forces; above all, to avoid all risk, without a very great object. We were sure, and we held ourselves to be so, that at some time, not far distant, we should be able to re-occupy whatever, under the pressure of circumstances, we abandoned; and of all losses, the greatest, affecting what is termed our prestige, and what is more our honour, is the massacre of English gentlemen, and outrage perpetrated upon their families.

"The greatest disasters we have experienced have arisen out of a disregard of these considerations, and I do not feel at all sure that a greater disaster has not occurred which may be traced to the same origin. I cannot say, therefore, with the facts before me, as

you have stated them, that you committed an error of judgment, in directing the temporary abandonment of Gya, very important as that place is, and, indeed, I am inclined to think that act of yours was not the real cause of your removal.

"I shall be happy to receive the further communications you offer me. I am very desirous of having before me all the facts I can obtain with the view of forming my opinions.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*Ellenborough*."

"W. Tayler, Esq., Patna,
4 November 1857.

EXTRACT from Colonel *Malleson's* "Indian Mutiny" (Volume I., pages 117, 118, 119, 120, 121).

"Forgetting, or choosing not to remember, his transcendent services, the fact that he had never despaired of the safety of his division; that he had baffled the counsels of the mutineers, and had suppressed, unaided, the rising of Patna; that he had been the rock on which every hope in Behar had rested; that he had cheered the despairing, stimulated the wavering, roused to action even the faint heart of the soldier; forgetting, or choosing not to remember, these great achievements, the Government of Bengal, acting in concert with the Government of India, seized upon his withdrawal order to dismiss Mr. Tayler from his post, to consign the saviour of Behar, in the very morning dawn of the triumph which he had prepared, to signal and unmerited disgrace.

"The Government of Bengal added insult to injury. Not content with suppressing the fact that Mr. Tayler had coupled with the order for the withdrawal of the officials from Gyá a direction that they should bring with them the treasure under their charge, unless by so doing their personal safety should be endangered, Mr. Halliday did not scruple to charge with being actuated by panic the man whose manly bearing had been throughout an example to the whole of India. It would be difficult to produce in the annals of official persecution, rife as they are with perversions of truth, a statement more gratuitous.

"But the fiat had gone forth. Mr. William Tayler was dismissed from his post. His career in the Indian Civil Service was ruined by one stroke of the pen.

"And yet this man had accomplished as much as any individual man to save India in her great danger. He had done more than Mr. Halliday, who recalled him; than the Government which supported Mr. Halliday. With a courage as true and a resolution as undaunted as that which he showed when dealing with the Patna mutineers, Mr. Tayler has struggled since, he is struggling still, for the reversal of the unjust censure which blighted his career. Subsequent events have singularly justified the action which at the time was so unpalatable to Mr. Halliday. Mr. Tayler's denunciation of the Wáhábí leaders, treated as a fable by his superiors, has been upheld to the full by the discoveries of recent years. It has been abundantly shown that to his energetic action alone was it due that Patna escaped a terrible disaster. The suppressed words of the withdrawal order have been published to the world, and the charge of panic has been recognised everywhere as untrue."

EXTRACT of *J. W. Kaye's* "History of the Sepoy War" (Volume III., pages 161, 162, 163).

"It is not to be questioned that up to the time of the mutiny of the Dinapore regiments the whole bearing of the Patna Commissioner was manly to a point of manliness not often excelled in those troubled times. He had exhorted all his countrymen to cling steadfastly to their posts; he had rebuked those who had betrayed their fears by deserting their stations. His measures had been bold; his conduct had been courageous; his policy had been severely repressive. If he had erred, assuredly his errors had not leaned to the side of weakness. He was one of the last men in the service to strike his colours, save under the compulsion of a great necessity, but when the Dinapore regiments broke into rebellion, when the European troops on whom he had relied proved themselves to be incapable of repressing mutiny on the spot, or overtaking it with swift retribution, when it was known that thousands of insurgent sepoys were overrunning the country, and that the country, in the language of the day, was 'up'; that some of the chief members of the territorial aristocracy had risen against the domination of the English, and that the predatory classes, including swarms of released convicts from the gaols, were waging deadly war against property and life, when he saw that all these things were against us, and there seemed to be no hope left that the scattered handfuls of Englishmen at the out-stations

out-stations could escape utter destruction, he deemed it his duty to revoke the orders which he had issued in more auspicious times, and to call into Patna such of our English establishments as had not already been swept away by the rebellion, or escaped without official recall.

"In doing this he generously took upon himself the responsibility of withdrawal, and absolved all the officers under him from any blame which might descend upon them for deserting their stations without the sanction of superior authority. It was not doubted that if there had been any reasonable ground of hope, that these little assemblies of Englishmen could hold their own, that they could save their lives and the property of Government by defending their posts, it would have been better that the effort should be made; but their destruction would have been a greater calamity to the State than their surrender. It was impossible to over-value the worth of European life at that time, and the deaths of so many Englishmen would have been a greater triumph and a greater encouragement to the enemies than their flight. It was the hour of our greatest darkness and our sorest need. We know not how Wake and Boyle and Colvin and their comrades in the 'little house' held the enemy in check, and how Vincent Eyre taught both the sepoy mutineers and the Shahabad insurgents that there was still terrible vitality in our English troops. Of this William Tayler knew nothing; but he had palpably before him the fact of Dunbar's disaster, and he believed that nothing could save the little garrison of Arrah. The probabilities at the time were that the Dinapore regiment with Kower Singh and his followers, having done their work in that direction, would move, flushed with conquest and gorged with plunder, upon Gya and other stations, carrying destruction with them wheresoever they might go. What the Commissioner then did was what had been done and what was being done by other authorities, civil and military, in other parts of the country; it was held to be sound policy to draw in our scattered outposts to some central point of safety, where the enemy might be defied. In this I can perceive no appearance of panic; if Tayler had not acted thus, and evil had befallen the Christian people under his charge, he would have been condemned with a far severer condemnation for so fatal an omission."

Numerous letters are in my possession confirming this view.

CHAPTER VII.

Letter to Mr. Bax.

One of the most harsh and unmerited charges recorded against me by Mr. Halliday in 1857, and, strange to say, under his representation, accepted at the time by Lord Canning and Sir John Low, the military member of the Supreme Council, was, my supposed illegitimate and unwise interference with the advance of Major Eyre to the relief of Arrah. The extraordinary accusations brought against me in connection with this point have already been dealt with under other heads, and the cruel misstatements have been refuted.

But, strange to say, notwithstanding the decision of the Court of Directors, that I had only written to give my advice, and that merely suggesting a different mode of advance to Mr. Bax, a civilian, in reply to a letter from him, asking my advice, notwithstanding the complete and honourable vindication of my action, Sir Frederick Halliday has not scrupled, after 22 years, to repeat the charge, and with this addition: "Had it rested with Mr. Tayler, Arrah "would have been lost, for at the very crisis of its danger, when Eyre was "advancing to its relief, he wrote officially, and advised him not to advance."

On this I need only observe as to the fact; all I did, as has been indisputably proved, was to give my advice not to Major Eyre, but to Mr. Bax, the civilian, sending my letter to the General of the Division to give such orders as he thought fit; my suggestion to be adopted, or set aside, as the General might wish.

General Lloyd passed an order on this, distinctly stating that the advance should not be made then, and sent me intimation of the same. The General's orders, with my letter for Mr. Bax, were then forwarded together by him.

It is perfectly true that on another occasion, when this point was not under discussion, referring to this unusual joint communication, I carelessly called it an "Order," as stated by Sir F. Halliday, in a foot-note to page 11; but he knows well that this blunder was admitted, and explained as an inaccurate phrase hurriedly used, and that *the fact, which is the only important thing, remains the same.*

This matter was fully explained by me in 1857, and a subsequent attempt of

the Government to catch me in an inconsistency by obtaining from Mr. Bax the envelope of the letter on which was the address both of Mr. Bax and General Lloyd, signally failed, as was admitted by the Government itself.

I leave my readers to form their conclusions as to the fairness and justice of this revival of refuted charges; but I think it as well to annex a copy of a letter received from General Sir John Low on this particular subject.

Sir John Low was a member of the Supreme Council of India in 1857, and was entrusted, as military member, with the special cognizance of my case.

Misled by the misrepresentations of Mr. Halliday, he concurred in my condemnation on this special point.

After his return to England, when, on investigation, he ascertained the *real* facts, he, with true nobility, admitted his mistake, with expressions of remorse, and wrote the following letter, with special permission for its publication:—

"LETTER from General Sir *John Low*.

"My dear Tayler,

"I HAVE read the several papers that you have sent for my perusal with deep interest. The feeling of interest has been, to some extent, of a painful kind to me personally. I allude now to the accusation against you of having written to Major Eyre to urge him not to advance direct against the rebels then surrounding Arrah, because I well remember my having, as a member of Lord Canning's Council, concurred with his Lordship in the censure which he passed upon your conduct on that point. It is true, however, that even now, considering the sort of information that was then before the Council, I think it was quite a natural decision for us to record that censure; but it has since been proved, *incontestably proved*, that the data on which that decision was based were quite incorrect; and if I had been still in India when the real fact was laid before the Supreme Council, that your letter was only an unofficial one, not addressed to Major Eyre at all, but to Mr. Bax, in answer to an unofficial one from him, and sent open by you to General Lloyd, for the latter to deal with as he might think fit, I feel sure that I would readily have stated officially that, in my opinion, you were entirely blameless in that matter respecting Major Eyre, which to my mind at that time was by far the most serious accusation against you. I say this chiefly in justice to *myself*, because my testimony on that point can be of no value to you, after the complete and, to you, the very honourable approbation of your measures that was, as I find, recorded in a despatch from the Court of Directors in Leadenhall-street.

"In regard to this terrible insurrection against us in 1857, I have always thought that, although our Hindoo sepoys were the most numerous of our *active* enemies, yet that by far the most *dangerous* enemies, being the most persevering, the most able, and the most influential, were Mahomedans, just as was the case at Villore, Hyderabad, and Kurnool, during the early part of my experience in India; and the despatch from the Court of Directors, describing the peculiar difficulties and importance of your position at Patna, the public trial of the Patna Wahabee conspirators by Sir Herbert Edwardes, and his late letter to you, all combine to prove indisputably (at least that is my honest opinion) that you had to deal with the most dangerous of all our Mahomedan enemies in 1857.

"From the clear light that, since that time, has been thrown upon the conduct of Patna Mahomedans during that eventful year, and before it, and also subsequent to it, I am decidedly of opinion that those Wahabee chiefs and their relatives were more dangerous to us than Feroze Shah, Khan Buhadur, Khan of Bareilly, and any thousand of our sepoy Mahomedans all put together. I sincerely believe that your skilful and vigorous management of the disaffected population of Patna was of *immense* value to the Government of India; and that in the last few months of your Commissionership, commencing with the arrest of these Wahabee conspirators, and the disarming of the greater portion of the inhabitants of the Patna city, your services were of more vital importance to the public interests than those of many officers, both civil and military, during the whole period of their Indian career, in these critical times, who have been rewarded, and justly rewarded, by honours from the Queen; while your services, by an extraordinary combination of unlucky circumstances, have hitherto been so overlooked. In Oriental phrase, 'What more need I write?'

"Believe me, &c.
(signed) "*J. Low.*"

For further corroboration of the account now given, under the head of this charge, I refer to Sir J. Kaye's and Colonel Malleson's histories.

I must not omit to mention that, at the time Mr. Halliday made the charge against me, he had in his hand the only letter I wrote, and, notwithstanding this, he not only repeated the accusation, but in endeavouring to sustain the charge of panic, he referred to my "reiterated and urgent advice, if not order, "to Major Eyre not to advance to the relief of Arrah!"

In

In his present minute he does not scruple to say, "Had it rested with Mr. "Tayler, Arrah would have been lost," as if I deprecated the relief itself instead of suggesting, subject to General Lloyd's decision, a *more complete and effective mode of advance.*

I leave this deliberate reiteration of a charge, as Sir John Low says, "incontestably proved to be false," to the consideration of my judges. It is impossible to characterise it save in terms which might be held indecorous.

I here give the extract from the despatch of the Court of Directors:—

"The explanation submitted by Mr. Tayler satisfactorily exonerates him from the serious charge of having written officially to Major Eyre, desiring him not to advance to the relief of Arrah. It now appears that the only letter which Mr. Tayler wrote on this subject was one addressed to Mr. Bax, a civil officer holding the office of joint magistrate at the time of Major Eyre's advance from Buxar in company with the force under that officer's command. In that letter Mr. Tayler expresses an opinion that 'it would be very unwise to march with so small a force as 150 men and three guns,' and he forwarded his note open through the officer commanding at Dinapore, requesting him to add whatever he may advise."

How, in the face of all this evidence, Sir Frederick Halliday can venture to reiterate and reproduce the same accusation is a mystery.

CHAPTER VIII.

Lootf Ali Khan.

Expost-facto Charges brought against me by Mr. *Halliday*, subsequent to my Removal.

"Evincing a most indecent anxiety for a conviction in the trial of Lootf Ali "Khan, and not scrupling to assail the judge with private letters urging him to "condemn the prisoner, in a manner contrary to all usage and propriety, and "even humanity."

Such was the alarming and high-flown accusation deliberately formulated by Mr. Halliday, shortly after my removal, but which in the more sober language of the Court of Directors was wisely and justly modified into "corresponding "privately with the sessions judge."

This exaggerated charge originated with the judge himself (one of the antagonistic trio at Patna), who, without any notice to me, and without any conceivable object, save to do me injury at all costs, sent up to Mr. Halliday what he called the "correspondence," *i.e.*, my letters to him, forgetting even to mention his letters to me, to which mine were replies.

Had he done this, the gratuitous and puerile character of the complaint would have been at once exposed.

With regard to the act itself, when it is remembered that the serious character of the crisis had led to the promulgation of special laws, abolishing all the technical observances of legal procedure, that individuals were empowered to arrest, try, and hang those whom they suspected, thereby uniting in themselves the offices of prosecutor, witness, and judge, it certainly does seem strange that when a powerful individual, whose confidential servant had been convicted of open rebellion, was himself accused of harbouring a mutineer at my instance, I, as the prosecutor, responsible for the safety of the province, should be charged with a crime "contrary to humanity," because, when applied to by the judge for information on matters connected with the trial, I did not hesitate to answer his letters, written, as may at once be perceived, on the spur of the moment, in the midst of the absorbing anxieties of the time, and the unreserved tone of private communications.

I would appeal to any impartial reader to say, whether with all the light that has been subsequently shed upon the case, the accusation is not cruelly unfair.

I can only say at the present moment, with a clear conscience, that in making those communications, and entering into the correspondence alluded to, I only did what I felt bound to do, and what it would have been a folly, if not a crime, to evade.

The extracts from "Kaye's Sepoy War," and the letters in the Appendix, will give an idea of the man himself, and the general feeling in regard to his character and power for mischief.

The letters which passed between myself and the judge are also given, with explanations. What was the judge's motive for bringing them forward, are best known to himself.

CASE of *Lootf Ali Khan.*

EXTRACT from Sir *John Kaye's* "Sepoy War."

"BUT Peer Ali was not a rich man, and Commissioner Tayler was thoroughly convinced by the fact that men had been kept for months on pay regularly distributed," under a conditional compact to come forward when called for; that some wealthy party was at the bottom of the intrigues, which were shown to have been carried on for months. He had no difficulty in naming the man. There was one Lootf Ali Khan, a wealthy banker, against whom there was a strong suspicion, by no means confined to the Commissioner.

"One of the men arrested and executed for the outrage which had resulted in the death of Dr. Lyall, was this man's jemadar.

"He was known to have harboured a sepoy of the Thirty-seventh Regiment that had revolted at Benares, and he was suspected of being in communication with sepoy regiments, and to have supplied for rebellious purposes the money distributed by Peer Ali and others."

Again, 'The banker was formally tried by Mr. Farquharson the judge, but the evidence adduced was insufficient to convict him, and in due course he was released.'

"In a foot note, Sir John Kaye writes: 'One letter before me, after stating what had been proved against Lootf Ali, says:—

"'We (the residents of Patna) know all this, which was afterwards proved on his trial, and doubted not of his fate; but to our astonishment, and mortification, and disgrace, he was acquitted, and borne away from court in triumph by his supporters. This was sufficiently alarming, one would suppose, to the supporters of order. But this was not the climax. A few days after his release, the man who, with hardly one exception, the Europeans of Patna and Dinapore considered a rebel of the blackest dye, was received with all the honours due to a highly faithful and meritorious subject by his late acquitting judge, in his then merely temporary position of Acting Commissioner.

"'Could any act of a single man have alienated me from the allegiance due to our Government, this would have done it. I had rather we had been all driven from house and home by an open rebellion in Patna than that this moral victory should have been yielded.'"—"Kaye's Sepoy War," Vol. III.

Many other letters from various experienced persons in Patna, which give a clear idea of the character of the man, are in my possession.

The following extracts from letters written to me at the time by a gentleman in constant contact and communication with the educated natives of Calcutta, will give a further idea of the publicity, even there, of the circumstances connected with this man's arrest, trial, and acquittal, and the unusual interest taken by my opponents in the matter, a state of things which created intense disgust and dissatisfaction among all the reputable inhabitants.

EXTRACT of LETTERS from *Cobb Hurry*, Esq., Editor of the "Calcutta Englishman."

"Lootf Ali's father-in-law is here, and says quite openly that he paid two lakhs for his release.

"24 October 1859."

"Aubdool Kassim is the father-in-law of Lootf Ali, and resides at Moorshidabad, at a place called Nowsank. He had no hand in the matter, but Lootf Ali's brother, Kassim Ali Khan, and their mother, arranged and paid the 200,000 rupees."

Whatever was the truth of these reports, it was a most unfortunate thing that so much attention was given, and so much sympathy displayed in favour of a man whose general character was what I have shown it to be, and whose special attribute was wealth; the appointment of his special friend and professional adviser as Assistant Commissioner was most unwise.

CHAPTER IX.

Case of Waris Ali.

There is one special and separate imputation which Sir Frederick Halliday himself never before brought against me, but has now introduced, at second hand, into his present minute.

In page 5 of his statement he thus writes :—

" During this time, while intentionally deprived of official information, I had " received intimation from a private source, but from indubitable authority, " that the Mahomedans of Patna were then very well disposed, but if Mr. Tayler " was not checked in his unnecessary and unjustifiable violence towards them, " he would infallibly breed an insurrection."

" One of these unjustifiable acts was at later date reported by Mr. Tayler " himself. He had apprehended one Waris Ali, jemadar, on suspicion of high " treason, and on the 31st July he thus reported to the Lieutenant Governor " what had been done with him."

He then cites these words of mine:—

Para. 22: " Waris Ali, whose arrest has been previously mentioned, was tried " under the Commission on Monday, the 6th July, and capitally sentenced."

Para. 23: " He was executed the same day, and his last words were to ask " whether no Mussulman would assist him."

Then, after quoting a short dialogue between myself and the prisoner, he adds:—

" Mr. Samuells, the able and experienced judge of the Sudder (now High) " Court, who succeeded Mr. Tayler at Patna, went at length into this case, and " reported his opinion that Waris Ali was guilty of no offence known to the law."

The very first line of this paragraph contains, as if incidentally only, a very unfair imputation which Sir Frederick Halliday must at the present day feel to be unjust.

" While intentionally deprived of official information " gives the idea of general and continued withholding of the information I was bound to give, whereas he must know that it was on one *special occasion only*, and for good and sufficient reasons, which he takes pains to omit, but which I have again and again exposed, that this was the case; so that the plausible insertion of the sentence is an insidious attempt to raise prejudice against me by a side wind, another instance of the ingenious though not very honourable tactics which Sir Frederick Halliday has adopted.

Why he repeats the dialogue which passed between me and the prisoner I cannot imagine, but I have been told that it was introduced to illustrate his charge of " reckless thirst of blood," and shows—awful thought—that I was not content with one life, but longed for three, to satisfy my thirst; a dipsomania of which I certainly was not conscious.

It is perhaps superfluous to point out to any one in his senses that the purport of my proposed *bargain* was simply to admit Waris Ali as Queen's evidence, if he could tell me of three accomplices as great or greater rebels as himself, a point of no little importance in those perilous days.

The statement of Mr. Samuells only shows his supreme ignorance of the facts. He " went into the case," Sir F. Halliday says, with which he had nothing to do, in furtherance of his rabid desire to aid Mr. Halliday in traducing me, as will be apparent by the perusal of his ferocious letter.

In sober truth the man Waris Ali was an active, and, had he not been caught in time, would have proved a most formidable rebel.

He was a police jemadar in the employ of Government, and was arrested, not by *me* at all, but by the assistant magistrate of Tirhoot, aided by two indigo planters, on information given.

Holding a lucrative appointment under Government as a head police officer, with a thannah under his immediate superintendence, he was apprehended just on the point of leaving his post, with all his belongings; a horse ready saddled was at his door, with a cartload of property!

When arrested he was in the act of writing a letter to the arch traitor Ali Kureem, for whose apprehension Government offered a reward of 5,000 rupees; and, when seized, a whole bundle of treasonous correspondence with that rebel was found on his person, proving that he had been in constant communication

with him, and was at last, after the application for leave of absence had been refused, abandoning his official position, and all his future prospects, on the express invitation of Ali Kureem to aid him in carrying out a scheme of rebellion and treason eight miles from Patna.

The man was publicly tried. The correspondence found on him distinctly established his partisanship with Ali Kureem in a plot, declared to be now ready for execution; he was found clearly guilty of participation in treason, and was sentenced accordingly.

It is specially important to notice, in regard to this second-hand charge, which I observe Sir Frederick Halliday himself does not venture to endorse, that the record of this case, with those of all the other criminals, was, immediately on my removal, sent down to Calcutta by the express order of Mr. Halliday, who was then raking together every conceivable accusation against me, in the evident hope and not unreasonable expectation of discovering a flaw.

The papers were entrusted for examination to an able and experienced judge; the result was eminently satisfactory; not a flaw was to be found, as the judge himself informed me.

It would perhaps have been considerate if, when Sir Frederick Halliday brought forward this criticism of a man known to have almost lost his head from passion, if he had mentioned this circumstance.

The correspondence on this subject was not, I imagine, likely to have escaped his memory.

To defend at the present time such a wild unmeaning charge, would be fighting with a shadow; but the following extract will substantiate the above statement, and expose the emptiness of Mr. Samuells' criticism.

Molvee Ali Kureem, Waris Ali's confidential correspondent, was one of the most notorious and influential rebels; when I sent the magistrate to arrest him, he fled on an elephant, and his house was found fortified. His letter to Waris Ali clearly established his guilt; his fortunate arrest saved us from a serious *émeute*.

Who was the "indubitable authority" who informed Mr. Halliday of the necessity of checking my violence? Sir Frederick Halliday, even to this present day, is ashamed to acknowledge.

Appendix F.

Extract from *Kaye's* Third Volume of the Sepoy War, page 78.

"One incident deserves special narration. About the end of the third week of June, intelligence reached the authorities of Tirhoot that one of their jemadars of police, Waris Ali by name, said to have been of the blood royal of Delhi, was in treasonable correspondence with some disaffected Mahomedans of Patna. The magistrate, seeing at once the necessity of immediately arresting this man, who was at a police station in the interior of the district, asked Mr. William Robertson, a young civilian of two or three years' standing, if he would undertake the work. Robertson, a fine and high-spirited youth, who seemed at all times to be cheery and confident, and ripe for action, accepted the offered duty with alacrity; and it was agreed that four Englishmen of the district should be selected to share the dangers and the honours of the enterprise. The gentlemen finally selected were Messrs. Urquhart, Baldwin, Holloway, and Pratt, indigo planters of the neighbourhood, 'all of them,' as Mr. Robertson wrote, 'steady cool chaps, and yet fighting men.' All arrangements made, this little party of five, well mounted and well armed, rode for Mr. Baldwin's factory, some three miles from the police station, where they devised and matured their plans; and before daybreak started in high spirits for the jemadar's quarters. Coming suddenly upon him, they found Waris Ali in the act of writing a treasonable letter to one Ali Kureem, a Mahomedan of wealth and influence, notoriously disaffected, who was then living upon the road between Patna and Gya. The culprit was seized with all his correspondence. He had evidently girded up his loins for immediate flight; and if William Robertson had swooped down upon him an hour later, the prey would have been lost. His horse, a remarkably fine one, stood saddled in the stable, with holsters at the pommel. Carts, already laden for a journey, with the draught cattle beside them, were standing in front of the house. Every article of furniture, down to the cooking pots and pans, were heaped up ready for departure. There was no doubt of the man's guilt. Taken '*flagrante delicto*,' he resigned himself to his fate. He was carried a prisoner to the station, and soon afterwards he was hanged. It is said that at the foot of the gallows he cried aloud, "If there is any friend of the King of Delhi here, let him come and help me.'"

CHAPTER X.

The Wahabees.

Those who have paid the slightest attention to the question of Wahabeeism, as connected with Patna, will to some extent have realised the peculiarities of the Wahabee character, the dangerous machinations of their devotees, and the importance of the timely arrest, and precautionary confinement of their leading Molvees in 1857.

I have now only to deal with the statements recorded by Sir F. Halliday in his present minute.

Some of these statements are so extremely puerile that I can hardly bring myself to deal with them seriously.

Summarising his criticisms, I observe he complains that I did not report the arrest at the time; that he never expressed or suggested any disapprobation of the arrest, but merely objected to being kept in ignorance of it; that I said I arrested them because I had obtained possession of important letters, which he asked for but I never sent; that I first intended to charge them with treason, and it was not till asked for further information that I said I had no evidence against them.

Again, that they were not released by him but by me, and at my recommendation.

He then denied that he endorsed the opinion in regard to the inoffensiveness of any of the Wahabees, and gave no opinion of his own as to the Wahabees or Wahabee character.

Finally, that he never cherished or petted them, and never knew anything about them, or any of their connections, at any period of his administration; he then makes the remarkable observation, that "as bearing strongly on the "assertion of Mr. Tayler, that the arrest of the Wahabees saved Patna from an "outbreak;" while they were under arrest, as hostages to prevent insurrection, a serious outbreak took place at Patna, attended with loss of life; this outbreak, the only breach of the peace which occurred then, was by Mr. Tayler attributed to the Wahabees; and finally, he adds, after their release as before, Patna remained perfectly quiet.

After this, commenting on my objection to the term "gentlemen" being applied to these traitors, he says I called Koer Singh "baboo," which means the same thing.

That Mr. Halliday never interfered or countermanded the arrest, I have before pointed out, the reason being, as I have always believed and felt, that in his painful ignorance and infatuated ideas as to the real state of things, any such decided measure was far beyond his capacity.

What I objected to, however, was his calling on me for the "proofs," for an arrest which was, as I throughout represented, merely precautionary, and his styling these miserable creatures "gentlemen," which covertly showed the disposition to uphold them. This was a "trifle," but a very significant one.

The statement that I said I arrested the Molvees "because I had obtained "important letters," is a misrepresentation.

I mentioned that letters had been brought to me, but were comparatively of little or no importance.

My motives for placing these Molvees under precautionary arrest were clearly set forth, and had nothing to do with any special proof of guilt; the discovery of letters was a mere accessory incident.

The importance which Sir F. Halliday wishes to clothe them with, is altogether imaginary.

I once again repeat that they did *not* form the ground or reason of the arrest, and were probably consigned to the rubbish basket when found to be unimportant.

The assertion that I *intended* to charge the Molvees with treason is untrue.

My ground for arresting them and placing them under surveillance was fully stated; there was no overt act charged against them.

It is perfectly true that I did not impute any blame to Mr. Halliday on the

ground of their release, but of their subsequent treatment by Government. Sir John Kaye calls it "fondling." The object of their temporary confinement was simply to paralyse their power for mischief during the crisis, and the measure has been universally attested, by those who are competent to judge, as eminently successful.

Mr. Halliday's statement that he did not endorse the opinion of the "inoffen-"siveness of any of the Wahabees," and gave no opinion of his own as to the Wahabees or the Wahabee character, or any part of the subject, I read with real astonishment even after the numerous instances of his inaccuracy.

"Did not endorse the opinion of the inoffensiveness of any of the "Wahabees!"

Did not Mr. Halliday accept, praise, publish, and circulate the famous letter of Mr. Samuells? Did he not send it to the press? Print it in his special blue book, and subsequently forward it for record in all the Commissioners' offices? Was he not severely censured for these very acts?

If this was not endorsing the opinion of Mr. Samuells, what in the name of common sense does endorsement mean?

What was the amount of Mr. Halliday's acquaintance with these men, and how it was that he did not "know anything about them," is a question which he must answer, not to *me*, but to his Queen and country.

The sentence regarding the *émeute* taking place during their confinement is so foolish an assertion as scarcely to deserve notice.

Did Mr. Halliday mean that the presence of these men, since proved to be deadly and uncompromising traitors, was a source of security; and their absence and precautionary arrest a cause of disturbance?

What can I say in answer to such a suggestion?

The statement that I attributed the *émeute* in the city to the Wahabees is untrue.

With regard to the trifling subject of the term "gentlemen" being applied to the Wahabees, I can only say that I never expressed any "indignation." I merely pointed to it as an unusual and inappropriate term, and as therefore implying and indirectly indicating disapproval of the arrest.

The comparison of the word "baboo" with "gentleman" is amusing but really somewhat foolish.

"Baboo" is an ordinary Indian word, always used when men of respectability are mentioned.

"Baboo Kower Singh" was his daily appellation.

"Gentleman Ahmed Oolla" had I fancy never been heard before.

The word as applied by Mr. Halliday has been quoted with ridicule ever since.

The negative fact that I had no evidence against them of treason, hardly entitles them to the special designation of "gentlemen?"

Is every man a "gentleman" who is not proved to be a traitor?

If I ever did call these creatures "gentlemen," it was probably in ridicule.

The word "baboo" I have already noticed as the ordinary appellation of natives of respectability.

Can Sir F. Halliday point out any other occasion when Wahabee fanatics, whose names were down in the black books of Government as suspected traitors, have been called by the name of "gentlemen?"

The extraordinary opinions regarding the Wahabee fanatics recorded by Mr. Samuells, and endorsed by Mr. Halliday, will be found in Mr. Samuells' celebrated letter, now reproduced by Sir Frederick Halliday; and* my answer will be seen in the copy of my reply to Mr. Samuells. As this copy has now been printed by order of the Secretary of State, I trust that it may be appended to my refutation for the benefit of the public.

See Parliamentary Paper, No. 308, of 1879, page 25.

I have hundreds of valuable letters on this subject, but will only give three or four of the most important.

It must not be forgotten that it was in 1864-65 that the true character of the Patna Wahabees was judicially established, and the dangerous unsoundness of the views recorded by Mr. Samuells and endorsed by Mr. Halliday, was thoroughly exposed. The letters that I now give are after that date.

Colonel *Blane*, Military Secretary to the Governor General of India.

"19 January 1867.

"I HAVE read your memorial, of course; it appears quite unanswerable, and makes out one of the strongest cases it is possible to conceive."

Sir *James Elphinstone*, Bart., M.P.

"9 December 1867.

"I THINK the usage you have received has been most grossly unjust, and am free to express my opinion that a simple recognition of your service now is no measure of the debt due to you. In common justice you ought also to be recouped for the fines imposed on you."

Sir *Herbert Edwardes*, K.C.B.

"22 January 1868.

"WHAT concerns you personally, however, is not the imperial but the provincial question. The Wahabee trials of 1864, at Umballa, and 1865, at Patna, disclosed (or, rather, brought to judicial proof, in courts of law, before the whole of India) what had only been imperfectly known previously, and most unaccountably pooh-poohed and smothered by the Bengal Government, viz., that for years the Wahabee followers of Syed Ahmed had spread a network of propagandism over the Bengal province; 1stly, to restore the purity of Islam in India; and 2ndly, as a logical consequence, to undermine and subvert the infidel power of the English.

"The centre of this truly bitter and formidable conspiracy was Patna. You lived there and knew what was going on. You acted on your knowledge, and paralysed the whole of the Wahabee sect, by seizing the leaders at the very moment when they could and would have struck a heavy blow against us. The Bengal Government was determined not to believe in the Wahabee conspiracy, and punished you for your vigour. Time has done you justice, shown that you were right, and hanged or transported the enemies whom you suspected and disarmed."

Sir *R. Montgomery*, K.C.B., late Lieutenant Governor of the Punjaub.

"7 February 1868.

"SIR ANDREW WAUGH had given me your 'Patna Crisis' to read, and I perused it with great pleasure.

"It showed that you had quickly appreciated the circumstances of the mutiny, and that you acted with great vigour, and in so doing checked the spirit of disaffection which was ready to burst forth at Patna. The Sitana campaign in 1863, the result of the Wahabee intriguers at Patna, and also the subsequent trials at Amballa, showed the animus of the Wahabee leader, resident at that place.

"The mutiny in 1857, though a military one, was deeper seated than that arising from purely military feelings. There was a deeper feeling of dissatisfaction throughout India at many of our acts. This encouraged the sepoys, and large masses sympathised with them, and would at once have joined them but for the vigour displayed by British officers at the crisis, and which kept them down till the population saw that the sepoys had lost.

"I believe myself the annexation of Oude was the crowning point of difficulties, and, exasperation at it, led the sepoys to mutiny. The mass of sepoys, as you are aware, came from that province."

T. Parry Woodcock, Esq., Retired, Bengal Civil Service.

"15 February 1868.

"I HAVE read with great interest the several pamphlets you were good enough to leave with me; and I have risen from their perusal with deep sense of the injuries consistently and perseveringly heaped upon you, and with a profound hope that truth will (it must!) prevail, and that you will meet with the just reward, however tardily, which the ability, courage, and energy you have exerted in your country's cause have so well deserved."

Hon. *Gerald Talbot*, late Private Secretary to Lord *Canning*.

"19 February 1868.

"I CAN, of course, have no sort of objection to repeat what is a very sincere conviction, that if Lord Canning had seen the papers which you now have to produce, and been made acquainted with the subsequent progress of events, he would most likely have changed his opinion as to the treatment you have experienced; and if he had changed his opinion, a man of his noble character would have been forward to say so, and to do you justice.'

General Sir *John Low*, K.C.B., late Member of the Supreme Council in India, 1868.

"I SINCERELY believe that your skilful and vigorous management of the disaffected population of Patna was of immense value to the Government of India, and that in the last few months of your Commissionership, commencing with the arrest of the three Wahabee conspirators, and the disarming of the greater portion of the inhabitants of the Patna City, your services were of more vital importance to the public interests than those of many officers, both civil and military, during the whole period of their Indian career, in less critical times, who have been rewarded, and justly rewarded, by honour from the Queen; while your services, by an extraordinary combination of unlucky circumstances, have hitherto been so overlooked. In Oriental phrase, 'What more need I write?'"

EXTRACT of LETTER from General Sir *Le Grand Jacob*, K.S.I.

"16 September 1873.

"THE Wahabees you checkmated, deemed so innocent by Mr. Halliday, had their treason's net spread over the land. For instance, in July 1857, on the opposite side of India, one of this dangerous fraternity, the favourite moonshee who was convicted and executed at Belgaum, wrote to a colleague (a subahdar of the the 27th N. I. stationed at Kolapore):

"'We are all ready to strike, and have great promise of support. Let us know when you are ready.'

"I do not think any single man did greater service to the State during that eventful period than yourself, and if my humble opinions be of the slightest service to you, you may make what use you please of this letter.

Yours, &c.
(signed) "*Le G. Jacob.*"

CHAPTER XI.

MR. SAMUELLS' LETTER.

PREPARED as I was for the production of all that Sir Frederick Halliday could utilise for my discomfiture, I never dreamed that he would be so unwise, as to disinter and bring again to light the indecent composition of Mr. Samuells' which, to my astonishment, he has reprinted in his present statement.

For the refutation and exposure of the manifold mis-statements contained in this remarkable letter, I need only refer to my answer, which now, at length, after two-and-twenty years, has, by the kind consideration of the Secretary of State, been given to the public; and to that I would, with confidence, refer all those who would wish to understand and appreciate the several points of controversy.

What was thought of Mr. Samuells' composition generally will be seen by the perusal of the extract from a leading article published at the time, in a well-known Calcutta paper, and known to be contributed by an influential and distinguished writer, at that time almost a stranger to me, Dr. Duff.

How

How it was regarded, even by Mr. Halliday's official superiors, will also be gathered from the severe censure and stern rebuke recorded by Sir Barnes Peacock, one of the Members of the Supreme Council, in the Minutes which have been published by the order of the Secretary of State (Parliamentary Paper, No. 308).

For publishing and circulating this violent and abusive letter, Mr. Halliday was himself (as may be seen in those Minutes severely reprimanded, and none were more distressed at the publication than Mr. Samuells' own friends.

After all this, that Sir F. Halliday should now reproduce the document, and appeal to the writer as an authority, is utterly unintelligible.

While, however, I leave the several points of controversy, as set forth in Mr. Samuells' phillippic, to the candid consideration of every impartial reader, who will take the trouble to peruse both letters. * * * *

There are two especial points which prominently now present themselves as calculated to cast light upon the most important subjects mooted by Mr. Samuells.

The first of these questions is that of the Wahabee fanatics.

Mr. Samuells, referring to the precautionary arrest of the leading Molvees of this sect, pronounced them to be "innocent and inoffensive bookmen," against whom "there was no cause of suspicion," and suggested that I had been induced to arrest them by the intrigues of two Mahomedans, Dewan *Mowla Buksh*, the deputy magistrate, and Syud *Wilayut Ali Khan*, a rich banker of the city, for their own evil purposes.

How painfully the fallacy of these opinions has been exposed by subsequent facts may be read at length in my chapter on the "Wahabees;" and this instance of ignorance and infatuation will give some idea of the general character of Mr. Samuells' qualifications.

I will here only say that the "innocent" head Molvee was several years afterwards sentenced to death by the High Court, while the two "traitors" have since been decorated by Her Majesty.

How Sir F. Halliday can, at the present day, when unquestionable facts and judicial evidence have established beyond doubt or cavil the dangerous fallacies thus publicly recorded, produce, to his own condemnation, the written evidence of this abusive blundering, it passes my imagination to comprehend.

But my readers will, in the presence of such strange procedure, be able to judge of the soundness of Sir F. Halliday's views, the justice of his proceedings, and the reliability of his statements.

All the varied points of difference of a more trifling character have been sufficiently disposed of in my printed answer to Mr. Samuells' letter, to which I would specially solicit attention. *

The graver question of the unfounded imputations which he presumed, in his paroxysm of passion, to cast upon my proceedings in the trial of the convicted traitor "Waris Ali," I have dealt with separately. The charges regarding the other trials Sir F. Halliday does not attempt to revive in his present statement, and with good reason.

Had Mr. Halliday, in common fairness, consented to give the same publicity to my answer to Mr. Samuells' attack in 1857, there would have been very little doubt or disagreement as to the facts.

The second question is the extrordinary fact, that although Mr. Halliday in 1857 accepted, praised, circulated, and sent to the press for publication, Mr. Samuells' letter, which contained these mischievous and infatuated fallacies, dangerous to the Government, and calculated to mislead all public officers on a vital point, yet, in his present statement, he unblushingly denies having "ever "endorsed the opinions of Mr. Samuells!"

It may, perhaps, be desirable for those who wish to examine and compare my statements with those of Mr. Samuells', to remember that I had been in the province of Patna for seven years, in intimate acquaintance with all the leading characters. While at Patna itself, I had passed upwards of two years before the Mutiny commenced, and that, consequently, while there was no commotion, I had had every opportunity of ascertaining the relative characters of the leading men; a knowledge which, as is now a matter of history, enabled me not to "confound the innocent with the guilty," as Sir Frederick Halliday pleasantly lays to my charge, but to distinguish good from evil, and thus to obtain effective support from the one, and keep the other in check. Mr. Samuells, when he

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 308, of 1879.

launched his attack, had been six months in Patna, had entered at once into the charmed circle of an antagonistic clique; depended for his information principally on the small trio who had, for purposes of their own, persistently endeavoured to thwart me; had for his counsellor and assissant a Mahomedan lawyer, who, whatever his own character, was the special friend and counsellor of a man whose ill-name was notorious throughout the district, and who, of his own knowledge, was utterly ignorant of all those matters with which I was familiar; and, lastly, that he wrote as the avowed partizan and champion of my persecutor.

To give the reader some idea of the style of Mr. Samuells' voluntary and uncalled-for attack, I will here subjoin a catalogue of the abusive terms employed, terms which Mr. Halliday, when officially approving of the production, described as "in some places less measured than is customary in official correspon-"dence," and then circulated the letter to all the Commissioners in Bengal, and sent for publication to the newspapers, refusing to give any publicity to my reply.

TERMS:

"Strings together a series of libels, every one of which, to a greater or lesser extent, is based upon fiction or misrepresentation."
"Daubs freely with the blackest colours his immediate superior, the Lieutenant Governor and his successor."
"Fuss and parade."
"Dishonest artifice."
"Miserable perversion of facts."
"Piece of pure slander."
"Could not support this calumny."
"Mr. Tayler's statement is wholly untrue."
"Voluntarily making himself the vehicle of the lies and calumnies of a parcel of worthless intriguers."
"A simple piece of impertinence, and wholly untrue."
"Simply talks nonsense."
"Wholly without foundation."
"Silly piece of rhodomontade."
"Perfect audacity."
"Facts and dates manufactured without scruple."
"Statements irreconcilable either with dates or facts."
"Pack of impudent and unprincipled libels."
"Vague grandiloquence, of which Mr. Tayler is fond."
"Pure romance."
"Imaginary measures."
"Ill-judged measures."
"A man of inordinate vanity, singularly bad judgment, and utterly unscrupulous; venting his spleen on all around him who are not inclined to take him at his own estimate, or who interferes with the spurious claims he sets up."
"Cap in hand, seeks the suffrages of the people."
"Wholesale misrepresentation."
"Barefaced claptrap."
"Rottenness of reputation."
"Charlatan."
"Misrepresentations and misstatements."
"Picks up the dishonourable weapons of his anonymous friends."

EXTRACTS from a Leading Article in the "Phœnix," written by Dr. *Alexander Duff*, published 6th April 1858.

"WHILE hitherto, for the most part, official documents have been considered as stereotyped specimens of the tame and the vapid in style, they have enjoyed the distinction of being regarded as perfect models of the decorous and polite. We regret to find the example of a signal departure from this hereditary prerogative recently set by no less eminent a person than Mr. Samuells, the Commissioner of Patna.

"Through a long career of public usefulness Mr. Samuells succeeded in gaining a high reputation for sobriety of mind, sedateness of manner, and a chastened decorousness of speech. Coupled with all this was an equally distinguished reputation for clearness of understanding and calmness in the delivery or record of his judicial decisions. But it would seem as if the recent earthquake of mutiny had shaken the previously firm pillars of his mental constitution, and made him reckless of a life-long earned reputation.

"In his elaborate Minute on the proceedings of his predecessor, Mr. Tayler, which occupies no fewer than *twenty-two* pages of the Calcutta Blue Book, the judge at once disappears in the violent controversialist. Surely the gagging act has already become as some of the antiquated laws of *menu*; otherwise the press, from which this most scurrilous of minutes emanated, would be at once silenced by its licence being revoked. And yet, strange to say, it is no private or interloper press, like that of the "Friend of India," or the "Hinkaru"; it is none other than the "Calcutta Gazette Office Press." The Act sternly prohibits the publication of aught that is calculated to bring *Government* or any of its *servants* into *contempt*. Now we venture to say that in the Blue Book, as a whole, there is more of a nature fitted to bring the Government and its servants into 'contempt' than has appeared in all the Indian newspapers put together since the now memorable 13th June 1857. But of all the documents in that discreditable Press-Act-violating Blue Book,

Book, Mr. Samuells' paper is justly entitled to hold the first rank in its 'bad eminence.'"

Again:—

"But surely, such an extraordinarily indecorous effusion cannot have passed without well-merited censure and rebuke. So one would have anticipated. But what is the fact? In acknowledging the receipt of it, the Secretary of the Bengal Government is directed to assure Mr. Samuells that as regards the substance of his letter, the Lieutenant Governor considers it able and successful, 'although it is not to be denied that the language in which his remarks are conveyed is in some places less measured than is customary in official correspondence.'

"And with this very mild and softly silken remark the whole is accepted and approved of. After this what are we to say?"

The writer thus concludes: "The stateliness of the courtier-civilian shrunk into the perturbation and disorderliness of the burly demagogue; the calmness of the solemn judge evaporated in the effervescence of the irate partizan; and in an effusion of unprecedented bitterness, worthy of O'Connell in his palmiest days, Mr. Samuells has done what he could to blast the well-earned reputation of a whole life spent in honourable service."

EXTRACTS from the Remarks of Sir *Barnes Peacock*, Member of the Supreme Council, Calcutta.

"I WOULD request the Lieutenant Governor to convey to Mr. Samuells the severe censure of the Supreme Government for the general tone of his letter, and the language which he has made use of towards Mr. Tayler; also for having officiously volunteered his opinions in respect of matters for which Mr. Tayler had been removed from the Commissionership of Patna, and for improperly availing himself of his office of Commissioner for the purpose of writing officially to the Government of Bengal upon matters wholly unconnected with his office, and in language unsuited to official correspondence.

"I would request him to stop any further publication of the letter, and to be more cautious in future as to the papers which he lays on the editor's table, or sends to the editors of the newspapers; and I would tell him that, in the opinion of the President in Council, correspondence on papers which expose dissensions between officers of Government, and especially when offensive and unbecoming language is used therein, or which tried to bring the administration of justice into discredit, ought not to be laid on the editor's table or circulated for the information of the public.

"21 June 1858. (signed) "*B. Peacock.*"

CHAPTER XII.

CRITICISM on the Minute of the 17th March 1858, containing Sir *Frederick Halliday's* Remarks on my "Brief Narrative."

BEFORE I enter upon this subject I must, to remove misapprehension, say a few words regarding the pamphlet entitled "Brief Narrative," to which it refers.

In the first place, my little brochure was not *published*, but printed for private circulation. Mr. Halliday was himself refused a copy by Messrs. Thacker & Co., when he or his secretary applied for one, but I sent him one myself when he asked me for it.

The pamphlet was written for the purpose of explaining to my friends the extraordinary circumstances under which, as I ventured to say, at "the zenith "of a successful administration," after I had devoted all my energies to the preservation of the great province committed to my charge, I was, on the plea or pretext of a single error of judgment, abruptly and ignominiously removed from my office, and suspended from the service by Mr. Halliday; such a sudden dismissal, degrading and dishonouring me before the whole of India, must, I felt, be regarded as a public disgrace, caused by some grave and serious misfeasance, which, if not explained, would indicate the perpetration of some heinous crime, and cause shame to my friends and family.

I was not aware that in printing such a statement for private circulation, I was committing any official sin, though it might be regarded as a breach of etiquette.

Before I had it printed, however, I asked the Secretary of the Supreme Government whether such a procedure was prohibited, and could obtain no information.

But, irrespective of the sudden penalties to which I was subjected, the glaring injustice of which was realised by many at the time, and has since been unanswerably established, I had another motive, for which the cold criticism of my adversaries will probably not give me credit, but which, nevertheless, did influence me, even more powerfully than my individual wrongs; that motive was the deep conviction that the views of the Bengal Government, and the principles on which their proceedings were regulated, were dangerously unsound, and that, far above my own personal grievances, was the national peril arising from misapprehension of the crisis.

Lord Canning, high and honourable as he was, was at that time (it is now a matter of history) necessarily, to a great extent, dependent on his Bengal advisers, especially Mr. Halliday, who, in his present Minute, vaunts himself as being at that time the "right hand of Government."

Although Mr. Halliday had other reasons for wishing to remove me from Patna, reasons which I have explained in my chapter on the "Industrial Institution," yet, separate altogether from this, the tendency of his mind (after my wished-for removal had been prevented by the intervention of the Governor General as "especially mischievous)" exhibited itself after a time in vexatious interference, cold approbation, unwise discouragement, a reluctance to admit the perils with which we were surrounded, or to acknowledge the probability of treason or disaffection; all these symptoms, becoming more obvious as the days advanced and the symptoms of danger increased, had so strongly convinced me of the awful danger in the political horizon, that I resolved on bearing testimony, according to my conscience, to the great fallacies which I fancied I perceived.

I acknowledge now that this step was, as far as my personal interests were concerned, imprudent. I did not perhaps, at the time, sufficiently realise that in thus expressing my conscientious sentiments, I was bringing upon myself the displeasure, not of Mr. Halliday only, but of the whole Bengal Government, who naturally became displeased at the general tone and purport of my remarks.

Some months afterwards I was made painfully conscious of my error, when the Supreme Government came forward to authorise the last ruinous blow, in my second suspension from office, for acts of which to this day I cannot recognise even the impropriety, as I shall show in my chapter on the subject.

While, however, this exposition of my sentiments irritated official minds, the opinion entertained by other competent judges was somewhat different, as will be seen by the letter placed at the close of this chapter from one whose capacity to form a sound judgment can scarcely be questioned, and who, being a stranger to me at the time, cannot be accused of personal partiality; I mean Dr. Alexander Duff.

While on this subject, which at the time was made a ground of complaint and censure, I annex a brief extract from a letter written to the Governor General in Council in February 1858; which, though the subject is not of great importance, ought perhaps to have tended to modify the official rebuke which I received at the time for what was considered a breach of official etiquette.

EXTRACT.

"I HAVE now only to explain, in regard to the printing and private circulation of the correspondence on which his Lordship (Lord Canning) has animadverted, that several days before I sent the papers to the press, I called on the Home Secretary, and asked him whether there was any objection to this course.

"Mr. Beadon's reply was, that he could give me no advice or information, that he thought some order against it had been issued by the Court, in the case of Mr. Lewis some years ago. I then observed, 'Yes,' but Mr. Lewis printed the letters of Government; I only propose to print my own and those of my friends.

"To this he again replied, that he could give me no advice or recommendation.

"Some days afterwards Mr. Beadon observed that I had 'violated rule and order,' when I reminded him of the conversation in the following words :—

"My Dear Beadon,

"You say I have violated rule and order in printing and circulating my defence.

"If you remember, when I asked you the other day whether there was any objection to printing it for private circulation, you said you could give me no advice or distinct answer.

"You

"You only said, you *thought* there had been some order of the *Court* against it in Mr. Lewis's case, some years ago; when I replied: 'Ah, but he printed the Government letters, which I do not intend to do.' I am sorry if I am out of order; it is too late to regret it. I must take the consequences.

"Yours, &c.
(signed) "*W. Tayler.*"

"No answer was received to this, and I thus inferred that the objection no longer held good; as to the correspondence being 'one-sided and incomplete,' the fact is sufficiently explained by what I said to Mr. Beadon, namely, that I, unlike Mr. Lewis, intended to print only my own letters and those of my friends, and thus, as I believed, avoid all infringement of rule. As the Home Secretary received this explanation, without any rejoinder, I naturally concluded it was satisfactory.

"Having submitted this explanation, I have now only to express my regret that, in thus printing my letters and the letters of my friends, I should have done what is displeasing to the Governor General in Council, but respectfully submit, in extenuation, that, in the absence of all known or promulgated prohibition, I could not be aware that I was doing what would subject me to censure."

I will here merely add, that when I ascertained that I had committed a breach of official etiquette, I withdrew the pamphlet from circulation.

My little essay, however, was not long left unassailed. On the 29th January 1858, the celebrated letter of Mr. Samuells appeared, concocted evidently to order, and welcomed with praise and exultation by Mr. Halliday. This extraordinary production was addressed to the Lieutenant Governor, and presented the strange spectacle of an executive officer taking on himself the office of defending the Lieutenant Governor in a letter to himself without either authority or license, and, at the same time, lavishing vulgar and personal abuse on his predecessor and senior in the service.

During the next month, when Mr. Halliday had swallowed this eccentric panegyric, he himself took up the cudgels, and produced the elaborate Minute now laid before Parliament.

But this Minute, though attacking me and my statements in no measured terms, and recording grave accusations to the discredit of my character, *was never shown to me*, though I made public application for it. Some paragraphs relating to the "Industrial Institution" he was compelled by the Supreme Government to send me, but the rest remained private, to be shown only to the authorities for my disparagement, and now only, on *quasi* compulsion, produced, accompanied by a fresh memorandum aggravating all the former charges, reiterating even those which had been publicly and officially disproved by our mutual superiors; disregarding the vast body of evidence which during the last 22 years has accumulated in my favour, and setting up his own opinion, unsupported by the slightest evidence, except that of his infuriated satellite, Mr. Samuells, in opposition to established fact, the testimony of all competent witnesses, the voice of the press, and the verdict of history.

As many of the subjects now introduced in this Minute are separately dealt with, I will here only notice those points which have not been elsewhere discussed.

In Paragraph 60 Mr. Halliday says that the "excessive shallowness of my "pretensions has been exposed by Mr. Samuells" in his letter, which in another place he terms "unanswerable," *never, of course, mentioning my answer!*

The force of this remark will be appreciated when both these letters are read, and the statements compared with the facts, as set forth in my chapter on "Mr. "Samuells' letter."

It is worthy of remark here, however, that, although Mr. Halliday published this letter in his special Blue Book, and circulated it throughout Bengal, he refused to give publicity to my reply, which he does not even deign now to mention.

Paragraphs 63 to 66 refer to Mr. Halliday's childish attempt to draw a distinction between "asking" the Zemindars for assistance, and thanking them if they did assist. Let any honourable man imagine that I could stoop to the transparent devices (which no one would understand and despise more thoroughly than the natives themselves), and say, "I must not ask you, my "friends, but I shall be very thankful if you will give me without asking." This distinction without a difference was obviously forced upon him for consistency's

sistency's sake, to support his new-born and ostentatious purism about the subscriptions to the "Industrial Institution."

His better sense must surely now show him the hollowness of the whole procedure.

Paragraphs 67 to 74 are occupied with a sort of exculpatory explanation, useful as far as it goes, regarding the 5th Cavalry; but all this is totally beside the mark. What passed between the Government, Mr. Yule, the Commander-in-Chief, and the other individuals set forth, do not touch my remark, and I made no reference to any such matters.

What I criticised was the apparently unmeaning answer given to my recommendation, viz., that "Government" could not afford to lose anything "in the "shape of cavalry until their absence was *proved* to be better than their "presence."

This appeared to me to exhibit such strange and mischievous *insouciance*, as to be fraught with danger at such a crisis, and the result, as is now notorious, was disastrous in the extreme.

Paragraphs 75 to 90 contain a long and rather rambling dissertation on a statement of mine, which is a simple fact, utterly unaffected by these remarks.

The striking characteristic of all the charges and imputations with which I have had to deal throughout this controversy is, that Sir Frederick Halliday has, in almost every instance, followed the plan of making a narrative of fact, often with considerable eloquence and apparent candour, and generally with a substratum of truth, so that an ordinary reader would in all probability feel a conviction, or at least an impression, that the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was set before him, while, *in fact, the real gist of the narrative is* garbled or kept out of sight.

This plan has been followed, as I shall show, in many instances, but in none more signally, than in the question embraced in these 15 paragraphs.

I have no objection to make to the narrative but *one*, and that is that *the one fact* which forms the key to the whole story is quietly suppressed; and suppressed not only here, but also in the special Blue Book printed by Mr. Halliday, and termed "correspondence connected with the removal of Mr. Tayler."

This suppression of the one fact which explains the charge made by me, and of all mention of the circumstances which induced me, in the discharge of my duty, to act on my own responsibility, has been so clearly set forth in my remarks on the charge of "concealing my acts and intentions," that very little more need here be said, except to point out a further instance of deliberate omission so artful, and yet, to one who discerns the practice, so palpable, that it is apparent at a glance.

The thing is simple and intelligible to a child. Up to the 7th June all was uncertainty—to all appearance Patna was quiet, and all consequently *hoped* that we might tide over the danger.

A reference to my daily letters, especially all those which I wrote from the middle of May to the 14th June (the whole of which have been left out of Mr. Halliday's special Blue Book) will show this.

Alternate apprehension and assurance, suspicion, and confidence, was the condition of affairs, as I have elsewhere related.

On the 7th June, however, all such confidence was dispelled. It was evident that my own police were in correspondence with the Sepoys; and, in fact, the accident of a wrong delivery of the Sepoy's letter alone, by God's mercy, saved Patna from a massacre more terrible than had yet occurred.

Such a fact, more convincing than a thousand lesser incidents, in one moment dispelled all former uncertain and ambiguous conclusions in my mind, as they would in the mind of any reasonable and unprejudiced man, and it never entered into my head for a moment that Mr. Halliday, with the vast responsibility resting upon him, could fail at once to have his doubts dispelled and his mind opened to the dread reality of the peril, on receiving intimation of the incident.

When, therefore, I wrote on the 8th to tell him of the disclosure made on the 7th, I could not entertain doubt of his readiness to adapt some measure to the reality before us, and I at once commenced all the secret and precautionary inquiries necessary to aid and direct me in the proper course of action.

While

While so employed I received, in answer to my letter of the 8th, that extraordinary letter of the 13th, in which Mr. Halliday ignored all danger at Patna, and held the mutiny of the Dinapore sepoys "inconceivable!"

Now, as I have before pointed out, these two letters, *i.e.*, mine of the 8th, and Mr. Halliday's of the 13th, contain the explanation, the key to all that then occurred.

In his special Blue Book he has made no allusion to the incident which I reported to him in my letter of the 8th; and though my possession of his letter of the 13th, which I quoted, necessitated the mention of that, my letter of the 8th, which contains his own condemnation, is not entered in the book, though many other private letters are.

And what do I find in this Minute, which is *now for the first time* seen by me!

There is a long story about former hopes, suggestions, and incidents, all of which I admit, and had myself frequently represented, but at the same time *there is a persistent omission of the information sent to him of the one pregnant fact in my letter of the 8th!*

His whole narrative, if carefully compared with the facts, will be seen to be garbled.

In para. 83 he thus writes:—"On the day following" (8th June) "he "announced the *vague truism*" (the *italics* are mine), "which was assuredly no "correction of the favourable reports he had continued to send to me up to "this time." Here is the "truism:"

"Though the Dinapore sepoys have not broken out, they may at any "moment."

This is the climax, the *ne plus ultra* of misrepresentation.

He actually quotes, and for the first time, a portion of one of my letters of the 8th,* but omits all mention and makes no quotation from the other, which announced the terrible discovery of the 7th, a discovery which at once, as by the stroke of a wand, falsified all previous confidence.

He thus suppresses (as he had in his Blue Book) all mention of the startling event, which, as I have before pointed out, formed the key of the whole transaction; and not only so, but in his engrossing desire to conceal his own infatuated disavowal of the danger reported, he calls the little sentence which he selects "a vague truism."

Undoubtedly, when stripped of the accompanying disclosure, and separated from the context, intentionally and unfairly suppressed, *it is* a "vague truism."

Let it, however, be read in connection with the fact and announcement which accompanied it, but which Sir Frederick Halliday carefully conceals, and is it *then* a "vague truism?"

The night before they had intended to attack Patna, and in concert with our own police then our only protection, a night of indescribable agony was passed; massacre and destruction were only averted through the goodness of the Almighty, by the delivery of the letter to a loyal man instead of a traitor.

On the *next* day, when relating the facts, I added the words quoted in contempt by Mr. Halliday, and which I venture to say, when read in connection with the crisis, only just staved off, were pregnant with importance.

I leave this exposure without further comment; the instance of deliberate and studied misrepresentation surpasses even Mr. Halliday's artistic practice.

I say nothing of the remaining arguments and excuses.

They are all tainted by the concealment of *the one great fact* which falsified every detail, para. 90 to 100. These paragraphs refer to the case of Baboo Koër Singh, and allude to what I stated regarding the unwise procedure adopted by the Sudder Board, and countenanced to some extent by Mr. Halliday, in unnecessarily pressing him in regard to certain arrangements which had been commenced at my suggestion, and thus rendering him discontented and desperate, at a time when he was sought for by the disaffected as an efficient leader, when the rebellion should break out.

This subject has been fully discussed and my proceedings vindicated in my answer to Mr. Samuell's attack, and need not be here repeated, except to point to it as a another instance of the concealment of the one fact which gives the cream of the story.

All

* *N.B.*—He received two letters dated the 8th from me, as he says in his letter of the 13th.

All the passages quoted by Mr. Halliday to my disparagement which refers to opinions held by me in regard to Koër Singh's loyalty are correct; I fully believed in the loyal feeling of his heart, and believe so still; that he felt a strong and grateful attachment for myself personally I was fully aware; he had some time before gone with me to the gaol at Arrah, and assisted me zealously in the suppression of an *émeute*, for which I was publicly thanked by Government.

He had, at my request, written an admirable letter to the 40th Regiment at Dinapore, entreating them to remain true to their salt; and further, when the reports of his disaffection were rife, I deputed Syud Azeem-ood-deen, the Mahomedan deputy collector, who was with the English in the Arrah garrison, and was afterwards decorated with the Star of India, to go without previous notice to his house, and quietly observe what was going on.

He did this, and at the very time when alarmists were accusing him of active preparations for mischief, he found the old man almost alone, laid up with neuralgia, and with no sign or symptom whatever that could be converted into rebellion.

But in this matter, as in almost every other; there is a fatal omission!

Quite separate from the official and demi-official correspondence, I had written myself, though I do not recollect the exact date, to Mr. Halliday, entreating him, in a private note, to send me one line privately, or demi-officially, which I might communicate at once to Baboo Koër Singh (irrespective or independent of boards, or forms, or secretaries) assuring him that he should not be thrown over.

That letter was in my mind when I made the statement in my "brief narrative," which Sir Frederick Halliday criticised in his Minute of 1858 (now reprinted), and which, as I have before mentioned, was never shown to me.

That letter would explain and confirm all I said, *but that letter like others is suppressed!*

Para. 111 to 113 refers to the case of Mr. Lowis, then the magistrate.

Mr. Lowis's father was one of my earliest and oldest friends, and I repudiate with indignation all imputations of prejudice or unkindly feeling.

It suited Mr. Halliday to state this; Mr. Lowis was son-in-law to Mr. Ross Mangles, Mr. Halliday's coadjutor in the India Office, who, though a private friend, was on political grounds, being an enthusiastic advocate of the "only a military mutiny" theory, an opponent to me.

If he could be persuaded that I had been unjust to his son-in-law, and that Mr. Halliday had espoused his cause, his opposition to me would be intensified, and his efforts in support of Mr. Halliday redoubled.

I can only say that from Mr. Mangles himself, as well as from his son, Ross Donnelly Mangles, I have letters which would at once dispose of Mr. Halliday's assertions, but the subject is a painful one. Mr. Lowis and his family are still on friendly terms with me, and no one who knows me will for a moment believe that I was or could be guilty of unkindness or injustice to a friend, the son of a friend, and a junior officer.

My disputes have unfortunately always been with my superiors; there is not one who ever served under my orders with whom I ever differed, with one exception.

Para. 116 to 118. These paragraphs discuss the expediency of the appointment of one *Ameer Ali*, a Mahomedan, as assistant to my successor. It would be waste of time to enter on that question here.

But the paras. 116 to 121 contain such serious and strange charges against me that they call for special notice.

In the last paragraph, though he had at the outset declared that his only object was to test the accuracy of my "statements in regard to himself, he launches forth with grave and damaging accusations against me which it is unnecessary to examine.

The statement contained in paragraph 116, is that I had ungenerously lent myself to the "unthinking hatred" which he had just described as a "blind and indiscriminate hatred to Mahomedans, loyal or disloyal," yet with the most extraordinary inconsistency he goes on, in the same paragraph, to say that there is "no one officer who has trusted and favoured Mahomedans more than "he has" (*i.e.*, I myself), a statement which stultifies at once the accusations; and what proof, what scintilla of evidence does Mr. Halliday produce to justify such

such a grave and dishonourable charge, publicly and officially brought forward for my disparagement, and forwarded to the Court of Directors without my knowledge!

The only tittle of proof which he is able to adduce in support of this serious charge is in the 119th paragraph, and what does that amount to? That I had adopted a "new theory" regarding my removal from office, having first imputed it to Mr. Halliday's proceedings in the matter of the Industrial Institution, and then, abandoning that ground, afterwards attributed it to the antagonism of my policy and that of the Government.

Truly, Mr. Halliday must have been driven to his wit's end when he committed himself to such a statement.

Need I point out the utter incoherence and inapplicability of the idea? What I said in 1857, and what I confidently repeat at the present moment is, that in the *first instance* Mr. Halliday wished, and intended to remove me from Patna, because he had stultified himself, and dishonoured me by the silly and insincere proclamation which he had published. Knowing from my grave and deliberate protest that I should contest his views, and himself evidently conscious of the mistake he had made, he was anxious for my *transfer to another* Commissionership to avoid the continuance or renewal of the controversy, especially as his own brother-in-law had so painfully committed himself in the discussion.

That this was the fact, and that his and his brother-in-law's proceedings had been strongly condemned by his own special friend, Mr. Samuells, has been shown in my remarks on the Industrial Institution.

But this has nothing to do with the question now mooted; the removal *then contemplated* was not a removal from office, but a mere transfer to another Commissionership of equal emolument, that of Burdwan, and clearly for the special purpose indicated.

But my penal and degrading suspension from public employ and dismissal from the Patna Commissionership, nearly two months afterwards, though doubtless in Mr. Halliday's heart connected with his former purpose, was, I verily believed, and still believe, caused not only by the motive first mentioned (though that still existed), but because he had shown such infatuation in common with other members of the Government in persistently ignoring the dangers which beset us; that infatuation it was which drove me, in the discharge of my sacred duty, to act on *one occasion* on my own responsibility, not according to his views, but my own.

I have already dealt in the early part of this statement with the charge of reckless "thirst for blood," and other unjustifiable calumnies, and have given evidence to show that, perhaps of all the civil servants in India, I have been the most remarkable for my kindly feelings towards the natives; that this fact has been publicly acknowledged by Mr. Halliday himself, specially referred to by Mr. (now Sir Cecil) Beadon, confirmed by history, manifested unmistakably by the letters and petitions presented by the natives themselves, when called upon to state their motives for subscribing to the Industrial Institution; by the unflinching loyalty and personal friendship of Dewan Mowla Buksh, and Syud Wilayut Ali Khan, both of whom, though suspected and denounced by Mr. Samuells, with Mr. Halliday's approval, have since been decorated by Her Majesty; by the fidelity exhibited by Karee Ramzun Ali, whom I placed in charge of the Chuprah station, when evacuated by the English, and a thousand other proofs which it is unnecessary to adduce.

In spite of this mass of evidence, although Sir John Kaye in his history specially refers to my kindly feeling, and quotes a letter written by me on the subject before the commencement of the mutiny. In the face of all this, Sir Frederick Halliday, a member of the Indian Council, without one iota of evidence, does not scruple to blacken my character, reproducing at the present day the charges which in an official minute, unknown to me, he had recorded, for the obvious purpose of prejudicing and poisoning the minds of our mutual superiors without giving me the possibility of a rejoinder!

I have reserved to the last this, perhaps the most remarkable, paragraph in Mr. Halliday's long Minute of 1857, a minute necessarily calculated to excite a feeling of disapprobation in the minds of our superiors, and purposely with-

held from my knowledge, for what reason will, I apprehend, be now clearly seen; but I certainly never expected, under all the inaccuracies which it contained, to meet with so pleasant and complete a nullification of all the terrible charges thus brought against me as is comprised in this paragraph.

Now I would particularly ask the reader to compare this paragraph, 121, with the general tenor of Sir Frederick Halliday's present minute.

For convenience sake, I will now put together the portrait of myself, as drawn by Sir Frederick Halliday in his Minute of 1879. In this I am represented as a concentration of every evil trait and characteristic which it is possible to conceive. "A thirst for hasty and reckless bloodshed" is my first attribute. Then follows, "unthinking hatred of Mahomedans, confounding the innocent with "the guilty; irritating all Patna by hasty and indecorous proceedings; the "cause of all the danger that existed at Patna by my unwise and violent "proceedings, hanging a man who had committed no crime. Interfering with "and endeavouring to prevent the relief of Arrah." The above are some of the terms applied to me, and sufficient certainly to exhibit me to the world as the most base, dishonest, and flagitious mortal that ever was invested with official powers.

Not a redeeming trait appears; bad at the commencement, worse at the end of my administration.

This is the picture in Sir Frederick Halliday's present Minute. But what do we find in the hidden Minute of the 17th March 1858, in paragraph 121; that the Government was "always anxious to support me, and that in every possible "case supported, applauded, and encouraged me, and blamed me ONLY for "withholding information."

Support, applause, and encouragement to a Commissioner who was unfit to be trusted, given to "reckless bloodshed and unthinking hatred; who con-"founded the innocent with the guilty, and was himself the cause of all the "danger;" and yet with all these crimes on his head was *only* blameable for withholding information.

With regard to the pamphlet itself, which was printed by me after my summary removal from office for private circulation among my friends, and in vindication of my name and honour, it is gratifying to me to be able to produce the following letter written to me at the time by the celebrated Dr. Duff, who was then a personal stranger to me:—

COPY of a LETTER from the Rev. Dr. *Duff*, dated Calcutta, 18th February 1858.

"My dear Sir,

"I HAVE to apologise for being so long in answering the note you so kindly addressed to me on leaving Calcutta to Patna. Let me at once say that the delay has arisen from no want of sympathy with you or your policy; quite the reverse; I am myself one of those who watched the whole of your proceedings during the terrible months of the crisis, and noted them with unqualified approbation. According to the current phrase, I did regard you as the 'right man in the right place;' and now that your own narrative of events sets forth authentically the whole of your doings, and the reasons by which you were guided, I can only say that I have risen from the perusal of your narrative and correspondence with my feelings of approval and admiration vastly enhanced.

"In pp. 19 and 20 of your narrative you have recorded your views of the nature and origin of the great revolt and rebellion. They are views to which I was led, in substance at least, to give expression as far back as May last; need I say, then, how thoroughly, how intensely I accord in them. You have, I believe, hit the very truth, and for the manly Christian courage which has enabled you to embody them in writing, I, for one, not only honour you, but with my whole heart thank you.

"By so doing you have rendered an important service to the cause of truth and righteousness in this land, and when the days of a crooked, selfish, patchwork policy, a policy too as short-sighted and ruinous as it is selfish, are numbered, you and others who, like you, have honestly tried to probe the grievous national sore to the bottom, in order that it might be more effectually healed, must rise to the surface and be borne along by the approving plaudits of the wise and the good.

"After all this I need scarcely add that I regard you as a thoroughly ill-used man. Writing to an influential friend in Scotland the other day, a friend who is sure to make use of my remarks, I could not help saying that if there was a man living who deserved the honour of British knighthood at the hands of his Sovereign, that man was Mr. Commissioner Tayler. But instead of this, what shall I say? indeed, words fail me to give expression to my sense of the unmerited indignity which has been offered to you.

"But my dear sir, your "Narrative" shows that you have learnt to put your trust in the God of Providence, and that you are not ashamed to own your faith in Christianity.

In

In this I rejoice more than I can tell, and I am sure, sooner or later, in your case the gracious assurance will be verified, 'Them that honour me I will honour.' Cheer up, therefore, and wait God's good time for deliverance.

"Yours, &c.

"*Alexander Duff.*"

I have now dealt with the principal items of Mr. Halliday's indictment, as set forth in his Minute of the 17th August 1858; but there are still one or two points which deserve further elucidation and exposure, being pre-eminently unfair above their fellows, and exhibiting a reckless disregard of established facts. These points are—

1st. The alleged abandonment of the Chuprah station by the constituted authorities, with the events which followed it.

2ndly. The circumstances connected with my letter to Mr. Bax on the subject of Major Eyre's advance to the relief of Arrah.

3rdly. The special charge of cruelty.

Abandonment of the Chuprah Station.

With reference to this subject, Sir F. Halliday thus writes in his Minute under consideration, para. 11:—

"In other parts of his jurisdiction he directed the abandonment of European "districts, none of which were in danger, and of which one station, at least, "was immediately taken in hand and successfully administered by the native "inhabitants, astonished and ashamed to find themselves abandoned by their "English chiefs, and left to manage for themselves as best they might, with a "treasury full of money and a gaol full of prisoners."

This description is doubtless ingenious, and well calculated to excite a strong feeling of disapproval if not indignation against me; the only defect is that it is *untrue throughout.*

What are the facts? The station referred to is Chuprah.

I never directed the abandonment of Chuprah at all!

This is what occurred:—

At an early period of the disturbances I discovered that the Collector of Chuprah had, without any communication with me, left the station in alarm. I expressed my disapprobation, and reported the circumstance at once to Mr. Halliday, who authorised my suspending him if I thought right.

He then returned to Chuprah, but some time afterwards, when the mutiny of the sepoys took place, the whole of the officers, alarmed at the events which were passing around them, deliberately abandoned their station, but under no order, and with no previous consultation or encouragement from me.

Although disapproving strongly of this movement, *no crisis having arrived, as it afterwards did, to justify abandonment,* I did not deem it right at such a moment to enforce their return, but at once took steps for preserving the district, and protecting the treasury and gaol.

To this end, on my own responsibility, I passed an order making over the entire charge of the station, during the absence of the English, to one Cazee Ramzan Ali, a Mahomedan resident, of whose loyalty, in opposition to the opinion of all the residents, I felt confident.

This man it was, and *not* the "native inhabitants" who, acting under my special orders, and vested by me with full powers, "administered the district," and re-delivered it a few days afterwards without loss or damage to the authorities!

Is it fair, just, or honest, in Sir F. Halliday, after so many years, and at such a crisis, to publish so palpable a misrepresentation of the real facts regarding this district?

And this is still more unjustifiable because the same mis-statement had been twice made before and twice refuted, viz.: first in 1857 by Sir Charles Trevelyan, writing under the name of Indophilus, in "The Times," and again in 1867 by Mr. Ross Mangles, in the "Edinburgh Review."

Sir Charles Trevelyan wrote only on the information sent to him from India,

and honourably admitted the fact when the error was represented to him by myself.

Mr. Mangles did the same; but their admission and apologies were private; their previous statements public.

But now after this thrice-repeated rectification of the mis-statement, of which Sir F. Halliday could not be ignorant, he again comes forward with the same account, not modified, but heightened with dramatic description, and with the whole blame cast on my devoted head!

This is another instance of that plausible system of misrepresentation, which has from the first been employed, and was not unnaturally successful in misleading Lord Canning, the Court of Directors, and subsequently, to some extent, Lord Stanley, in my absence. I earnestly beg that the entire question may be carefully studied; first, by a perusal of my own explanation and defence; secondly, by the recorded statement of those who are acquainted with the circumstances; and thirdly, by the light of history, as set forth by Sir John Kaye and Colonel Malleson; and I once again protest against the misrepresentations now deliberately repeated by Sir Frederick Halliday, in the face of the evidence on record, and in total disregard of truth.

At the bottom of page 11 of his "Minute," Sir F. Halliday thus writes :—

"Had it rested with Mr. Tayler, Arrah would have been lost, for at the very "crisis of its danger, when Eyre was advancing to its relief, he wrote *officially* "*and advised him not to advance.* Fortunately, Eyre neglected this advice, if "indeed it ever reached him."

A few minutes reference to Chapter VII. will show how painfully false, how cruelly unjust is this tirade, again set forth 22 years after the truth has been established. It will be seen that so far from preventing Major Eyre's advance, I never addressed him at all. I merely recommended, in answer to a note from a civilian, what I thought was a *safer and more effective mode of advance*, at that particular crisis, that so, we might strike a harder blow, in which I could give extra help! and then sent my private note to the General of the Division, to give such orders as he thought right.

Again I ask, where is honesty? where truth? The little note at the bottom of page 11 is specially unfair. Nobody knows better than Sir F. Halliday that the one careless expression which he quotes, and which was casually used in a letter when that particular question was not under discussion, referred chiefly to General Lloyd's memorandum, which was endorsed upon my letter to Mr. Bax, and contained *his order, not to my own separate letter to Mr. Bax*, which merely contained my suggestion and advice; and that this was fully explained to the satisfaction of every one, the covert and unjustifiable re-introduction here of this refuted charge is an unworthy trick, which I imagine Sir F. Halliday expected would escape observation, though it might do me injury.

A few more words I would now wish to add in regard to the charge of cruelty which has been prominently brought forward by Mr. Halliday. The following memorandum was written shortly after my return to England in 1867 :—

"Of all the malicious misrepresentations which were employed to prejudice the mind of Lord Canning against me, at a time when his Lordship had no personal acquaintance with any public officers out of Calcutta, none was more unfair or unjustifiable than that which pourtrayed me to him as an advocate for excessive severity against the natives. It was a convenient weapon to use behind my back, because from his Lordship's well-known sentiments of benevolence there was nothing more likely to raise a bias in his mind against a public officer than the idea that he was cruel and relentless.

"Had my calumniators spoken truly, or in my presence, they must have told Lord Canning, what they all knew, that no man in the Civil Service had more warmly and consistently advocated conciliation and kindly treatment towards our native fellow-subjects than myself; that no one was more ready to cultivate the friendship of those with whom friendly communion was possible, and that while I felt the necessity of dealing fearlessly and promptly with the mischievous and the disloyal, I was throughout supported by all good and loyal natives in the province."

The above paragraphs were written long before I had seen the "Memorandum" now published by Sir F. Halliday, and the long Minute of 1858 which it contains. But as in this "Memorandum" these strange charges of "cruelty," "blood-thirstiness," "unthinking hatred," &c., have been now seriously and deliberately

deliberately placed on record by Sir Frederick Halliday, it may be as well to meet them with a few remarks, which will, I hope, tend to show the strange metamorphosis which must have come over me before I could exhibit such characteristics.

As Sir Frederick Halliday produces no evidence in support of this new denunciation, save the rabid and abusive letter of Mr. Samuells, I need not enter at any length into the question, especially as the long list of letters which I have now produced will sufficiently expose the utter groundlessness of the charge; but the following extracts may, I think, be appropriately read in connection with the subject.

The following is a portion of a letter addressed by me to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal on 27th June 1855, two years before the Mutiny, when I represented the excited state of the Mahomedan mind, the *first* intimation, I believe, that was ever made before the storm broke.

Part of this letter is quoted by Sir John Kaye in his Third Volume, chapter II., page 69.

EXTRACT of my LETTER to the Secretary to the Bengal Government, dated 27th June 1855.

Para. 16.—"I now take the liberty to suggest that some steps be immediately adopted to remove, as far as may be, the mistaken ideas of these ignorant and misjudged people. However absurd or unfounded their belief may be, it is neither the less firm or the less fraught with future mischief; and my conviction is that, unless pains are taken to explain the measures and intentions of Government, to conciliate the affections, and encourage the loyalty of the people, all efforts to enlighten or elevate them will be idle and abortive.

Para. 17.—"Separated as we necessarily are from the millions around us by our habits and ideas, we are still further, and without the same necessity, isolated from their hearts by the utter absence of all individual feeling or sympathy. The great mass see or hear of functionary after functionary coming and going, and holding the destinies of the people in the hollows of their hands; but they seldom, perhaps never, know what it is to feel that the minds of their rulers have ever been directed to understand or sympathise with the great heart that is beating around them.

"The result is an utter absence of those ties between the Government and the governed; that 'unbought loyalty' which is the strength of kings, and which, with all his faults, the native of India is well capable of feeling."

The following extracts are also to the point:—

EXTRACT of a LETTER to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, dated 30th May 1855.

"I have ever found the respectable natives ready and willing to enter into all reasonable views, when they were reasonably expounded and patiently explained, not by public notices or through red tape subordinates, but in friendly and unreserved conversation. It is by personal communication, considerate reasoning, and careful argument, that their prejudices are removed, and their minds impressed, and it is by personal kindness that their hearts, like all human hearts, are touched."

EXRACT from a LETTER from the Private Secretary of the Government of Bengal, dated 2nd August 1855.

"I have read with much interest your letter regarding education in Behar; I so entirely agree with you in thinking that personal intercourse with those around us is by far too often overlooked.

"From my experience in Upper India, I am quite sure that more can be done by a timely and kind word than by all the liberalty the Government is able to bestow."

EXTRACT from a LETTER from the Lieutenant Governor's, Mr. *Halliday's*, Secretary, dated 9th June 1855.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to forward, for your information, a copy of a letter this day addressed to Mr. Drummond, in reference to the recent outbreak in the Shahabad gaol, and I am instructed by the Lieutenant Governor to express to you his warm acknowledgments for the prompt and very useful assistance which, from Mr. Drummond's reports, it is evident he received at your hands after the disturbance had broken out.

"2. The Lieutenant Governor is indeed disposed to attribute, mainly to the effect of your presence at Arrah, and to your *personal influence* with those leading persons of the town and district who are named in Mr. Drummond's reports," the circumstance that at Arrah no open expression of feeling was manifested beyond the precincts of the gaol.

"I have, &c.
(signed) "*W. Grey.*"

The above brief extracts will, I imagine, be considered conclusive on the point under notice; but I must also add the testimony of a hostile and unwilling witness, Mr. Samuells, who in his attack on me stated (as he supposed to my prejudice and disparagement) that "of all civilians in the country" I was "the most noted patron of Mahomedans!"

Indeed the most remarkable feature in my case, perhaps, was the brave and undaunted support which, even after my dismissal from office, was given to me by the independent and respectable natives of the province, men who it was said by Lord Macauley are ever ready to aid in crushing those who are in disfavour with Government.

The letters and addresses from natives already printed in the first portion of this narrative, and the continual friendship which I have since maintained with all those who distinguished themselves for loyalty, Mowla Buksh, Wilayut Ali Khan, Hedayut Ali, and others, are proofs of the fact.

The benefit which the Government derived from this friendly feeling was, as I have shown, on more than one occasion acknowledged with special thanks by the Lieutenant Governor; and when the Chuprah authorities left their station in alarm, it was through my influence with a Mahomedan gentleman, Lazi Ramzan Ali, a man who had been in great disfavour with my opponents, that I was able to make arrangements for the preservation of the district.

This incident is, as I have shown, strangely misrepresented by Sir Frederick Halliday, in his present Minute.

That, with all these proofs on record of my kindly feeling, Lord Canning should have been persuaded, as he was, that I was unfeeling and tyrannical, and thus induced to concur in my removal (on the mere pretext of a single error) was a triumph of successful intrigue, but not very creditable to those who adopted it.

Thus much I have been tempted to say regarding myself, because it is possible that some, who on other grounds would cordially support my claims, might have their sympathy weakened if they believed that I was an enemy to reasonable clemency or wise conciliation towards the natives of India.

COPY of a LETTER to *R. D. Mangles*, Esq., from *W. Tayler*, Esq., Commissioner, Patna, referred to on page 50.

"My dear Mangles, 1857.

"I DO not know whether you are aware that I was in former days an intimate friend of Lowis's father and your own. If you are, you will understand how really painful this unhappy business with Lowis has been to me. If I could reproach myself with a single thought, word, or deed of unkindness towards him, the case would be different.

"From the day he arrived to the present time, consistently, and under great provocation, I have *endeavoured* to treat him as a friend, and even when absolutely compelled by public duty to notice his conduct, have never done so with the severity that the case warranted; after the determined and uncompromising spirit of opposition and enmity he has shown, I do not suppose there would be any use in assuring him that even *now* I would gladly do what I could in his behalf; but I cannot refrain from writing to you, as his friend and near relation, and sending you the accompanying correspondence, to show you that up to the *last* I made friendly and conciliating overtures to him, but without effect. *Twice* after that correspondence, at the *risk* of being misunderstood, did I again speak to him in the most friendly tone, and *begged him* to understand me. All to no purpose! The only point that I am anxious about is, that his, and your father and mother, should *know* that I have not causelessly or wilfully caused injury to their children. You have not been here long enough to know, or understand, the extraordinary *set* there has been made against me for months past; for what cause, God only knows. To my friends who know me, to myself, who am only conscious of a wish to live in peace and happiness with all, it is a perfect enigma.

"It would be almost a relief to me to think that Lowis was *influenced*, as many suspect, by some among the clique who thus assailed me, because I ventured to do something out of the common line! but I almost fear he has not.

"There

"There are several other notes that I should like you to see, and it would be a great satisfaction to me if, after perusing the correspondence, you yourself are convinced that I have acted fairly and kindly towards Lowis, you will do me justice before those whose opinion and friendship I so much value, as I do your parents and his.

"This is of course as a private matter, but one on which I feel deeply. I have not written to Farquharson, as he is not so nearly related to Lowis, and moreover he has not treated me as old friendship might have led me to expect.

"Believe me, &c.
(signed) "*W. Tayler.*"

CHAPTER XIII.

Treatment after my Removal.

In referring to his treatment of me, after my sudden and humiliating removal from the Commissionership, Sir Frederick Halliday thus writes:—

"I will only add, since Mr. Tayler bitterly complains of my treatment of him "after his removal from Patna, that I gave him the best appointment then in "my gift, little less valuable than that from which he had been removed, only "delaying it until I should receive the decision of Lord Canning's Government, "on his appeal and claim to be reinstated at Patna."

Here is another instance of Sir F. Halliday's plan of omitting what is essential to the truth.

Sir Frederick Halliday removed me from the Commissionership on the 5th of August, lowering my salary from 3,906 rupees per mensem (besides travelling allowance) to 300 rupees, the amount authorised for subsistence allowance, thus at once reducing me, with my wife and grown-up daughters, to a state of the greatest distress, which he knew well must be aggravated by former pecuniary difficulties.

On this starving allowance he kept me for seven months, thus robbing me of some 2,500 *l.*, and compelling me to sell property to obtain the means of subsistence.

At the expiration of this time he appointed me to the judgeship of Mymensurgh, a station 600 miles from Patna, at the eastern extremity of Bengal, notorious for its damp and unhealthy climate.

The appointment was not given to me till February, and I was thus compelled to leave my wife and family, and travel to this place of banishment, at the beginning of the hot season.

To keep me for seven months on this miserable pittance, without even offering to give me an intermediate appointment, on the plea of waiting for the decision of the Supreme Government, was simple cruelty, and was in fact done with the obvious purpose of starving me into submission.

There was no conceivable necessity for waiting until my claim to restoration to Patna was decided by the Supreme Government, except the satisfaction that Mr. Halliday derived from my distress and difficulties.

The place selected was, as I have said, 600 miles from Patna; the climate, as was afterwards shown by medical certificate, was, from its excessive damp, injurious to my health, the distance necessarily involved lengthened separation from my family and home, and the long and tedious journey made my departure penal.

But to prove how unyielding and relentless was the spirit of persecution in Mr. Halliday's heart, I must mention that after I had been at Mymensingh for some months I took advantage of the "privilege leave" to which I was entitled, and returned to Patna for a short time. My second memorial was then still before the Court of Directors, and at the time my leave expired an answer might be expected every day.

It was on the cards that I might be restored to Patna, and it was of great importance to me to be spared, if possible, an useless journey of 1,200 miles. The doctor's certificate testified that the climate had already been injurious to me, and Mr. Halliday had treated with contempt my entreaty to be appointed to a station nearer to my home, so I applied for a short leave of absence on private affairs.

But the same unforgiving spirit refused me this trifling favour, and under circumstances which showed the extreme hostility of my persecutor.

At that time a general order of the Governor General existed prohibiting leave on private affairs to all civilians, owing to the disturbed state of the country; but Lord Canning, who was then up in the north-west, on a representation of the peculiar hardship of my case, actually telegraphed special permission to disregard the order in my favour.

But Mr. Halliday was still obdurate; he had got me down. He had already taken more than 2,000 *l.* from me; had separated me from my family; had caused injury to my health, and in spite of medical certificate, spite of Lord Canning's kind concession, he sent me back to my banishment.

And now Sir F. Halliday, the man who perpetrated all these cruelties, coolly writes, as if he had been my friend, and exhibited consideration and kindness.

"I will only add, since Mr. Tayler bitterly complains of my treatment of "him, after his removal from Patna, that I gave him the best appointment then "in my gift."

The old device of stating what suits his purpose, and ignoring all else.

CHAPTER XIV.

As I do not profess to be immaculate, I will, in this concluding summary, willingly leave a margin for reasonable criticism on my two first chapters, viz., whether Mr. Dampier had good and sufficient reason to be cross; whether I was too enthusiastic in carrying out my new scheme of "Industrial Education."

Mortal man is subject to error; but if I saved a Province, when all India was in danger, such minor peccadillos may, perhaps, meet with mercy.

But in regard to the unmerciful catalogue of serious charges affecting my character as a public officer, a gentleman, and a Christian, I wish at the close of this compulsory refutation to lay them before my countrymen, not without some confidence as to the result.

One word only as regards the educational scheme I will offer, as it has been perverted into a damaging accusation. I will only say, however, that I did nothing that had not been *approved, applauded, sanctioned, and practised by Mr. Halliday*, and if the wrong which he has invented *was* done, it was *he* that did it; a fact which, I venture to say, is no longer "probandum," but "probatum."

I now proceed to the formidable catalogue of imputed sins. Enough to satisfy my bitterest enemy, and make, if printed, a heavy load for the "Confessional."

What I have said, therefore, as to the Industrial Institution may be taken in the catalogue, as—

No. 1.—Enthusiasm.
Answer.—Admitted.

No. 2.—Disobeying a "positive order" in a matter "of life and death."
Answer.—Clearly proved to be untrue. Chap. IV.

No. 3.—Largely mixing myself up with the operations of the police in a case specified.
Answer.—Directly opposed to established fact. Chap. IV.

No. 4.—"Indecorum."
Answer.—Untrue. Chap. IV.

No. 5.—Causing public scandal and discontent.
Answer.—Utterly without foundation. Chap. IV.

No. 6.—Concealing my acts and intentions "as much as possible," and "as a rule."
Answer.—Utterly untrue. Action on *one* actual occasion, without previous concurrence, is the only foundation for the charge. Chap. V.

No. 7.—Writing short private notes, instead of formal official reports.
Answer.—This was by Mr. Halliday's special order, which he has concealed. Chap V.

No. 8.—Lending myself to a reckless thirst of blood; cruelty, and unthinking hatred.
Answer.—Too absurd to require formal refutation. *See* Evidence, "*passim.*"

No. 9.

No. 9.—Unthinking hatred, cruelty, &c.
Answer.—Ditto, ditto.

No. 10.—"Confounding the innocent with the guilty."
Answer.—This must be a mistake; and have referred to Mr. Halliday, who "upheld" the Wahabee fanatics, and dishonoured my loyal co-operators, both of whom have been decorated by Her Majesty.

No. 11.—"No danger at Patna, except what was caused by my unwise and violent measures."
Answer.—Totally disproved by universal evidence, and the recorded decision of the Court of Directors.

No. 12.—Convicting and sentencing one Waris Ali, who was innocent.
Answer.—Untrue; W. Ali was a traitor, arrested "*flagrante delicto.*" Chap. IX.

No. 13.—Issuing the order for the withdrawal of the Christians "under a panic."
Answer.—Altogether untrue, as decided by the Court of Directors. Chap. VII.

No. 14.—Writing "reiterated and urgent orders to Major Eyre not to advance to relief of Arrah."
Answer.—Proved that I never wrote to Major Eyre at all. Chap. VII.

No. 15.—Interfering with the military authorities.
Answer.—Distinctly disproved. Chap. VII.

No. 16.—Guilty of "quibble."
Answer.—Rejected as false by Court of Directors. Chap. VII.

No. 17.—Showing great want of calmness and firmness.
Answer.—Directly opposed to the whole mass of evidence on record. Chap. VII.

No. 18.—Issuing an order quite beyond my power as Commissioner.
Answer.—Proved that in the matter referred to I issued no order at all. Chap. VII.

No. 19.—Arresting "innocent and inoffensive" men against whom there was no cause of suspicion.
Answer.—The Wahabee fanatics. Chap. X.

No. 20.—Putting myself into the power of traitorous hypocrites, who, for their own purpose, persuaded me to arrest the "innocent Wahabees."
Answer.—These traitorous hypocrites were Dewan Moula Buksh, and Wilayut Ali Khan.

Both of these men have since been decorated by Her Majesty; the one with the Star of India, the other, Wilayut Ali Khan, with the Order of the Indian Empire.

The latter was privately introduced to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in India, graciously received, and congratulated on his services.

The list of Mr. Halliday's acts of oppression and cruelty will be found in Chapter XV.

And now, in conclusion, I would venture to quote the words of the late Lord Dundonald, which exactly expresses my feelings.

"It has been said that truth comes sooner or later, but it seldom comes "before the mind, passing from agony to contempt, has grown callous to man's "judgment.

"To this principle, I am thankful to say, I have never subscribed, but have 'to this hour remained firm in the hope and confidence that, by the mercy of "God, I shall not die till full and ample justice of my fellow men has been "freely rendered me.

"It may be thought that, after the restoration of rank and honour by my "late and present Sovereigns, after promotion to the command of a fleet, when "I had no enemy to confront, and after the enjoyment of the sympathy and "friendship of those whom the nation delight to honour, I might safely pass "over that day of deep humiliation; not so. It is true that I have received "those marks of my Sovereign's favour, and it is true that from that day to the "present I have enjoyed the uninterrupted friendship of those who were then con-"vinced of my innocence; but that unjust public sentence has never been pub-"licly reversed, and the equally unjust fine inflicted upon me remitted, so that if "I would, it is not in my power to remain silent and be just to my posterity."

These eloquent and pathetic sentiments I venture, from my heart, to re-echo.

Though I cannot, like Lord Dundonald, *yet* refer to rank restored, or honours vouchsafed, by Majesty, I *can* say that I have been encouraged by the gradual verification of my views, and the unanswerable vindication of acts which were scouted and condemned by Government in 1857. I have been sustained by the recorded approval of my general administration during the awful crisis of the mutiny, by the Court of Directors in 1858, and gratified by the flattering encomium passed upon my proceedings 10 years afterwards, by the late Secretary of State, Sir Stafford Northcote.

My heart has been warmed by the support and sympathy of my friends, by the written approval of a large body of distinguished statesmen, the verdict of History and the Press both in India and England, and the gratitude of not a few who consider that they owed their lives to my measures.

And I may truly say that I feel a just pride in the encouragement given me by the memorial presented to Lord Beaconsfield by 58 Members of Parliament on both sides of the House, and the petition presented to the House, and to the leader of the Commons, by 174 noblemen and gentlemen interested in India.

In addition to these grounds of satisfaction, it is also a pleasing reflection that the late Viceroy, Lord Northbrook, thought me worthy of being consulted, after Lord Mayo's assassination, on the question of Wahabee fanaticism, and that the measures which I ventured on that occasion to suggest, were adopted by his Lordship, on his arrival in India, and were held by him to have been of service in securing the safety of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales on the occasion of his visit to India.

All this I can truly say, but yet must add in the words of the noble Lord, "That unjust public condemnation has never been publicly reversed, nor the "equally unjust fine inflicted upon me remitted."

I now lay my case before my countrymen in Parliament, strong in the consciousness of a good cause, unshaken in my reliance on British honour, and firm in the belief that no technical formalities or official etiquette will deprive me of justice.

And here I am tempted to quote the words of Lord William Bentinck, when suffering from injustice, as I am: "I have been severely injured in my character "and feelings; for these injuries I ask for reparation, if, indeed, any reparation "can atone for feelings so deeply aggrieved, and a character so unjustly com- "promised in the eyes of the world. In complying with my demands you will "discharge, if I may venture to say so, what is due no less to your own honour "than to mine."

(signed) *William Tayler,*
Late Commissioner of Patna.

CHAPTER XV.

My Second Suspension.

I HAVE now, though I fear with some prolixity, discussed the several subjects contained in the formidable indictment which Sir F. Halliday has placed on record, and venture to hope that I have not only satisfactorily refuted the numerous charges brought against me therein, but vindicated also the character of my views and measures by evidence which is unanswerable.

I now approach a subject which, though only collaterally connected with the actual question of my administration, it is still necessary to dispose of, especially as it comprises incidents which have formed the subjects of censure by the Secretary of State, acting at the time on partial information and inaccurate statements.

Before

Before, however, the reader can form any accurate judgment on the matter it is indispensable that he should understand and realise my exact position in regard to Mr. Halliday.

This I will now briefly describe.

First, then, on *grounds which have since been shown to be utterly fallacious*, without giving me the opportunity of defence or explanation, Mr. Halliday summarily thrust me out of my high appointment as Commissioner of Patna, thus dishonouring me before the province and the public.

Secondly, after this summary and ignominious treatment, Mr. Halliday placed on record a catalogue of sins and misdemeanours, some serious, some trivial, and others inexpressibly frivolous, each and all of which have been proved to be either without foundation, or so insignificant as to be unworthy of notice.

Thirdly, Mr. Halliday publicly declared that my measures, since proved indisputably to have been successful to the last degree, and a ground of congratulation and eulogy from all quarters, had been a " cause of public " scandal and discontent."

Fourthly, in the midst of all my heavy and anxious responsibilities, Mr. Halliday had received and used to my prejudice, a *secret* Despatch written by an irresponsible individual of notoriously evil character, connected by the most scandalous and indecent ties, with the Mahomedans, especially the Wahabees, one of which treasonous sect was the principal lady of his seraglio, a document which, though he used and quoted it to my prejudice, he never showed to me.

Fifthly, Mr. Halliday had endorsed and officially approved a scandalous letter written for my vilification by Mr. Samuells, the officer whom he had deputed to succeed me, a letter filled with virulent abuse and personal invective.

Sixthly, Mr. Halliday actually had this letter printed, published, and circulated throughout Bengal, while he refused to give similar publicity to my reply, in which I refuted every imputation cast upon me.

Seventhly, Mr. Halliday had publicly endorsed and circulated the extraordinary dictum that the Wahabee fanatics, whom I had placed under precautionary arrest, and the principal of whom has since been convicted of deadly treason, and sentenced to imprisonment for life, were " innocent " and inoffensive men, against whom there was no cause of suspicion;" thus by implication charging me with causeless and unjustifiable oppression.

Eighthly, Mr. Halliday in the same way endorsed and circulated dishonouring disparagement against two loyal Mahomedans of the highest respectability, who had co-operated with me, and both of whom thus disparaged and dishonoured, have since been publicly honoured by the Supreme Government, one with the Star of India, the other with the order of the Indian Empire.

Ninthly, Mr. Halliday, seven months after Lord Canning had declared that there was nothing to prevent my re-employment in high office, having intermediately kept me on starving allowance for seven months, selected an office 600 miles from Patna, in a most unhealthy station, and sent me there at the beginning of the hot weather, and, in spite of a medical certificate, refused to transfer me, or grant me private leave of absence.

Tenthly, Mr. Halliday had sent to the Court of Directors a list of charges against me, which I had never seen or heard of, and could not therefore explain in my memorial, a procedure which compelled me to submit a second memorial containing the necessary explanations.

Eleventhly, Mr. Halliday actually adopted the cruel and unjustifiable course of withholding this memorial for several months, without any intimation or hint to me, thus causing me serious prejudice with the Court of Directors, and enabling him to obtain support and advocacy in England, and prejudice the Court of Directors and Secretary of State against me.

Twelfthly, the Despatch of the Court of Directors when it reached Calcutta, contained high approval and eulogy of my general administration, and absolved me from all the important accusations recorded against me by Mr. Halliday, but disapproved of my proceedings in certain minor matters. Mr. Halliday on the receipt of this Despatch, published the *unfavourable* paragraphs and suppressed the favourable.

Such, then, was my position, such the measures levelled at me, the severity and unfairness of which I feel sure will be condemned by all honourable men.

It was at this crisis that I was said to have perpetrated a new crime, and the last deadly blow was struck, which, but for God's merciful support in my independent exertions, would have consigned me to poverty and ruin.

The details of my new offence I will now give.

On discovering that Mr. Halliday had sent charges to the Court of Directors, which I had no opportunity of refuting, I had forwarded through him a second memorial, in the course of which I submitted, as I believed, and still believe, I was fully entitled to do, to our mutual superiors, that he had made a misrepresentation. This I did in grave and decorous language, to which I never dreamed any objection could be made.

Believing that this memorial would be at once forwarded, I remained quiescent; but several months afterwards it quite accidentally came to my notice that Mr. Halliday had actually, without giving me hint or notice, detained my memorials, the *immediate* presentation of which was of the utmost importance to me, while the interval was employed by him in strengthening his own case, and poisoning the minds of the authorities in England; this fact was only accidentally discovered, and how much longer the memorial would have been delayed, who can say? every day lost was injury to me.

And the plea or pretext given for this unprecedented, unfair, procedure was, that in making use of the word misrepresentation referred to I had been guilty of "insolence."

Directly I discovered this, I submitted an earnest protest to the Supreme Government, and in it explained fully and respectfully the circumstances under which I had made the statement.

This explanation, to my astonishment, was arbitrarily set down as an additional offence.

My next sin was in this wise.

I have already stated that the first Despatch received from the Court of Directors contained high and gratifying praise and approbation of all my measures in all important points, and that Mr. Halliday had published the *unfavourable* portion of this Despatch, and *withheld* the favourable portion.

Indignant at this mean and cruel proceeding, especially after Mr. Halliday had published and circulated the scurrilous abuse of me recorded by Mr. Samuells, I at once protested to the Supreme Government, who, doubtless themselves indignant at the unworthy stratagem, directed the whole Despatch to be forwarded to me, and gave me express permission (a most unusual concession) to "*publish the whole in any way I chose.*"

Acting on this special permission, obviously given for the purpose of counteracting the unfair advantage taken by Mr. Halliday, I at once forwarded the Despatch to the "Englishman" newspaper; but, as many months had elapsed, and it was unavoidable that my friends and the public should have forgotten the particular points on which I had been arraigned by Mr. Halliday, and acquitted by the Honourable Court, I divided the subject *into portions*, and added explanatory notes, necessary to the due apprecition of the subject. These letters were written and dispatched from Mymensingh, where I was then officiating as Judge.

Four letters within the dates of 29th December and 24th January had appeared; they had been written under the sincere conviction that I was scrupulously acting under the authority, and with the sanction, of the Supreme Government, when, suddenly, to my utter bewilderment, I received a letter denouncing both my letter of explanation, already quoted, as well as these letters thus published, as "intolerably offensive," and actually authorising, for this alleged offence, my second suspension from office; thus again depriving me of 250*l.* per month (after I had already been mulcted of at least 2,500 *l.*).

And now, nearly 20 years after the date of these occurrences, during which every

every incident and event has been subjected to searching investigation, I would wish to submit to the calm and impassioned judgment, not only of the authorities, who are responsible to God and their country for the administration of justice, but to every Englishman of honourable feeling, to say whether the facts, as now conscientiously and truthfully set forth, and which rest on unquestionable evidence, do not present a picture of unprecedented official tyranny.

Driven from a high appointment at a great national crisis, in which my position, as described by the Court of Directors, was "the most difficult of all "the officers in the Lower Provinces"—dishonoured, loaded with unjust and unfounded charges—my whole administration publicly condemned as a "scandal"; traitors, whom I had arrested, upheld and honoured; loyal men, who aided me, dishonoured and disgraced; falsely accused of panic, interference with military authority; scurrilous personal abuse, recorded by my successors against me, published and circulated by the Lieutenant Governor; my defence rejected; secret accusations to my prejudice, from irresponsible parties, encouraged and acted upon; my memorial to the Home authorities *delayed* for months, on a frivolous and unreasonable pretext; the favourable portion of the Directors' Despatch dishonestly *withheld*, while the unfavourable is published; a heavy and ruinous fine of 2,500 *l.* taken from me; and, when re-employment was unavoidable, separated from my family, and banished to an unhealthy district 600 miles from Patna; nothing omitted which ingenuity, malice, and revenge could devise to crush and ruin me.

And when thus suffering all that malice could suggest and autocratic power render possible, *because*, in appealing to our mutual superiors, I ventured to complain that my persecutor had made a misstatement, and been guilty of a "deviation from truth," and because, in publishing under the direct permission of the Supreme Government the Despatch which had been unfairly withheld by Mr. Halliday, some of my expressions are arbitrarily pronounced "offensive," I was again disgraced by public removal from all official employ, again subjected to heavy and ruinous fine; and even when I fulfilled the condition on which the Supreme Government made my suspension depend I was refused re-employment by Mr. Halliday, and thus kept for an unknown and indefinite time in poverty, humiliation, and disgrace. And during the whole period of this persistent persecution, myself conscious that in every point in which my acts, my judgment, and my views were condemned by Mr. Halliday, I was right, and he egregiously, dangerously, wrong; conscious that under appalling difficulties, with the lives of my own wife and children, and all Christians in the province in my keeping, and the safety of India more or less dependent on that of the province committed to my charge, I had been permitted by an overruling Providence to discern the truth; to know evil from good; to act, where action was urgently required; to inspire all (but an insignificant clique of three or four personal enemies) with confidence in my measures, and finally to save Patna.

That I was not crushed by this unsparing persecution; that I am enabled at the present day to vindicate my honour and my name; that I am able to point to the accumulated evidence of a perfect galaxy of high and eminent statesmen, and the impartial verdicts of two eminent historians in support of my character and conduct; that I still live to ask in my own person for justice and compensation, is owing to the unmerited and almost unhoped-for mercy of Almighty God.

The following chapter will give the further particulars.

CHAPTER XVI.

MINUTES of Lord *Stanley's* and Sir *Charles Wood.*

It now remains for me to offer some remarks on the two Minutes recorded by Lord Stanley and Sir Charles Wood on the 1st of June and 28th July respectively.

The second, and shorter of the documents, both of which Sir Frederick

Halliday has reproduced in his statement, refers exclusively to the "Industrial "Institution," a subject which I have treated at length in my chapter on that question.

Before I enter into this explanation, however, I must remove the impression which may, perhaps, be caused by the remark of the Secretary of State, that "Mr. Tayler has declined to avail himself of the permission accorded to him "to address the Home Government on the subject of the Lieutenant Governor's "decision in the matter of the Industrial Institution."

As this remark may possibly be interpreted as indicating an apprehension that I had no defence to offer, or that I was unable to meet or refute Mr. Halliday's statements, I think it advisable to insert here the copy of a letter addressed by me to Mr. Beadon at the time, which will explain the cause of my silence.

The real fact was, that having been severely punished for venturing to accuse Mr. Halliday of "misrepresentation," and my apology and explanation honestly submitted in mitigation of the word used having been arbitrarily pronounced to be an "aggravation" of the offence, and then I myself having been ruthlessly driven from office solely on the grounds of the above expression and of certain others used in letters written under the express authority of Government, for the purpose of giving publicity to passages in the Despatch of the Court of Directors which had been unfairly withheld by Mr. Halliday, I felt no inclination to incur the further displeasure of authorities who misinterpreted my intentions, and thus subject myself unwittingly to still harsher penalties. I therefore declined to submit any further defence on a charge which I had already refuted, and which, if I had fully discussed it, must have again convicted Mr. Halliday of something more than "misrepresentation," and be added to the catalogue of my sins.

The following is the letter referred to:—

From *W. Tayler*, Esq., to *A. R. Young*, Esq.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your office docket, No. 1259, of the 26th ultimo, forwarding copy of a letter from Mr. Secretary Beadon, granting permission to me to submit a memorial to the Secretary of State against the decision of the Lieutenant Governor in the matter of the 'Industrial Institution.'

"After careful consideration of the subject, and anxious as I am to submit a memorial in vindication of my character from aspersions which I believe to be unmerited, I yet feel that I cannot safely avail myself of the permission vouchsafed by his Excellency in Council.

"On the 26th of January last I was suspended from office, and was informed that I should not be re-employed until I assured the Lieutenant Governor that I 'would, in future, conduct myself with proper respect and subordination to Government.'

"This assurance I promptly gave, and at the same time asked permission to make some remarks on the letter of the Supreme Government. But the mere soliciting this permission has been held by Mr. Halliday as a fresh offence and made the ground of further and prolonged penalty—a penalty 'which is reducing myself and family to penury and distress.'

"While, therefore, I feel it to be of the utmost importance that I should disprove the statements recorded by the Lieutenant Governor in the Minute of the 22nd March, I feel that I cannot do so without running the risk of entailing on myself further suffering and ruin.

"I request that a copy of this letter may be forwarded to the Supreme Government, for submission to the Honourable the Secretary of State in Council, merely adding that I respectfully and earnestly protest against the imputations recorded against me."

I will only here repeat, that with the general conclusions formed by Sir Charles Wood in regard to the subscriptions for the Industrial Institution, I have no cause to be dissatisfied.

I have, as will be perceived from first to last, admitted the exercise of all my official "influence" to induce the wealthy landowners to subscribe to the great and useful scheme which I projected, and did so with the *open*, *hearty*, and *recorded approbation* of Mr. Halliday.

As to the two petty and contemptible charges referred to of concealment of letters, the refutation of this miserable accusation I have given elsewhere.

How Mr. Halliday could have ever consented to place them on record I cannot conceive.

Had

Had Sir C. Wood examined the facts he would at once have recognised the *absurdity of the* accusation. This Minute I see now for the first time!

Lord Stanley's Minute of the 1st of June 1858 refers entirely to the circumstances which I have detailed at length in my chapter on my "second suspension."

It is, I confess, with deep mortification that I peruse the remarks which it contains.

Such a concurrence in the proceedings taken against me after all my sufferings, and on such strangely insufficient grounds, would indeed be perfectly unintelligible, did I not clearly perceive that the real facts had been obviously withheld from his Lordship's notice, and when Mr. Halliday's established practice of concealing papers essential to the impartial decision of questions under inquiry; of withholding from the person principally concerned such documents as his elaborate Minute of the 18th March 1858, which (with the exception of a few paragraphs regarding the Industrial Institution) *I now see for the first time*; of suppressing a portion of documents which it did not suit him to make known, and, as in the present instance, detaining a memorial addressed to a mutual superior, without having the common fairness to inform me, the memorialist, on the mere plea of a disrespectful expression; when I consider all these peculiarities, I am relieved from much of the pain occasioned by a decision which I feel convinced was formed in the absence of important facts.

In this conclusion I am the more confirmed when I look back on the circumstances which I have before described in connection with the detention of my second memorial to the Court of Directors. That secret and unwarrantable detention, accidentally discovered by some one in the secrets of the office, was evidently a manœuvre to afford Mr. Halliday time to influence his friends at home in the Court of Directors, and thus to secure their advocacy and support when the case should come before the Secretary of State.

It is no discredit to a nobleman like Lord Stanley, whose ability and honourable character are undoubted, to be, to some extent at least, influenced by the officers of his department in regard to a matter with which they were better acquainted than himself, and which, in fact, formed only the sequel to a controversy with which they had been familiar. That such influence was exercised, and not illegitimately, by some members of the Court, I am well aware, and that the decision of Lord Stanley was to a great extent affected thereby, appears obvious from the fact that little or no consideration seems to have been paid to my explanations and arguments on the point at issue.

The acceptance, without examination, of Mr. Halliday's charge against me, of "imputing unworthy motives to all who, in the discharge of a public duty, felt "themselves called upon to express an opinion in any way adverse to Mr. Tayler's "proceedings," corroborates my conclusions, inasmuch as the number of those who opposed themselves to me was so exceedingly small, and the opposition they offered of such a character, that it could not, under the most favourable view, be regarded as offered in the discharge of their duty; while at the same time the whole body of the residents of every denomination were warm and enthusiastic in my support.

I have the less scruple in offering these criticisms, as I am aware, from Lord Derby's own statement, that no one is more painfully alive than himself to the fallibility of official decisions, and that if he were once convinced that he had been betrayed into an unjust decision, no false shame and no length of time would prevent his acknowledging his error, and endeavouring to do justice.

If Lord Stanley had been aware of the true character of the grievance of which I complained, and the real history of the cruel and unpardonable accusation made by Mr. Halliday in 1857 (and now reproduced in his present statement) of wilful disobedience to a positive order, the full exposure of which is to be found in Chapter IV., I feel very sure that his decision would have been different.

POSTSCRIPT.

AFTER I had completed the above refutation, and had the several Chapters copied, I accidentally made a discovery which has so close and important a connection with the whole case, and especially the separate accusations recorded against me by Sir Frederick Halliday, that it became indispensable, with a view to the full comprehension of the controversy, to make some supplementary remarks, to which I would solicit special consideration.

I have already pointed out that in my memorial presented in 1868 to the Secretary of State in Council, when defending myself from the unfair and groundless charge of "concealing as much as possible my acts and intentions," I represented that Mr. Halliday had published a separate and special Blue Book, entitled "Correspondence connected with the Removal of Mr. William "Tayler from the Commissionership of Patna."

The obvious purpose of this separate publication was to support and substantiate his charges, and especially those which referred to the character and extent of my communications, his complaint, as shown, being not only that I had "concealed my acts and intentions," but that I had written short private and unsatisfactory letters, instead of formal and regular reports, which it was my duty to submit.

Now this, as I have before observed, was a grave and serious charge, and when Mr. Halliday recorded it, and adopted the unusual course of honouring me with a special Blue Book, printed at the public expense, it was at least incumbent on him to reproduce *all* the correspondence which had passed between us and any third parties, and especially all that were directly or indirectly connected with the several subjects under discussion.

Common fairness and honesty would demand this at least, and also if by chance any of the letters had been lost or mislaid, that the subject referred to, if important in its bearing on the question, should be mentioned.

To judge how far this was the case, however, I must point out that the most essential letters, *i.e.*, those which contained Mr. Halliday's direct instructions for my guidance in regard to our correspondence, have all, as I showed in my memorial of 1868, been omitted, and the orders consequent on them altogether passed over in silence, though manifestly calculated to show the injustice of the accusation. This memorial, as is now admitted by the Secretary of State, is missing from the India Office, but, through the consideration of Lord Cranbrook, has been reprinted by order of Parliament, and is therefore available to Members and the public; while the pamphlet of letters, which formed an Appendix to the memorial, and contained copies of all my letters which were in Mr. Halliday's special Blue Book, has been reprinted, with this refutation.

But unfair and cruel as was the suppression of all the letters, private and public, between the middle of May and the 14th June (which is the date of the first letter of mine printed in the book) the discovery just unexpectedly made exhibits a painful aggravation of the injustice.

Although Mr. Halliday had omitted or suppressed the letters between the dates referred to, on the plea that they were private (a poor excuse under the circumstances), I could never imagine that he had withheld any public or strictly official communications, especially if they bore closely on one of the subjects introduced, so that I had never till a few days ago thought of examining the regular Blue Book of the period.

In doing this, however, to my supreme astonishment, I perceive that many letters of great or lesser length, all of them important as disproving the charge of reticence or concealment in general, and many specially so, as bearing directly on the several accusations brought against me, though necessarily published in the ordinary Blue Book, *have been withheld from the special volume which would naturally be consulted in the consideration of my case.*

Subjoined is a list of all the letters referred to, and it will, if I am not mistaken, strike all who read this with some astonishment when they find that almost all of them have direct bearing on different points brought forward to my disparagement.

It

It will not be necessary to give the contents of all these letters, but the fact of their omission is important, as every additional letter tends to invalidate the groundless charge of "concealment, as a rule," or "as much as possible."

List of Letters omitted from the Special Blue Book published by Mr. *Halliday* in 1857, entitled "Correspondence connected with the Removal of Mr. *William Tayler* from the Commissionership of Patna."

	Blue Book (Appendix B.)
9 July - -	Letter to Government, enclosing petition, presented by the inhabitants of Sassaram, with reply from Government.
13 July - -	Reporting bestowal of 300 rupees to one Sheikh-Syvd-ood-deen for gallantry during the *émeute* in the town of Patna, with reply from Government approving the reward, and sanctioning promotion.
14 July - -	Recommending the appointment of an English Deputy Magistrate at Buxar.
14 July - -	Reporting formation of a body of Sowars, and requesting authority for constructing stables, with Government reply approving and sanctioning.
15 July - -	Forwarding copies of correspondence between myself and the Magistrate regarding his Nazir.
23 July - -	Reply of Government to the above.
15 July - -	Forwarding copy of letter addressed to Magistrate of Patna.
15 July - -	Sending Government a report from Magistrate regarding the demeanour and remarks of the prisoners executed on conviction of rebellion.
15 July - -	Long and important report regarding extra Police.
21 July - -	Reply of Government.
19 July - -	Intimating arrest of Waris Ali by Mr. Robertson.
25 July - -	Regarding Lootf Ali Khan and the false charge against Wilayut Ali Khan.
25 July - -	Containing sanction of Government to the entertaining, as recommended, of 25 extra Sowars.
23 July - -	Report regarding Captain Rattray's Sowar, with the judgment enclosed.
29 July - -	Letter from Government calling for the record of the trial.
29 July - -	Forwarding to Government three enclosures.
30 July - -	Reporting to Government the attack made by the 12th Irregulars on the houses of Mr. Lynch and Mr. M'Donell.
16 July - -	Forwarding to Government further translation of two letters found among Peer Ali's correspondence.
16 July - -	Forwarding to Government copy of letter from the Magistrate of Patna.
15 July - -	Letters from Magistrate regarding his Nazir (important).
14 July - -	From Magistrate, forwarding letter from his assistant regarding demeanour of four criminals during execution.
18 July - -	Letter from Magistrate, informing Government that I had undertaken the raising of a body of Sowars.
11 July - -	Long and important report to Government regarding the raising of extra Police.

	BLUE BOOK (APPENDIX A.)
30 June - -	Long report to Government regarding arrangement for Rattray's troopers, with reply. *N.B.*—This has been copied as a specimen of letters omitted.
15 May - -	Forwarding letter from Major Nation for consideration and orders regarding muskets of the police.
13 June - -	Reporting bestowal of reward on three sepoys of the Patna police for an act of fidelity.
22 June - -	Conveying the "high approval" of the Lieutenant Governor.
14 June - -	Forwarding long letter and enclosures from the Maharajah of Bettiah, expressive of loyalty, and enclosing correspondence between Major Holmes and his confidential manager, Syyd-Nujeem-ood-deen.
24 June - -	From Government, informing me that thanks have been returned to the Maharajah.
13 June - -	Soliciting instructions regarding a Nujeeb guilty of treachery.
17 June - -	From Government, appointing me and the Magistrate to try cases under Act XIV. of 1857, and to try Nujeeb at once.
13 June - -	Forwarding copy of instructions to the several Police Magistrates regarding extra police.
20 June - -	Conveying the approval of Government.
11 July - -	Forwarding copy of letter from Captain Rattray, recommending his proposal.
3 July - -	Forwarding long and important correspondence with the Magistrate of Patna, containing 15 letters.
8 July - -	Forwarding report from the Magistrate of Shahabad, with remarks and recommendations from myself regarding extra Sowars.
16 July - -	Reply from Government, giving sanction and approval to the propositions made.
22 June - -	Five letters containing correspondence with collector of Chuprah regarding his abandonment of the station. *N.B.*—Important; some copied.
3 July - -	Forwarding to Government a petition from the Rajah of Hutwa, expressing his loyalty, and placing his life at the disposal of Government.
8 July - -	Forwarding second letter from the Maharajah of Bettiah, and offering his services.
17 July - -	From Government, acknowledging receipt and expressing great satisfaction.
24 July - -	Informing, in reply to letter of 20th June, that I do not think it necessary at present that any other officers in my division should be empowered to hold trials under Act XVII. of 1857.
4 July - -	From Government directing narratives to be sent in future, instead of the reports called for in the Circular of the 23rd of May.

The above lists will give an idea of the number of letters which have been withheld from the special Blue Book.

The extreme unfairness of omitting all these, when the charge of "concealing as much as possible my acts and intentions," formed one of the principal charges against me, I leave to the judgment of my readers.

EAST INDIA (MR. WILLIAM TAYLER).

COPY of a MEMORIAL addressed to the Secretary of State for *India* by Mr. *William Tayler*, late Commissioner of *Patna*, being his REPLY to MINUTE of Sir *Frederick Halliday* on the st of the INDIAN MUTINY, 1857, presented liament at the close of Session 1878–9.

(*Sir Eardley Wilmot.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
18 *March* 1880.

[*Price* 9 *d.*]