

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 806-807

Dated 6th Aug. 1896.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

MADRAS BODY GUARD.

Directing the transmission to the Government of India of
copy of a letter from the Military Secretary to His Excellency the
Governor explaining the necessity for two British officers for the----.

PRINTED IN G.O. dated *Public*

26th Nov.

1896 1257

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
C	3776		1896				

Had also the following papers

Organisation.

No. 1558-B.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

*It is requested that the
writing bearing with number
and date of this communica-
tion, may be quoted in any
subsequent correspondence
on this subject.*

CHIEF SECRETARY
25 JUN. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Simla, the 15th June 1896.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Sir,

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 522, "Public," dated the 8th May 1896, on the subject of the reconstitution of the Madras Body Guard. It was proposed that instead of the present arrangement under which 125 men from the three Madras Cavalry regiments are detached for duty with the Body Guard, the strength of the three regiments should be reduced by a total of 70 men, and that a separate Body Guard of this strength should be created. His Excellency the Governor in Council acquiesces in this scheme subject to the modification that a second British officer shall be permanently retained for the Body Guard, as in His Excellency's opinion one officer cannot in any case properly supervise 70 men and horses, and when allowance is made for sickness and absence such supervision becomes still more impossible.

2. In reply, I am to point out, with reference to the retention of a second British officer, that the Bombay Body Guard, which is of the same strength as that proposed for Madras, has only one British officer, and that the proportion of one officer to 70 natives of all ranks is not less than that obtaining in the Native Cavalry generally, where frequently only one British officer is available for a squadron. I am therefore to ask whether there is any special reason, apart from that already given, why two British officers are considered necessary for the Madras Body Guard.

I am,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Mr. P. Kinghaman.
Depy. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Public Rept.

Pub. No. 524-227 8-5-96 or 97

CS

Endt No. 1287.

Referred to the Military
Secretary to H.E. the Governor
for favour of remarks.

Redniewhice
Chief Secretary

CS.
28.6.96

Ottacamund
30th June 1896

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

From the Govt. of India
Military Dept.

No. 1558 B

Dated 15 }
Recd 25 } June
Regd 26 } 96

Encls - 12 a/cs of the
current.

Subject.

Replying to letter No. 522,
Pub. 8/5-5-96 on the reconstitution
of the Madras Body Guard and
inquiring whether there is any
special reason why 2 British of-
ficers are considered necessary
for the said Guard.

No. 247.

Government House
Ottacamund
24th July 1896

From

Major F. W. Romilly D. of O.
Military Secretary to H.E. the Governor

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
Stonehouse Hill.

Sir,

I have the honour, in returning Government
of India, Military Department letter No. 1558 B of 15th June
1896, to make the following remarks, as requested in your
endorsement No. 1287 of the 30th idem.

The question as to whether one or two British
Officers are necessary to supervise and maintain the
Body Guard in a state of efficiency, and properly carry
out all its duties, is not affected by the proposal to
reduce the strength of the unit in men.

It is precisely for the reason stated in para 2 of
above quoted letter, that "frequently only one British
officer is available for a squadron," that the necessity,
as in the Native Cavalry, for an establishment of two is
apparent.

In a Regiment of 4 squadrons, with 2 British
Officers to each squadron, it is easy to arrange for the
duties of any officer temporarily absent being carried out
by another, but if the total establishment be one only,
that one cannot be replaced, when desirous of Recreation
or Temporary leave, or is ineffective for short periods from
sickness.

In the event of the one British Officer leaving,
or

or becoming incapacitated, there would be none to teach his successor or officiating substitute the peculiar duties pertaining to the Body Guard.

The case of a Commandant proceeding on furlough or Privilege leave no doubt can be partially met by appointing an "officiating" officer, though this course is open to many objections, for the latter must be hampered in the proper performance of his duties by ignorance of local customs, persons, places, etiquette and ceremonial.

With a second British Officer on the strength of the unit no such inconveniences would be experienced, as he would be perfectly acquainted with the peculiar duties for which it is maintained.

With regard to the fact referred to in para 2 of Government of India letter, that the Bombay Body Guard has only one British Officer, it is within my knowledge that the want of a second British Officer is greatly felt in that Presidency, and is constantly the cause of much inconvenience.

I have reason to believe that, when the Commandant of the Bombay Body Guard proceeded on leave last year, no little trouble was experienced in selecting a suitable officer with sufficient service experience and the various other necessary qualifications, to replace him; and that the officer who was at last appointed to the officiating command, spent the whole of the time during which he acted, in learning his duties.

The example of Bombay, thoroughly bears out the contention that a second British Officer on the establishment of a Body Guard, though with a strength

of only 70 men, is at times quite essential.

If it is held that 70 men is too small a number for the constant charge of 2 British Officers, it would seem best to retain the Body Guard on its present effective footing of approximately a Native Cavalry squadron; and so avoid the necessity of bringing a half squadron of Native Cavalry to Madras whenever required, which essential condition of His Excellency the Governor's acquiescence in the proposed reduction is not referred to in para 1 of Government of India letter, and it is only on the further express condition of the retention of two British Officers on the establishment of the Body Guard, which all experience has proved to be necessary, that His Excellency is able to concur therein.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most obdt. Servant

F. Ponnilly. Major,
Military Secretary.
18th/24/7

Public Dept.

[G.]
[25 A.]
1,000-21-3-96.

Public DEPARTMENT

C. No.

2410

From the Military Secretary.
to H. E. the Governor.

No. 247.

Recd 24 }
Decd 25 } July 96.
Decd 27 }

Encls - Pub. C. no.
2056 retd.

Subject

Returning Govt. of India
letter re the Madras
Body Guard, with the re-
mark that two British
officers are necessary.

I think so - I quite
concur with it

BD

31/7/96

+ so do I.

31/7/96

FOR ORDERS. whether a copy of
the Milly Secy's letter may
be sent to India with the
intimation that the Govt.
adheres to the conditions
mentioned in paras 2 &
3 of letter No. 522 Pubd
8 May last.

28/7/96

28/7/96

Reduction of the
Body Guard

FOR ORDERS.

H. M. and core

[G.]
[24.]

1,000-15-11-95.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

G.O. Nos 806-78 6/8/96

Again G.O., dated 8th May 1896, No. 521-2 Public (p)

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 2056 of 189 6, dated 15th June from the Govt of India, Mil Dept

" " 2410 " 189 6, " 24th July, " the Mil Secy to H.E. the Governor (a)

" " " 189 , " " "

ORDER. No 80686 August 1896

The Govt of India
will be addressed.

No 807
Letter to

The Secy to the Govt of India.

Mil Dept.

(with copy of the Mil Secy's letter)

Sir,

In reply to Col. King-
Harman's letter No 1558 B,
of the 15th June last, I am
directed to forward, at
letter from the Mil Secy
to H.E. the Governor, in
which ~~the reasons for~~
in Council fully explains
~~the reasons for~~
for the ~~reduction of~~
guard is explained

2.

I must add
that this foot adhere

to the conditions mentioned
in paragraph 3 of my
letter No 522 Public,
2/8-5-96.

Officers for
Body Guard

FROM ORDERS.

Cut
4.8.98
CS. 1st can't
the marks down
and it has been
Para 2 is not "from
orders" & shd. apparently be
omitted.

5.8.98
4/8/6
less what
should be
the in the
attending
and has said
578

C. S.
A
mit

then given for copying
then copied
then examined
then signed

189

NO. AGAIN G.O. No.

NO.

NO. TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

OF GOVERNMENT

ENT WITH DITTO

NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL

H. L.
Please return with for dispatch

6/8/96

N.B.

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

23/5

4-7-10 ✓

21-2-11 ✓

5-11-12 ✓

25-5-14 ✓

8-11-20 ✓

19-12-23