(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 14

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 5/89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1758

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

Spare copy.

நாள் : 3.7.1889

198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண, எண்-1—18,000—15-6-87.

1758

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

Promotions.

Read the following paper:—

No. *From Lieutenant-Colonel E. COLLEN, Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to Brigdr.-Genl. A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Secretary to the Government of Madras, Military Department; dated Simla, the 29th May* 1889, *No.* 1302-*A.*

Promotions.

In continuation of Military Department endorsement, No. 1311-A, of the 12th June 1888, I am desired to forward, for the information of the Governor in Council, the accompanying copy of a despatch from the Secretary of State for India No. 71, dated the 11th April 1889, and to point out that no officers can be appointed to the posts specified in para. 3 of this despatch unless they have completed three years' satisfactory service on full pay with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, but that the District Staff are not affected, except as provided for in para. 9 of the War Office letter of the 21st December 1888, No. 57514-1971.

Page 5 of the despatch.

Military Despatch from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Most Honorable the Governor-General of India in Council; dated India Office, London, 11th April 1889, No. 71.

Promotion to rank of Colonel in the Army.
Appointments in India to carry that rank.

I have received and considered in Council your Military Despatches Nos. 150 and 160, of the 10th and 31st August 1888, respectively, on the subject of promotion to the rank of Colonel in the Army and the appointments in India to carry that rank.

2. I forward herewith copy of correspondence * with the War Office on the subject, and with the Horse Guards regarding certain particular appointments.

3. Apart from the Royal Artillery and Engineers, the following appointments only will be Colonel's appointments to which properly qualified officers must be appointed:—

Adjutant-General.
Deputy Adjutant-General.
Assistant Adjutant-General.
Assistant Adjutant-General for Musketry, Bengal.
Quarter Master General.
Deputy Quarter Master General.
Assistant Quarter Master General.
Inspector-General of Cavalry.
Brigadier-General.
Colonel on the Staff.

* To War Office, 1st November 1888, M 9248.
From do. 21st December ,,
To do. 14th January 1889, M 12247.
To Horse Guards, 10th October 1888, M 9920.
To do. 24th ,, ,, M 9920.
From do. 30th ,, ,,
To do. 7th November 1888, M 10526.
To do. 17th ,, ,, M 10526.
To do. 28th ,, ,, M 10526-A.
To do. 24th December ,, M 10526-B.
From do. 10th January 1889.
To do. 15th ,, ,, M 308.
To do. 23rd ,, ,, M 818.
From War Office, 29th January 1889.
From Horse Guards, 30th January 1889.
To War Office, 6th March 1889, M 1138.
From do. 18th ,, ,,
To Horse Guards, 7th ,, ,, M 2309.
From do. 20th ,, ,,
To do. 22nd ,, ,, M 2687.
To War Office, 11th April ,, M 2629.

4. The following appointments will carry the rank of Colonel when the selected officers possess, on appointment, the necessary service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel :—

Military Secretary to the Viceroy.
Military Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief, East Indies.

5. In accordance with the request of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, your Government should state, in each case of the nomination of a Lieutenant-Colonel to an appointment carrying the rank of Colonel, that the circumstances are sufficiently special to warrant the nomination.

6. In my telegram of the 21st March, you were informed that the extension of the field of selection for the staff in India (sanctioned in para. 4 of my Despatch No. 67 of the 22nd March 1888) applied only to appointments carrying the rank of Colonel.

ENCLOSURES.

M 9248-88. No. 1.

INDIA OFFICE,
1st November 1888.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council, with reference to your letter of the 16th February 1886, No. 57514-1846, to forward herewith, for such remarks as the Secretary of State for War and His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief may have to offer, copies of two Military Despatches * from the Government of India, on the subject of the appointments in that country to carry the substantive rank of Colonel.

* No. 159 of 10th August 1888, and No. 160, of 31st August 1888.

2. It will be observed that the Government of India are desirous that the appointments in question shall not be absolutely Colonel's appointments, for which only Lieutenant-Colonels of three years' service in that rank shall be eligible. For reasons given, the Government desire to have the power of appointing to these posts officers who have not served three years in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, the substantive rank of Colonel being, however, conferred on such officers on completion of that service.

3. Concurring as His Lordship does to a great extent in the views of the Government of India, Viscount Cross would be glad if Mr. Secretary Stanhope and His Royal Highness would assent to the measure as far as regards the administrative staff and the departments.

4. The case of the Army staff is, however, somewhat different. Viscount Cross admits that there would be a difficulty in adopting a rule which does not obtain on the staff of the Army at home. His Lordship would, however, be glad, if it were possible, if the appointment of District Staff Officer could be treated in the manner proposed by the Government of India.

5. I am here to state that His Lordship does not propose to abandon the title of District Staff Officer, and revert to those of Assistant Adjutant-General and Deputy Assistant Adjutant-General.

6. It will be observed that the Government have added a few appointments to the list. They are entirely opposed to the proposal that brigade commands and the appointments of Adjutant-General and Quarter Master General shall be held in future by officers of the permanent rank of Major-General. Under the circumstances, His Lordship proposes to assent to their inclusion in the list, together with the recently created appointment of Inspector-General of Cavalry.

7. The appointment of District Staff Officer is referred to above.

8. With reference to the additional appointments in the Ordnance Department, Viscount Cross is unable to concur with the Government of India, for the reasons given in the eighth paragraph of the letter from this office of the 30th November 1887, M 10049.

9. His Lordship proposes to inform the Government of India that the extension of the field of selection referred to in the 15th paragraph of their Despatch, No. 150, is intended to be limited to the Colonel's appointments.

10. His Lordship would be glad to be furnished with definite replies to the questions raised in paras. 11 and 16 (*b*) of that despatch.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN H. MAYO,
Assistant Military Secretary.

The Under Secretary of State for War.

1756

No. 2.

No. 57514-1971. WAR OFFICE,
21st December 1888.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st ultimo, forwarding, for such remarks as the Secretary of State and His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief might have to offer, copies of Military Despatches * from the Government of India on the subject of the appointments in that country to carry the substantive rank of Colonel.

* Nos. 150 and 160 of 1888.

Royal Engineers.

2. The proposal of the Government of India, in which they are supported by the Secretary of State for India in Council, is that 14 appointments as Chief and Superintending Engineers are to be allotted as carrying the substantive rank of Colonel. It is specially provided that there should be only 14.

3. To this there is no objection, but whilst there are only 14 of these appointments, in addition to three others named, which will carry qualifications for the rank of substantive Colonel for officers of the Royal Engineers, the Government of India reserve the power to select officers of any rank, including Civil Engineers, and from any service, to fill these appointments.

4. In considering this question it must be remembered that officers of the Royal Engineers are practically, if not technically, barred from most of the appointments which carry the substantive rank of Colonel, apart from the appointments in the Public Works Department.

5. It would thus be possible that not a single appointment carrying rank of Colonel would be held by officers of Royal Engineers in India. It cannot be said that this is a desirable prospect, and, whilst quite recognizing the force of the reasons given for the proposed reservations, the Secretary of State considers it essential, if the country is to hope for the services of an efficient body of Officers of Royal Engineers in India, that these officers, if qualified, should be able to look forward with confidence to the attainment of the substantive rank of Colonel, irrespective of the comparative claims of Civil Engineers to the higher appointments in the Public Works Department.

6. The proposal of the Government of India does not appear to give them this prospect and, as stated in my letter of the 16th February last, it is very doubtful if officers will risk their future by accepting continuous service in India, unless there is a fair proportion (which has been agreed upon to be 14) of appointments carrying the substantive rank of Colonel allotted to the Royal Engineers, independently of any fluctuations caused by Civil Engineers or officers of other branches of the service taking up these appointments; and officers before electing continuous service should be fully aware of these conditions.

7. With regard to the appointments named in the margin, there would appear to be no objection, if necessity required to the appointment of officers of special qualifications, but of insufficient service, on condition that the officers so selected should not have any claim to promotion to the substantive rank of Colonel on the ground of qualifying service in such appointments.

Secretary to Government of India, Public Works.
Surveyor-General of India.
Deputy Surveyor-General of India.

General Staff.

8. With regard to appointments on the general staff which are to carry substantive rank of Colonel, the Secretary of State and His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief are of opinion that, as it is probable there will always be a plentiful supply of qualified officers on the general list awaiting selection for appointments on the head-quarters staff in the three Presidencies, there is no reason why the arrangement arrived at in my letter of the 16th February last should be interfered with, and they are not prepared, therefore, to sanction the appointment of officers of insufficient service to these posts.

9. There would appear to be no objection to a modification of the arrangement come to in regard to appointments to First Class District Staff Officer so far that, should the Commander-in-Chief in India desire to nominate for such appointment officers from the general list fully qualified by length of service as Lieutenant-Colonel, and possessing requisite Indian qualifications, His Royal Highness would be prepared to take such recommendation into consideration, and if he saw fit might, with the Secretary of State's approval, sanction the appointment, and the grant of the substantive rank of Colonel.

10. The proposal to allow officers of insufficient service to qualify in such appointments, and be granted the rank on completion of such qualifying service, cannot, in the opinion of His Royal Highness and of the Secretary of State, be entertained, as being outside the spirit and

21

intention of the Warrant, and beyond the fact that such an officer would be putting in service to qualify him for selection for a Colonel's appointment hereafter, he would reap no further benefit from his appointment.

11. The decision meets the case of those officers referred to in the Government of India Despatch, para. 11.

12. Any general rule to the contrary would have the effect of giving an officer who happened to be on the Indian establishment, and who was selected for such an appointment, a very undue advantage over the general list of officers of his rank serving elsewhere.

13. It would also, in the opinion of the Secretary of State and of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, be detrimental to the efficiency of the command of regiments and battalions, for an officer would no sooner obtain the substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel than, seeing that all his prospects of advancement in the service were dependent on his obtaining a staff appointment at the earliest opportunity, he would do his utmost to obtain such appointment, to the disregard of his legitimate duties as a Commanding Officer.

14. The appointments referred to in para. 13 are not omitted from the list of Colonel's appointments if held by qualified officers. That of the Inspector-General of Cavalry is new, and will be included in the Colonel's appointments as the holder is a Brigadier-General.

Royal Artillery.

15. The appointments open to officers of the Royal Artillery at home and in India have been materially curtailed by recent changes.

16. The posts of Superintendents of Ordnance Factories at home, when filled by officers of sufficient service, carry the substantive rank of Colonel on appointment, and the Secretary of State would strongly urge upon the Secretary of State for India in Council a reconsideration of the decision arrived at by him to exclude similar posts in India, although their inclusion has been recommended by the Government of India.

17. The following are replies to specific paragraphs of the Government of India Despatch :—

Para. 15.—Selections from the general list are only intended to be made for appointments carrying the substantive rank of Colonel.

Para. 16 (*a*).—This deficiency of Colonels will be to some extent remedied by selection from the general list, but there must always be a disproportion between the British and the Indian services in favor of the latter.

Para. 16 (*b*).—Precedence will be governed by date of Colonelcy, whether substantive or otherwise. Hereafter all Colonels will be substantive, excepting those promoted for distinguished service, &c., and promotion to rank of Major-General or to the appointments carrying that rank will be by selection from Colonels, whether substantive or brevet.

Para. 16 (*c*).—The rank of Colonel hereafter is substantive, but not regimental, and will not be tenable with any other substantive or regimental rank.

The brevet rank of Colonel was specially revived to meet the latter point.

I have, &c.,

The Under Secretary of State for India. (Signed) RALPH THOMPSON.

No. M 12247-1888. No. 3.

INDIA OFFICE,
14th January 1889.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st December 1888, and to reply as follows :—

2. With regard to the Royal Engineers (paras. 2 to 6 of your letter), I am to inform you that the question of the formation of Military Works Departments in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies is now under Viscount Cross' consideration. In the event of the departments being formed it is anticipated that the establishment of Chief and Superintending Engineers will be sufficiently large to admit of 14 of them holding the rank of Colonel. Meanwhile, pending a settlement of that question, it does not appear necessary to interfere with the arrangement concluded in the correspondence which terminated in my letter of the 21st March 1888, M 1942.

3. In the seventh paragraph of your letter it is stated, with regard to certain appointments named, that there would be no objection, if necessity required, to the appointment of officers of special qualification, but of insufficient service, on condition that the officers so selected should not have any claim to promotion to the substantive rank of Colonel on the ground of qualifying service in such appointments. This is in effect a decision that a Lieutenant-Colonel of three years' service in that rank, if appointed Surveyor-General of India, would be given

the rank of Colonel on appointment, whereas a Lieutenant-Colonel of under three years' service would not be able to obtain the rank of Colonel even after completion of the three years in the appointment, that is to say, practically, that the latter would never become a Colonel at all, or, in other words, that the appointment which would give one officer the rank of Colonel would actually debar another from ever attaining that rank, simply because the latter might have a month's less service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel at time of appointment.

4. Viscount Cross cannot understand why an officer who is qualified for the rank of Colonel, and who holds a Colonel's appointment, should not have the rank of Colonel, and His Lordship would be glad to be furnished at length with the grounds for this decision.

5. Paras. 8 to 14 of your letter deal with the general staff of the Army. It is presumed that under this head it is intended to include the administrative staff and departments, as they are not specially referred to elsewhere in the letter, and that it is intended to decline to sanction any modification of the rule with regard to them. Assuming that intention of the Secretary of State for War is rightly understood, Viscount Cross desires me to point out the inconvenience of adhering to the rule in this instance.

6. It will be observed that, in the seventh paragraph of their Despatch of the 10th August 1888, the Government of India state that both the Commissary-Generalships in Bengal are now held by Majors. These officers are at present only officiating in the appointments in question, but one of them the Government wish to appoint permanently, a full vacancy having recently occurred. They say that the seniors of the department, though good executive officers, could not be appointed to the administrative posts of the department without risk to its efficiency. It would therefore follow that a department, upon the effective administration of which the well-being of a large army in the field may at any time depend, would be prevented by a hard and fast rule from having its higher appointments filled by the best men available, except at the price of a, possibly, permanent exclusion of such men from the higher grades of the Army, to which they are entitled to look forward with confidence.

7. Such a rule seems to Viscount Cross to be inexpedient in the best interests of the service, and I may here state that His Lordship, approving of the principle of the alteration in the rules for promotion incorporated in the Royal Warrant of the 31st December 1886, has done his best to reconcile the provisions of the Warrant with the requirements of the Army in India, especially in respect to its departments, but that the inelasticity of the rules or the stringency of their interpretation is such that the difficulties in the way of reconciliation appear to be almost insuperable.

8. With regard to the Army staff proper I am to point out that Viscount Cross did not propose any modification of the rule, except as regards the District Staff Officer, For the reason given in para. 4 of this letter His Lordship is unable to appreciate the grounds of the refusal of His Royal Highness and the Secretary of State for War to modify the rule in the manner suggested.

9. With reference to the 13th paragraph of your letter, I am to state that His Lordship does not see why the Commanding Officer of a regiment should disregard his legitimate duties in order to do his utmost to obtain a staff appointment any more before he had completed three years' service as a Lieutenant-Colonel than after he had completed that service, and was nearer to the vacation of his command. Moreover, it appears to His Lordship that, should any such disregard of duties occur, the instant remedy is in the hands of the superior military authorities.

10. In the 11th paragraph of your letter it is stated that the decision against officers being allowed to qualify for promotion in Colonel's appointments meets the case of those officers referred to in the Government of India Despatch, para. 11. This hardly appears to be the case. The Government say :—"As the case stands, these officers apparently will fail to obtain the rank of Colonel under either the old or the new warrant, and on vacating their appointments must see themselves superseded by their juniors." The meaning of the Government of India can perhaps be better illustrated by an instance in point. Lieutenant-Colonel W. P. Tomkins, R.E., a Superintending Engineer in the Military Works Department, attained the rank of Lieutenant Colonel on the 26th May 1888. Under the old regulations he would have been promoted to the rank of Colonel on the 26th May 1892, but under the new regulations, as interpreted by the Secretary of State for War, he cannot, because he holds a Colonel's appointment, be given the rank of Colonel until he obtains another Colonel's appointment, before which he must, to all appearances, undergo considerable supersession.

11. With reference to paras. 15 and 16 of your letter (Royal Artillery), I am to state that the main objection of Viscount Cross to the appointment of Superintendent of an Ordnance Factory in India being made a Colonel's appointment was that the Ordnance Department would have more than its fair share of Colonels. The suggestion of the Secretary of State for War that such officers should be granted the rank of Colonel, if qualified on appointment, would hardly meet the views of the Government of India.

12. With reference to the remark on para. 16 (*c*) of the Despatch for India contained in para. 17 of your letter, I am to call attention to the correspondence which terminated with the letter from the Horse Guards of the 25th May 1888, No. 57514-1913.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Under Secretary of State for War.

No. 4.

M 9920-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
10th October 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to state, for the information of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, that Lieutenant-Colonel and Colonel Montagu Clementi, Bengal Staff Corps, has been appointed to be Judge Advocate-General in India, with effect from the 1st April 1888.

That date is anterior to that of his promotion to the rank of Colonel in the Army, which appeared in the London Gazette of the 14th August last, and it is presumed, therefore, that this promotion will be cancelled, and that Colonel Clementi will be promoted to the substantive rank of Colonel in the Army, with effect from the 1st April 1888.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN H. MAYO,
Assistant Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 5.

M 9920-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
24th October 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council, with reference to my letter of the 10th October, M 2920, to inquire whether the appointment of Colonel M. Clementi will be gazetted at an early date, as it is desirable not to defer longer than is necessary the gazetting of the officers appointed to the re-organized Judge Advocate-General's Department in India.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN H. MAYO,
Assistant Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 6.

No. 61025-521.

SIR,

HORSE GUARDS, WAR OFFICE,
30th October 1888.

In reply to your letters of the 10th and 24th instant, M 9920, I am directed by the Commander-in-Chief to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State for India in Council, that His Royal Highness suggests that Colonel M. Clementi, Bengal Staff Corps, be gazetted provisionally to the appointment of Judge Advocate-General in India, the question of his promotion to the substantive rank of Colonel in the Army from the 1st April last being held over for future consideration, in accordance with my letter of 28th April last, No. 57514-1902.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) C. H. BROWNLOW.

The Under Secretary of State for India.

No. 7.

M 10526-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
7th November 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th October, No. 61025-521, and to point out that the case of Colonel Clementi differs from those of the officers who were provisionally gazetted to the appointments of Assistant Adjutant-General and Assistant Quarter Master General.

Those officers were appointed to posts which were about to be reconstituted under a change of designation and to be reduced in number, which were not to carry the rank of Colonel, and to which they might not be re-appointed. Colonel Clementi, on the other hand, has been given an appointment which it has been decided shall carry the rank of Colonel (for which he was qualified), and which he will probably hold for the full tenure of five years.

I am to inquire whether, if Colonel Clementi were in the first instance gazetted provisionally from the 1st April 1888, there would be any objection to his being definitely gazetted, with the rank of Colonel, with effect from the 11th June 1888, the date from which he has already been promoted to the rank of Colonel in the Army.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN H. MAYO,
Assistant Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 8.

M 10526-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
17th November 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to request that I may be furnished, as soon as possible, with a reply to the letter from this Office of the 7th November, M 10526, regarding the gazetting of Colonel M. Clementi, Bengal Staff Corps, as Judge Advocate-General in India.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN H. MAYO,
Assistant Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 9.

M 10526A-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
28th November 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council, with reference to the letter from this Office of the 17th November, M 10526, and previous correspondence, to inform you that Colonel Clementi's provincial appointment as Judge Advocate-General in India, was notified in the London Gazette of the 27th November.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 10.

M 10526B-88.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
24th December 1888.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council, with reference to my letter of the 28th November last, M 10526-A, and to previous correspondence, to inquire whether it is intended to gazette Colonel M. Clementi, Bengal Staff Corps, to the appointment of Judge Advocate-General in India, with effect from the 11th June 1888.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 11.

No. 61025-527.

SIR,

HORSE GUARDS, WAR OFFICE,
10th January 1889.

With reference to your letter of the 24th ultimo, I am directed by the Commander-in-Chief to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State for India in Council, that steps are about to be taken to gazette Colonel M. Clementi, Bengal Staff Corps, to the appointment of Judge Advocate-General in India, with date of 11th June 1888, the date on which he attained the rank of Colonel, but His Royal Highness does not propose to submit to the Queen that he should be granted the substantive rank of Colonel in the Army, as he has already

attained the rank of Colonel under former rules, and it would be necessary, if granted that rank, that he should be removed from his Corps, as is done with officers of the Imperial Service.

It has not been the custom hitherto, when dealing with appointments, under article 15 (*a*) of the Royal Warrant, of officers belonging to the Staff Corps, to give them the substantive rank of Colonel, and, in the future, it is considered desirable that such officers should be gazetted only with the rank of Colonel in the Army, omitting the word "substantive," in order to avoid their holding a double substantive commission.

I have, &c.,

The Under Secretary of State for India. (Signed) G. B. HARMAN.

M 308 No. 12.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
15th January 1889.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th January, No. 61025-527. I am to inquire whether it is intended that article 15 (*a*) of the Royal Warrant of the 15th November 1887 should not apply to officers of the Staff Corps, but that the promotion of these officers to the rank of Colonel in the Army should be made under regulations laid down by the Secretary of State in accordance with article 5 of the Warrant.

I am also to state that, if it is not intended to gazette Colonel Clementi to the substantive rank of Colonel, it does not appear to Viscount Cross to be necessary that this officer's appointment of Judge Advocate-General in India should be gazetted by the War Office. It could be notified in the London Gazette in the usual manner by this Office.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

M 818. No. 13.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
23rd January 1889.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to state, for the information of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, that Colonel C. Cuningham, Bombay Staff Corps, has been appointed to be Deputy Adjutant-General, Bombay, with effect from the 25th October 1888, *vice* Colonel Wooldridge, whose tenure of service on the staff has expired.

This is an appointment which should, under the terms of article 15 (*a*) of the Royal Warrant of the 15th November 1887, carry the substantive rank of Colonel in the Army, and be gazetted by the War Office. Viscount Cross, however, presumes, with reference to your letter of the 10th January, No. 61025-527, and my reply of the 15th January, M 308, that whatever arrangement is come to with regard to the case of Colonel M. Clementi should also apply to the case of Colonel Cuningham.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 14.

No. 57514-1994.

SIR,

WAR OFFICE,
29th January 1889.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, M 12247, in continuation of the correspondence relative to the appointments which are in future to carry the rank of Colonel in the Army.

In place of categorical answers to its various paragraphs, it will, perhaps, be more desirable and better calculated to effect some understanding on the whole question if I briefly state the scope of article 15 (*a*) of the Royal Warrant of 15th November 1887, its effect as regards Imperial officers, and what are understood to be the proposals of the Indian authorities in connection therewith, and I accordingly enclose a memorandum on the subject for the information of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Under the circumstances therein stated, it is clearly a necessity that officers, to be eligible for an appointment carrying the rank of Colonel, should possess at least the requisite period of

service as a Lieutenant-Colonel, and with regard to officers of the British Service the rule will be maintained.

Nor does it appear desirable that a different rule for appointments on the general staff should apply to officers of the Staff Corps, in view to the question of their superseding British officers serving in India; but, considering the exigencies of the Indian service, as pointed out by the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Government of India, in the event of officers not possessed of the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, or not having three years' service in that rank, being selected by the Government of India for appointments requiring special qualifications, such as those on the administrative staff, it must be clearly understood that, though such officers should not, on account of service in such appointments, be considered as having put in claims for promotion to Colonel in that appointment by qualifying service therein, if in special cases it were considered essential for the good of the service, it would be open to the Government of India to re-appoint such officers on completion of three years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel, and Mr. Secretary Stanhope would have no objection in such instances to take into consideration the recommendation of the Indian Government that they be then granted the rank of Colonel.

This concession, however, does not get over the difficulty which it is found arises in regard to the grant of substantive rank of Colonel to officers of the Indian Army, who must also retain their substantive rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Staff Corps, nor does it leave the question generally in a satisfactory condition, and Mr. Secretary Stanhope would be willing to consider the suggestion made in your letter of the 15th instant, No. 61025-529, that the promotion of officers of the Staff Corps should be regulated by rules laid down by the Secretary of State for India in Council under article 5 of the Royal Warrant of 15th November 1887 (though it is not strictly applicable, as the promotions in question are "Army," and not "Staff Corps"), provided that regulations can be framed on the basis of article 15 (*a*), so as not to involve inequality of promotion as between the British and Indian services, or inflict an injustice on the former in regard to the conditions of staff service in India.

It would also, under any circumstances, be essential that the rank of Colonel should be granted by this department, and the appointments therefore which carry the rank should also be gazetted by this department.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) RALPH THOMPSON.

The Under Secretary of State for India.

Enclosure in No. 14.

MEMORANDUM.

Article 15 (*a*), Royal Warrant, 15th November 1887, definitely states that a Lieutenant-Colonel may be promoted to the rank of Colonel on selection for specified appointment, provided he have completed three years' satisfactory service on full pay with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

The article appears to be stringent in regard to the possession of the necessary service prior to selection, and our contention has been based upon this ruling.

The Indian authorities, however, argue that they should be enabled to appoint officers to Colonel's posts prior to their having put in this service, and that on completion of three years' service as Lieutenant-Colonel in the Colonel's appointment they should, on their recommendation, be confirmed in the substantive rank of Colonel.

A compliance with this suggstion would mean a reversion to the old system of qualifying service reduced from four to three years, and subject only to a recommendation for fitness. It would probably involve heavy supersession of regimental Lieutenant-Colonels if they retained their regimental commands for the full term, and in the case of British officers serving in India would give them a very undue advantage over officers serving elsewhere.

A different rule for Staff Corps officers holding appointments on the administrative staff and in the departments would also lead to supersession of British officers, though it is hard to withstand the strength of the arguments used by the Indian authorities on this particular point.

Article 15 (*a*) is not intended to have general application until 1st January 1891, when all the Lieutenant-Colonels now qualifying under old rules will have become Colonels, and it by no means follows that even then will a Lieutenant-Colonel of only three years' standing as such be in a position to consider, with reasonable prospect of success, that he will have early selection for a Colonel's appointment.

For years to come there will be a long list of Colonels, and the Lieutenant-Colonels with completed qualifications as regards service will multiply a good deal quicker than there will be appointments available for them under existing regulations.

Consequently, the period at which a Lieutenant-Colonel in the future may expect to receive a Colonel's appointment is indefinite, and by no means a certainty, owing to his being in possession of three years' service in the rank, which is the limit at which the India Office wish to make it a certainty.

The rank of Colonel under article 15 (*a*) in future is substantive and therefore cannot be held with regimental rank, and there has been some confusion in the correspondence with the India Office on this point, to which they draw attention, but it is presumed that it will not be possible to gazette Staff Corps officers to substantive rank if they continue to hold their position as substantive Lieutenant-Colonels in the Staff Corps, and they should be gazetted to the rank of Colonel in the Army without the use of the word "substantive," unless it be possible to institute a substantive rank of Colonel for Staff Corps officers, to which they might be gazetted from Lieutenant-Colonel, and which, it is suggested, need not be regimental, any more than is that of the Staff Corps General Officers' list.

It has been conceded unofficially that special cases of granting rank to officers who have put in their service in the Colonel's appointment, if on re-appointment they were specially recommended by the Commander-in-Chief in India, would receive favorable consideration by His Royal Highness, but it was not considered desirable to lay this down officially, or to in any way sanction its adoption as a rule.

WAR OFFICE,
29th January 1889.

No. 15.

Nos. 57514-2001 and 61025-529.

HORSE GUARDS, WAR OFFICE,
30th January 1889.

SIR,

I am directed by the Commander-in-Chief to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 15th and 23rd instant, M 308 and 818, having reference to the respective appointments of Colonel M. Clementi, B.S.C., and of Colonel Cuningham, Bo. S. C., to the staff in India.

In reply, I am to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State for India in Council, that, pending a settlement of the whole general question of appointments to the staff in India which are to carry the rank of Colonel, concerning which a communication was made to you from this department on the 29th instant, it would appear only desirable for the present to adopt the following course:—

Colonel Clementi having already been gazetted provisionally by your department, no further steps to be now taken, the question of rank being left pending its settlement.

Colonel C. Cuningham, Bombay Staff Corps, to be gazetted by this department to the post of Deputy Adjutant-General, Bombay, for which he has been selected, the question of rank in his case also being left pending its settlement.

On receipt of your reply, any necessary steps in these cases will be taken accordingly.

I have, &c.,

The Under Secretary of State for India. (Signed) G. B. HARMAN.

No. 16.

M 1138.

INDIA OFFICE,
6th March 1889.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th January, No. 57514-1994, and of the letter from the Horse Guards of the 30th January, Nos. 57514-2001 and 61025-529.

In accordance with the suggestion contained in the last paragraph but one of the former letter, I am now to propose definitely that the promotion of officers of the Staff Corps to the rank of Colonel in the Army shall be made under such regulations as may be laid down from time to time by the Secretary of State for India in Council and to suggest that a clause to that effect should be inserted in article 15 of the Royal Warrant of the 15th November 1887, or in any Royal Warrant which may be intended to supersede that Warrant.

Should the Secretary of State for War assent to this proposal, it will not be necessary to maintain the list, recently agreed upon, of appointments in India to carry the rank of Colonel, and of the difficulties of the Government of India will be considerably lessened.

Setting aside the appointments peculiar to the Artillery and Engineers, the following appointments only, which are appointments on the general staff of the Army, need be maintained:—

Adjutant-General.	Deputy Quarter Master General.
Deputy Adjutant-General.	Assistant Quarter Master General.
Assistant Adjutant-General.	Inspector-General of Cavalry.
Assistant Adjutant-General for Musketry, Bengal.	Brigadier-General.
Quarter Master General.	Colonel on the Staff.

Officers of the Staff Corps who attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel before the 1st January 1887 will of course continue to be promoted to the rank of Colonel under existing regulations, except in the rare case of an officer of less than four years' service being nominated to one of the appointments in the above list.

For the officers promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel after the above date, all that will be necessary will be to extend the system of supplementary selection already agreed upon. When it has been definitely decided about what number of Colonels there are to be in future in the Staff Corps, the Secretary of State will be able to select officers for promotion to the rank of Colonel from among the Lieutenant-Colonels who have completed three years' sevice in that rank.

In making this selection, the Secretary of State would of course endeavour as far as possible to ensure equality of promotion as between the British and Indian Services. As in the case of promotion to General officer, there must, however, be some supersession one way or the other, more especially as promotion will be made by selection.

The term "substantive" was adopted at the instance of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief. Its use in the Indian Service is somewhat inconvenient, and Viscount Cross has no objection to its being abandoned.

The promotion of officers of the Staff Corps to the rank of Colonel in the Army should, as heretofore, be gazetted by the War Office, and the appointments, therefore, which carry the rank should also be gazetted by that department.

Should then the Secretary of State for War and His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief assent to the above arrangements, Viscount Cross would cause the appointment of Colonel M. Clementi to be notified in the London Gazette, but the appointment of Colonel C. Cuningham, being to a Colonel's appointment, should be gazetted by the War Office.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Under Secretary of State for War.

No. 17.

No. 57514-2016.

WAR OFFICE,
18th March 1889.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, M 1138.

In reply, I am to request that you will be good enough to inform the Secretary of State for India in Council that Mr. Secretary Stanhope agrees to the proposals now made in your communication under acknowledgment, provided that, as stated in the letter from this department of the 29th January last, due care be taken in framing the regulations, so that inequality of promotion between the British and Indian Services be, as far as possible, avoided, and that no injustice be inflicted on the former in regard to the conditions of appointment to staff in India; and, subject also to any reservation in regard to the grant of rank in the Army which may require the approval of the authorities in this country. A clause to the necessary effect will be added to the Royal Warrant on Pay and Promotion.

In addition to the appointments set apart for Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, and also those for the general staff of the Army, it is presumed that the following personal staff appointments will also be retained when the officers selected possess, on appointment, the necessary service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, viz.:—

Military Secretary to Viceroy,
Military Secretary to Commander-in-Chief, East Indies.

The use of the word "substantive" will be discontinued when gazetting an officer in the Indian Service to the rank of Colonel, and steps will be duly taken to gazette the appointment of Colonel E. Cuningham to be Deputy Adjutant-General, Bombay.

The proposed regulations, when framed, should be referred for the consideration and approval of the Secretary of State for War and of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) RALPH THOMPSON.

The Under Secretary of State for India.

No. 18.

M 2309.

INDIA OFFICE,
7th March 1889.

SIR,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to state, for the information of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, that Lieutenant-Colonel A. G. Hutchins,

Madras Infantry, has been appointed to be Deputy Quarter Master General, Madras, *vice* Lieutenant-Colonel D. J. S. McLeod, D.S.O., who has vacated, with effect from the 28th November 1888.

The appointment of Deputy Quarter Master General is one which carries the rank of Colonel in the Army. Lieutenant-Colonel Hutchins has completed the necessary three years' service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, and Viscount Cross will be glad if His Royal Highness will submit the name of this officer to Her Majesty accordingly.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 19.

No. 57514-2017.

SIR,

HORSE GUARDS, WAR OFFICE,
20th March 1889.

With reference to your letter of the 7th instant, M 2309, on the subject of the appointment of Lieutenant-Colonel A. G. Hutchins, Madras Infantry, to be Deputy Quarter Master General in Madras, with effect from 28th November last, *vice* Lieutenant-Colonel D. J. S. McLeod, Madras Cavalry, I am directed by the Commander-in-Chief to acquaint you that His Royal Highness will cause the same to be submitted to the Queen for Her Majesty's approval.

I have, however, to point out that this is the first case of promotion of an officer to the rank of Colonel in the Army in consequence of selection to a staff appointment under article 15 of the Royal Warrant of 15th November 1887 that has been sanctioned, and His Royal Highness, in agreeing to it, presumes that the circumstances are sufficiently special to warrant its recommendation by the authorities in India.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) G. B. HARMAN.

The Under Secretary of State for India.

No. 20.

M 2687.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE, WHITEHALL, S.W.,
22nd March 1889.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th March, No. 57514-2017, and to acquaint you that the Government of India will be requested to state in each case of the nomination of a Lieutenant-Colonel to an appointment carrying the rank of Colonel that the circumstances are sufficiently special to warrant the nomination.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Military Secretary, Horse Guards, War Office.

No. 21.

M 2629.

SIR,

INDIA OFFICE,
11th April 1889.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th March, No. 57514-2016, and to acquaint you in reply that, in the selection of officers of the Indian Service for promotion to the rank of Colonel in the Army, due care will be taken to avoid, as far as possible, any irregularity of promotion between the British and the Indian Services, and to prevent the infliction of injustice on the former in regard to the conditions of appointment to the staff in India.

2. Viscount Cross concurs in the following appointments carrying the rank of Colonel when the selected officers possess on appointment the necessary service in the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel :—

Military Secretary to Viceroy.
Military Secretary to Commander-in-Chief, East Indies.

3. The proposed regulations, when framed, will be duly referred for the consideration of the Secretary of State for War and of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief. They can hardly, however, be framed until the number of Colonels for the Indian Service has been fixed, and that must depend upon the number in British Service.

I have, &c,

(Signed) ALLEN JOHNSON, Lieut.-Genl.,
Military Secretary.

The Under Secretary of State for War.

No. ORDER THEREON, 24 June 1889, No. 4419

Communicated to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, in continuation of Proceedings of Government, No. 4441, dated 29th June 1888.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Brigdr.-Genl.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Adjutant-General,
" Quarter Master General,
" Inspector-General of Ordnance,
" Commissary-General,
" Public Works Department,
" Controller of Military Accounts,
" } for information.

Ezd. A. D. Xavier.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

MILITARY.

To

THE ADJUTANT-GENERAL,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated June,

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 24 June 1889, No. 411.9

comnicated A. No. 1758 dt. 3rd July 1889

JUNE.

Nos.

Promotions.

Officers.—Letter from the Government of India forwarding, with remarks, correspondence from Her Majesty's Government on the subject of promotion of — to the rank of Colonel in the Army and the appointments in India to carry that rank, communicated to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.