M.R.O. 1—77,005—6-6-57.

(1) Number of pages 10

(2) Date of repair 12-6-61

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 302 Press / Mis.

38-39

Dated 25-6 1868.

6/7

38-39

Not to be folded or roughly handled

X
1

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
25th June 1868.

No. 38. Read the following letter from the Acting Under Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Financial Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Bombay Castle, 4th June 1868, No. 785.

In continuation of this office letter, No. 684, dated the 26th ultimo, I am directed to forward, for the information of the Government of Madras, the accompanying six copies of a letter addressed by this Government to the Government of India, No. 745, dated 1st instant, on the subject of the new Military Furlough Rules.

From the Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department; dated Bombay Castle, 1st June 1868, No. 745.

In continuation of my letter, No. 681, of 25th ultimo, on the subject of the proposed new Furlough Rules as respects the Civil Service, I have the honor to convey the opinion of this Government on the rules for the Military Service.

2. His Excellency in Council asked the opinions, severally, of three Officers—Colonel Marriott, the Secretary to Government in the Military Department, Colonel Kirby, the Adjutant General of the Army, and Major Chitty, Military Accountant and Secretary, Military Fund. Their opinions are appended.

3. His Excellency in Council, adverting to the 2nd to 7th paragraphs of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum, invites consideration of the incongruity of retaining any distinction of furlough or general leave founded on place of residence. The old grounds for such distinction being obsolete, it is open to all the objections shown by Colonel Marriott.

4. The three Officers above named alike notice the objections to the limitation of privilege leave to places east of the Meridian of the Cape of Good Hope. His Excellency in Council recommends that the rule be that privilege leave cannot be taken out of India without the permission of Government.

5. His Excellency in Council concurs with the representation in the 8th paragraph of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum, and recommends that, in case of sick leave being taken by an Officer whilst on privilege leave, the rule should be, as in the Civil Department, that the privilege leave is converted into general leave.

6. With reference to paragraphs 9 to 11 of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum, I am desired to observe that, in discussing the Civil rules, His Excellency in Council has already expressed an opinion in favor of one year after seven, and shorter intervals between furloughs. The proposal to grant furloughs in proportion to the quantity of service, instead of after fixed periods, would, if adopted, undoubtedly clear away many of the difficulties and inconsistencies which arise out of the system now in force. But it may, perhaps, not be deemed expedient, at this stage of the discussion, to introduce a new principle which would involve reconsideration of the whole scheme. In that case, it might be well to allow, in the Military Service, special leave, analogous to that sanctioned for the Civil Service, and thus obviate the inconvenience noted by Colonel Marriott as attending the absolute limitation of intervals.

7. Paragraphs 12 to 15 of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum are in entire accordance with the opinions already expressed in my letter touching the Civil Rules.

8. His Excellency in Council recommends the addition of five years in 35 to the scale of proportions of service which count for pension.

9. I am to invite attention to the 19th paragraph of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum on the subject of the objection taken by the Secretary of State to an Officer on the Effective List ceasing to draw full pay.

10. I am desired to draw attention to the 21st and following paragraphs of Colonel Marriott's Memorandum in reference to the personal benefits of passage money and income allowance hitherto enjoyed under certain circumstances by Captains and Subalterns; to Colonel Kirby's notice of the case of a Subaltern Officer requiring one year's leave on medical certificate, and compelled by Rule XIV to take it on private affairs, and thus receiving only £250 to pay his

passage home and out and his residence in Europe for ten months; and to Major Chitty's objection to Rule XIV. His Excellency in Council thinks that Rule XIV, by which an Officer leaving India for his health is compelled to proceed on ordinary furlough, if such be due to him, is a very necessary rule. The abandonment of it would give an undue advantage to those who should take their leave in the first part of their service on medical certificate These would still have all their ordinary furlough due to them; and the temptation to an unconscientious use of medical certificates, so happily excluded in great measure by the new rules, would be retained. But, undoubtedly, the rule, as shown by Colonel Kirby, is liable to press hardly in particular cases. if accompanied by a withdrawal of all assistance in the shape of passage money or free passage. Therefore, whilst the income allowances must of course be given up, His Excellency in Council would suggest that every Officer should be allowed a free passage home and back, once in his service, provided the boon be claimed whilst in the rank of Subaltern or Captain. The establishment of Government troop ships favors this, by providing for it, in a large number of cases, without appreciable cost to the State.

11. The mode of calculating service in India under Rule IX requires to be clearly defined, as noted by Colonel Kirby, and as previously noted by the Secretary of State.

12. His Excellency in Council draws attention to Colonel Kirby's observation regarding the probable effect of the new rules in adding a further discouragement to retirement of old Officers. The remark is noteworthy; but the inconvenience is one to be met by other measures than any modification of the furlough regulations, and does not require further immediate notice.

MEMORANDUM.

The proposed Rules begin with a broad distinction as to place which appears to me objectionable in principle.

Rule IV says :—

Leave of absence will in future be of three kinds—

I. Furlough in or out of India.

II. General leave on private affairs or sick certificate in India.

III. Privilege leave.

Privilege leave is really of a separate character; but the only distinction of the first two classes is of place.

2. This distinction is not proposed for the Civil Service. The practical effect of it is as follows :—

Two Officers require a years' absence from duty on account of health. One goes to the Neilgherry Hills and the year counts as Indian service; it does not count as part of his due furlough nor as part of his maximum period of eight years on furlough; and he receives all the time his full military pay and the half staff pay of his office; and this leave, with all these advantages, can be extended to two years. The other goes to Europe: the time does not count as Indian service; it does count as part of any due furlough, and counts as part of the maximum period of eight years; and he receives less pay than the other by the half of his military pay.

The Committee notice the matter very briefly and inconclusively. They say (paragraph 51) :— "These rules have worked satisfactorily; they tend greatly to the health and efficiency of the Officers of the Army and to the popularity of the Indian Service, whilst the authorities can at any time restrict their application as they may deem necessary." I question both the tendency to efficiency and the power of restriction.

3. I see no reason for maintaining this distinction of place. I see strong reason against it. No Leave Rules will be perfectly satisfactory except such as are conceived solely on the principle of first determining the quantities of absence from duty which it is right to grant and placing no restrictions thereon but such as are demonstrably needed for direct administrative ends. So long as the Rules make arbitrary distinctions, there will be dissatisfaction, however large the concessions; because an inconsistency has always an inequitable side, and even a boon if inconsistent is liable from the inequitable point of view to be converted into a grievance.

4. The statement of there being three kinds of leave of absence under the proposed rules is not quite accurate; because there is a fourth kind (see Rule XXVII) for short leave to sea on private affairs or sick certificate.

This rule is reasonable in general intention that an Officer may have leave for a short period without interfering with more considerable absences. But the distinction of place 'to sea' is objectionable. It arises out of the previous distinction of place above noted, whereby, if the leave were 'on land' in ndia, instead of being limited to three months, it could be extended on medical certificate to two years.

5. Curiously inconsistent with this distinction of 'in' and 'out' of India is the rule that furlough on private affairs for two years may be taken in India (Section XVII). I would not prohibit it; but the one distinction of place which is reasonable, if it were worth while to make it, is that a long leave of absence for two years is only granted because of the need of an entire change of climate and the great cost of the journey to and from Europe. No other Government, I suppose, would give its servants two years' leave at one time to live at their ease in the neighbourhood of their place of duty, still less in order to take arduous work under other Masters, as was actually the case in the only instances of furlough taken in India which I have known. Still I am not proposing any condition of place. I only use the existing rule as an *a fortiori* argument against the distinction between leave to the Neilgherry Hills or Simla or other such places in India and leave to Europe.

6. The foregoing observations seem concurrent with the Secretary of State's objection to the allowance of an indefinite amount of sick leave in India with retention of office. I think that the whole of Chapter II should be merged in Chapter I.

7. One of the Rules regarding privilege leave is open to the same objection. Rule XXXI restricts it to places eastward of the Meridian of the Cape of Good Hope. The restriction had a meaning when the Cape was the only route to England. The rule seems to me now more than unfit. It appears absurd. I trust this arbitrary rule may be abandoned. The cases in which an Officer desires to go to Europe on two months' leave are necessarily few. The two or three instances I call to mind were all for such reasons as it would have been cruelty to disallow. I remember a widowed Officer going home to make arrangements to settle his children; another taking home his wife who was dangerously ill; another, who had been separated from his family for years, used his privilege leave to rejoin them on the occasion of his daughter's marriage I am not choosing sentimental cases; for, excepting the case of an Officer who went to see the Paris Exhibition, I can recollect no other. Let the Rule be, as it was till lately, that privilege leave cannot be taken out of India without the permission of Government.

8. There is another point of principle touched by Rule XXVIII which allows of general leave in extension of privilege leave. It is true that it only allows it in cases of sickness or some other serious emergency which could not have been foreseen; but such conditions are almost inoperative. A man knows that he can get a sick certificate if he represent his case to a medical man, and he goes on privilege leave and sends a medical certificate at the end of the privilege leave. I have recent cases in mind in saying this. Beside other objections to any partial or exceptional conjunction of privilege leave with other leave, this rule is bad, because it offers specia' temptation to unconscientious action. The Rule should, I think, be, as in the Civil Department, that, if an Officer whilst on privilege leave is compelled to take general leave, the privilege leave is converted into general leave.

9. There is another point which touches principle, but less absolutely. The Rules prescribe two years' leave after eight of service, one after six more, &c., and require an interval of three years between two furloughs. If these points are to be precisely regulated at all, the rules appear unobjectionable (excepting that I believe seven years would be a preferable term to eight, an opinion which may go for what it is worth as a make-weight if many others happen to think the same); but my experience goes against making absolute rules for limiting intervals. Lest I be misunderstood, I premise that, of course, there must be a limit to quantity of leave in relation to

quantity of service, and that the amendment I advocate is to substitute the proportion of two years *in* first ten for two years *after* eight, three years *in* seventeen for two after eight and one after six more, and so on.

I believe it would be still better to make one proportion for all service, that is, that four in twenty-four or one-sixth may be passed on leave with half-pay and allowances, subject to the limit of absence during which office can be retained and the limit of total absence at one time.

10. If there be any absolute limit of intervals, it will happen again, as occasionally hitherto, that an Officer has really urgent need to go on leave, and yet wants but a very short time of the limit, and the Government has no power to let him go. I call to mind the case of an Officer whose six years since his last return from furlough would be completed on the 1st June. The steamer to England left on 27th May ; and private circumstances made delay to the next Steamer in June very disadvantageous to him. The Government had no power to give him leave four days earlier. They gave him leave from 1st June, and he went away without leave on 27th May I have known a medical consultation whether an Officer's wife could, with safety to her life, delay her departure a fortnight, because her husband wanted a few days of the limit since his last return from furlough. If an Officer may have two years after eight ; why should he not, under exceptional circumstances, have a shorter absence at an earlier date ?

11. A Government ought not to be so helplessly deprived of all discretion, that it cannot anticipate the regulated period however great the urgency. There should be, and there would naturally grow up, a recognized practice not ordinarily to give the first leave of absence before, say, seven years, or a second furlough until after an interval of, say, three years ; so that no one would expect an earlier grant without giving good assurance of really exceptional need. In short, there should be such a rule as would compel the applicant to prove an exceptional case, but not such an absolute rule as hitherto, and as intended by the new Regulations.

I now turn to points of detail.

12. I think that the amendment made by the Government of India and the Secretary of State on Rule VII is very good, *i. e.*, that two years should be the maximum time of absence during which an office can be retained, whether on leave on private affairs or on medical certificate.

13. The Secretary of State objects to the long period of five years for which, under Rule III, by repeated medical certificates, an Officer may remain continuously absent on furlough. I certainly think that three years would be a sufficient limit.

14. So large a maximum period of leave being allowed, and so much of 'officiating' tenure being inevitable throughout the Service, I think it important to prevent men retaining their offices for two years after, to all other intents, they have resigned them. Under the proposed rules it is inevitable that this should become common. It cannot be prohibited directly. It is so easy for a man going home to persuade himself that perhaps he will return, that no certificate or declaration of purpose would be effective ; but it would be checked by limiting the aggregate period of retention of office during absence on furlough. I think five years would be a liberal allowance, and that Rule XVI should be altered to a maximum of eight years with retention of pay, and five with retention of office.

15. With apology for offering an opinion in opposition to the deliberate judgment of the Government of India, I must add that my sense of the operation of acting tenures is, on the whole, very different from that expressed in the 5th paragraph of the Government of India's despatch. My experience seems to tell me that the case supposed by the Government of India of desire to remove a man because of his unfitness for the office to which he has been appointed is rare. Defective ability is, of course, common enough ; but such great mistake in selection as makes an effective desire to remove a man, is rare ; whereas a diminished weight in opinion and action attending an acting tenure, and a consequently diminished sense of responsibility, are, I think, not rare.

16. Supposing the leave in India (which counts for pension) to be given up, and all such leave, as well as short leaves to sea, to be merged in the general furlough rules, I think that it

extend the period of leave which counts for pension to five years. At

2 in 20
3 in 25
4 in 30

tionable to add 5 in 35
re intended to show that the Rules are open to objection in principle.
distinction of place.
ite a limitation of periods of time before and between furloughs.
n any case privilege leave to be joined to sick leave.
o amendment in detail.
period for which an office can be retained during absence at any one
overnment of India and the Secretary of State.
he maximum period of absence at any one time, as suggested by the

necessary extension of acting tenure, by a limit to the aggregate period

he portion of leave which counts for pension in a service of 35 years

e several proposals would be, in brief, to limit the principal rules regard-
bsence to these.—That (privilege leave altogether excepted)—
pass more than a certain proportion of his service on leave of absence
est one-fourth as most nearly corresponding to the proposed maximum of

t be absent for more than a certain period at one time under any
ears have been suggested above)
t be allowed to be absent at one time for more than a certain period
. (Two years, as proposed by the Government of India, seems fit.)
t be allowed to be absent at one time for more than a certain period
ary pay. (The three years proposed by the Rules appear suitable.)
t, by successive absences, altogether retain his office during absence for
(I suggest five years as in remarks above.)
nadmissible under the foregoing rules, if granted on account of extraordi-
be without pay ; and the time of such leave will be excepted from all

shall count as service for pension only in a certain proportion to his
suggest the present rules with the addition of 5 years out of 35 for the

es would be needed ; but it would only encumber the discussion to intro-

of State offers an objection that no Officer of the Staff Corps on the Effec-
aw full pay. I do not apprehend why this should be so absolute that
e unable to rule that, under certain circumstances, leave, if taken at all,
y or on half pay. But I note that the second of the above abstract rules,
nce at one time correspond with the limit of pay during absence, meets
the case of extraordinary leave without pay (under Rule XI of the new
oregoing abstract rules).
ny observations on the Civil Rules ; but it may not be out of place to
n of proportion of leave to service instead of fixed periods, would allow
ween the Civil and Military Rules. For instance, the Rules propose a
sence for Civil Servants and six for Military. The proportion of one-
both. All the other abstract Rules given in paragraph 18 above seem to

of State points out that the principle laid down in the first portion of the
Officer entitled to ordinary furlough whose health may necessitate his

absence from India will be compelled to take leave as ordinary furlough) can only be made applicable to certain classes by the withdrawal of privileges which, according to present regulations, they claim on proceeding to England on medical certificate, such as passages at the public expense and certain allowances from the Military Funds.

In this Presidency, Subalterns going home on leave on medical certificate receive a free passage home from Government, passage money (£83) from the Military Fund to bring them out again, and an income allowance whilst in receipt of English pay at the rate of £21-7-6 per annum. A Captain going home on medical certificate receives Rupees 832-10-5 homeward passage money.

Supposing an Officer to have two years' leave, the contrast between what he would now receive on medical certificate and what he would receive by the new rules on private affairs is as follows :—

A Subaltern, if unemployed, would receive—

On medical certificate by present rules about £511*. — On private affairs under new Rules minimum allowance £500.

The Captain, if unemployed, would receive—

On medical certificate by present rules about £595†. — On private affairs under new Rules minimum allowance £500.

If the Subaltern held the office of Wing Subaltern (staff salary 100) he would receive—

On medical certificate by present rules £511 plus half staff pay for six months=£541. — On private affairs under new Rules minimum allowance £500.

If the Captain held the appointment of Junior Wing Officer (Staff salary 230) he would receive—

On medical certificate by present rules £595 plus half staff pay for six months = £664. — On private affairs by new Rules half staff pay for 24 months £724-18.

22. From the foregoing comparisons it would appear that, in the case supposed of an Officer compelled to go home by ill health who is entitled to an ordinary furlough, Subalterns would be likely to lose about £41 on the two years. A Captain might possibly lose £95 if unemployed; but, on the whole, would be more likely to gain than to lose.

23. Against the possible loss is to be set off not only the possible gain even in the particular case, but the great gain by the new rules on the whole in giving the same advantages on furlough on private affairs as on medical certificate, and the large benefits which will be received under the new Rules in the higher ranks and better paid offices.

24. Moreover, owing to the Officers who have joined the Indian Army since 1862 being excluded from the Military Fund and to the operation of the Rule quoted in the margin, there are very few Officers left who will ever be able to claim the special allowances. I do not see any reason why these Officers should not be left to make their option between the new Rules and the old, on the understanding that the new rules involve forfeiture of those special allowances when on leave on medical certificate.

Personal benefits, viz., passage money (homeward and outward), income allowance to subscribers on sick certificate, connot be claimed a second time, until the expiration of eight years reckoning from the renewal of Indian subscriptions; and in the case of a subscriber who shall have received these benefits before he has served eight years in India, he will not be entitled to a second indulgence until he shall have been (exclusive of first furlough) 16 years in India.

(Signed) W. F. MARRIOTT, Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

19*th May* 1868.

* 6 months' Indian pay £135 9
18 months, at 6-6 a day 178 2
Passage money home and out, say 166
Income allowance for 18 months 32 1
£511 12

† 6 months' Indian pay £224 9
18 months, at 10-6 a day 287 14
Passage money home 83
£596 3

Observations, &c., on proposed New Furlough Rules.

How will Rule IX apply to Officers who join the Staff Corps from Her Majesty's Army? Will the eight years commence from date of arrival in India, as does the service for pension?

Rule IX.

It wants clearness; the numbers to be affected will soon be many.

As I read it, if Rule XIV is enforced on those who do not accept these New Rules, vide Rule 33, it will bear hard on Subalterns: *e. g.*, a Subaltern of 10 years' service falls sick; he *must* go on "private affairs" for the first two years; but if a year recruits his health, is he, out of £250, to pay passage home and back? This would give £50 to live on! *Perhaps* he will receive, as now, his passage and Indian pay for six months.

Rule XIV.

I don't think many will advocate three years' continuous absence with retention of appointment.

Rule XV.

There are many situations continued absence from which would be a serious disqualification; for, to whatever extent the Public Service may have suffered under the acting man at the outset, the return of the incumbent would repeat this injury.

I do not appreciate the retention in these New Rules of XXXI. All geographical limit should be obliterated, or India proper from Cape Comorin to Peshawur be the limit.

Rule XXXI.

There can be no doubt whatever but that the effect of these rules will be that the majority of appointments will be held by *acting* men. Such *may not* be injurious to efficiency, but I fear that it will be so, because of the non-appreciation by many who act of their individual responsibility.

Unless under a close application of Rule VI there is hardly any limit to the quantity of leave obtainable *in* and *out* of India. Of course, the conditions as to residence for pension will operate as a check; but so long as men can obtain long periods *in* India without their being to their debit as furlough, many will be found to avail themselves of it.

Rule VI.

So far as these Rules go I have nothing more to say.

They are comprehensive and *most* liberal.

To speculate as to their working amongst the older Officers would now be useless. Those who have to apply them to the phases of service of the several applicants will be able to judge.

To me it appears that while these are Rules which have for their object "to draw Officers and make the Service popular," the framers have lost sight of the possibility that their very scope and liberality will not only *draw* but *retain*.

To a certain extent this is good, but, so far as I have mastered the *feeling* of the Staff Corps, retirement is now the exception.

I don't think these rules will do much to hasten such, and by their application we shall possibly have a perpetuation of that stagnation (if I may use the expression) now so oppressive.

(Signed) W. H. KIRBY, Colonel,
Adjutant General of the Army.

23*rd May* 1868.

Remarks on the proposed New Furlough Regulations.

These Rules provide for furlough being granted subject to the exigencies of the Service (except in the case of leave being taken on medical certificate), and are so liberal that there will no longer be the necessity, hitherto existing, for the majority of Officers abstaining from taking furlough on private affairs, and only going on leave when they could obtain a medical certificate.

I think, therefore, Rule XIV, compelling an Officer who obtains a medical certificate to take his furlough if he has one due, would bear very hard upon some, and as the aggregate amount of furlough with pay and retention of appointment is limited to eight years in the whole period of

service, the compulsory rule seems the less needful. It seems also inconsistent with the remarks of the Committee, if I correctly understand them, in paragraph 43, page 35—

"That the continuation to Military Officers of the immemorial privilege of regarding absence on sick certificate as in no way infringing on their rights to furlough is desirable not less on account of the nature of their profession than of the climatic changes to which they are exposed."

There is no doubt that the restrictions as to the places an Officer may resort to on leave have been considered a great hardship by all. This was set forth in the Report, dated 6th December 1867, of the Committee appointed by the Bombay Government (of which I was a member). The continuance, therefore, of the restriction as in Rule XXXI appears undesirable and unneccssary, because, on the promulgation of these rules, it is highly improbable that any Officer, except under the most extreme urgency, would proceed to England on privilege leave, incurring an expense of nearly £200 for passage money and for a stay there of fifteen days. Besides, the granting or withholding such leave rests entirely with the Government, and any abuse could be readily checked. It seems, therefore, undesirable to place a restriction which, however unjustly, is looked upon as a hardship, more especially when the removal of it would give satisfaction to the Army generally, and cause no inconvenience to the State.

I believe that when no such restriction existed (and there was tenfold the inducement then for Officers to avail themselves of the boon than would now exist) very few Officers indeed availed themselves of privilege leave to go to England, owing, doubtless, to the heavy expense.

This and the inability to get such leave extended without loss of the privilege, and the power of Government to refuse such leave, seems sufficient restrictions to prevent any inconvenience therefrom to the State.

There is little doubt that by the new rules every Officer obtaining furlough will gain, even though the privileges they now have of free passage homeward and outward in the case of Subalterns, and homeward in the case of Captains, should have to be given up when proceeding on medical certificate. I think, however, the amount that could be claimed on this account is so inappreciable that it might be a matter for consideration whether the liberality of these rules should in any way be marred by so small a consideration.

In the first place, fewer Officers will take leave on medical certificate, thereby reducing the claims to free passage or other allowances, whilst a larger number will proceed on private affairs, which gives no such claim.

Secondly, the Subscribers to the Military Fund who have any such claims are few, and their claims are fast dying out, either by promotion to superior grades or otherwise. Since 1861 there have been no new Subscribers admitted to the Bombay Military Fund, and of those who entered before that date many have received income allowance and passage money. Consequently, but few are likely to be in a position to claim such allowances again ; whilst personal benefits are not given to Field Officers. The advantages, therefore, to be given up are comparatively insignificant.

On the other hand, an Officer, particularly a Subaltern, falling suddenly ill, might be seriously embarrassed if this means of taking leave, necessary to restore him to health, were removed ; but, if it were, I would recommend the continuance of the privilege subscribers to the Fund now have of obtaining their passage money at all times, when proceeding upon medical certificate, on loan.

(Signed) W. T. CHITTY, Major.

Poona, 19*th May* 1868.

No. 39. ORDER THEREON, 25th June 1868, No. 302.
Communicated to the Military Department.
(True Extract.)

R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

To the Military Department.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

No 785 of 1868

Financial Department

Bombay Castle 4th June 1868

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No 684 dated the 26 Ultimo. I am directed to forward for the information of the Government of Madras the accompanying 6 copies of a letter addressed by this Government to the Government of India No 745 dated 1st Instant on the Subject of the new Military Furlough Rules.—

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

R S Saville
Actg Under Secretary to Govt

Rec'd 6th June 68 Nos 12-13

Financial 1868 Dept.

Forwarded

302

From
Under Secretary to Govt
of Bombay Financial Dept
No 785-

Encls as stated

Dated 4 June
Rec'd 12 June No 283

25th June 1868 No. 302.
Communicated to the
Military Department.

To the Military Department.

Dated 25

Forwards copies of a letter
addressed to Govt of India
regarding Military Furlo
Rules With encls.