

1.

Extract from a private letter from His Excellency the Viceroy to the Private Secretary to His Majesty the King-Emperor, dated the 12th January 1911.

* * * * *

7. The question of horse *versus* elephant is one for the King to decide. My feeling is that, if it should be decided that the King should ride on an elephant, then I think that the King and Queen should be the only persons allowed to ride an elephant, and that all the rest of the Ruling Chiefs should be on horses. On the other hand, if there are no elephants, the King should ride and the Queen should drive in a very smart turn-out. I can provide a very smart State barouche with six horses, postillions, &c., or two semi-State barouches, with the same number of horses, postillions, &c. I can guarantee that they will be as smart as possible. If a mere gorgeous carriage should be required than my State barouche, it will have to be sent out from England.

* * * * *

D.-O., No. 1243, dated Calcutta, the 14th March 1911.

From—R. PARSONS, Esq., Registrar, Office of the Military Secretary to the Viceroy,
To—G. W. MARSHALL, Esq., Registrar, Foreign Department.

The Military Secretary has asked me to return the accompanying papers, which were sent to the Private Secretary to the Viceroy by the Foreign Department.

STATE ENTRY PROCESSION.

Three alternative schemes are submitted for consideration.

There has not been time to work them out in detail, and in each of them there are many little points that require the most careful examination before a conclusion can be arrived at. There seems no great hurry about the case, and I would beg for a few weeks to work it up.

Scheme A—Is based on the procession in 1903.

Scheme B—Appears to me to be the most correct arrangement, the King's own procession being quite distinct from the rest.

Parts I and III are interchangeable, but if it is desired that the Ruling Chiefs should not halt at the Ridge, the arrangement as shown allows them to go on without affecting the proceedings. But I think that the Ruling Chiefs would not care to leave the King. They will be quite prepared, I am sure, to conform to his movements whatever these may be. The only point I am doubtful about is the position of the Commander-in-Chief and the Army Head-Quarters Staff. I have shown the Commander-in-Chief in his correct* place in the precedence table, and presumably the staff must go with him wherever he is.

* I have altered this as he should be ahead of His Majesty in the procession.

A. H. McMAHON.

Scheme C—Embodies what was suggested at the first meeting of the Durbar Committee, but this was modified at the second meeting.

V. GABRIEL,—22-2-11.

Alternative suggestions for State Entry Procession.

SCHEME A.

- | | | | | |
|-------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| All mounted | ... | ... | { | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Procession Marshal.2. Inspector-General, Punjab Police, and Staff.3. Deputy Assistant Quarter-Master-General, or other officer leading His Majesty's Escort.4. Troops of His Majesty's Escort. The arrangement of these is a matter for the Adjutant-General, but the usual scheme is—<ol style="list-style-type: none">(a) cavalry,(b) artillery,(c) main body of cavalry. |
|-------------|-----|-----|---|---|

All mounted—*cont d.*

Some in carriages and some mounted ;
but this difference not effect order of pro-
cession.

5. Staff of His Majesty's Escort.
6. General Officer Commanding His Majesty's Escort.
7. His Excellency the Naval Commander-in-Chief and Staff.
8. Army Staff.
9. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.
10. State trumpeters.
- 11.* Body-Guard and Imperial Cadet Corps.
12. The Governor-General's Staff.
13. His Majesty's Staff.
14. The High Officers of State in attendance on His Majesty.
15. HIS MAJESTY attended by the Governor-General.
16. HER MAJESTY and Lady Hardinge (in a carriage or carriages).
17. Body-Guard and completion of His Majesty's Escort.
18. Ruling Chiefs, each with their own escorts.
19. Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Members of the Governor-General's Council, &c., each with their own escorts, in proper order of precedence.
20. Cavalry.
21. Police.
22. Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Punjab.

V. GABRIEL,—22-2-11.

* Their relative order, a thorny question, is a matter for subsequent consideration.

SCHEME B.

1. Marshal.
2. Inspector-General of Police and Staff.

PART 1.—RULING CHIEFS' PROCESSION.

Ruling Chiefs mounted and in carriages, commencing with those of lowest rank, each with his own escort.

PART 2.—HIS MAJESTY'S PROCESSION.

3. Officer leading His Majesty's Escort.
4. Troops of His Majesty's Escort.
5. Staff of His Majesty's Escort.
6. General Officer Commanding His Majesty's Escort.
7. Commander-in-Chief and Army Head-Quarters Staff.
8. State Trumpeters.
9. Body-Guard and Imperial Cadet Corps.
10. Governor-General's Staff.
11. His Majesty's Staff.
12. High Officers of State.
13. HIS MAJESTY attended by the Governor-General (riding).
14. HER MAJESTY and Lady Hardinge (carriage).
15. Body-Guard and Escort.

This arrangement is based on the supposition that His Majesty will ride and Her Majesty drive.

A. H. McMAHON.

PART 3.—OFFICIALS' PROCESSION.

16. Marshal.
17. Troops.
18. Governors of Madras and Bombay, each with his own staff and escort.

19. Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab with his own staff and escort.
 20. Lieutenant-Governors, Naval Commander-in-Chief, Chief Justice of Bengal, Bishop of Calcutta, Members of Council, &c., in their proper order and with their staffs and escorts.
 21. Troops.
 22. Police.

V. GABRIEL,—22-2-11.

SCHEME C.

Mounted Procession ...	{	Police.
		His Majesty's Escort.
		Governor-General's Staff.
		His Majesty's Staff.
		HIS MAJESTY and the Governor-General followed by those Chiefs and Governors who are mounted.
Carriage Procession ...	{	His Majesty's Escort.
		HER MAJESTY.
		Lady Hardinge.
		Escort.
		Ruling Chiefs.
		Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, &c.
		Troops.
Police.		

V. GABRIEL,—22-2-11.

IMPERIAL CADET CORPS.

Twenty or twenty-five Cadets in fours or even in twos make a very poor show in a large procession. If the number is increased to fifty or sixty, however, there are sufficient to make a good show and the Corps will become one of the finest feature of the procession.

V. GABRIEL,—22-2-11.

I discussed the procession arrangements with Colonel Maxwell.

We came to the conclusion that it would be quite impossible to put the Chiefs in the procession in front of the Viceroy with their retinues if they were to be on the railway station to meet His Majesty, as it would be impossible for them to get out to their places in time.

His Majesty might take up a certain amount of time in inspecting the Guard-of-Honour, &c., on the railway station, but, even so, the distances of some of the Chiefs' horses or carriages from the station would be great. It would of course be possible to marshal the Chiefs' part of the procession in the Queen's Garden opposite to the station, so that they can get to their horses and enter their carriages quickly. But, even so, it seems doubtful whether arrangements could be made for them to get out without a scramble or without delaying His Majesty's departure.

The same difficulty would probably occur if they were behind the King in the procession with retinues, as it would take a long time for the latter to move up and the procession would have passed most of the way round the course before some of the Chiefs had even started.

The same applies to the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors if they have their escorts in the procession.

It is to be remembered that in 1903 the elephant procession was arranged so that the elephants were drawn up on both sides of the Queen's Road facing inwards, and the Viceroy passed up through them before they moved off, thus giving time for the Chiefs to mount and for the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, &c., to get to their places in the procession.

We came to the conclusion therefore that, if the Chiefs are to be in the procession at all, the only way of doing it will be for them to ride or drive without their retinues. Their horses

and carriages could be drawn up in the Queen's Garden opposite to the station and the procession could easily move on while the King was inspecting the Guard-of-Honour, &c., at the station.

It appeared to us, however, that everything would be very much simplified and improved if the procession were that of the Viceroy alone and if the Chiefs and Governors were omitted from it altogether.

If the Chiefs have to be at the station at all, the best solution, therefore, would be to have a procession of the King and his Staff and Escort only and allow the Chiefs to have their own little processions afterwards passing round the processional route. This would afford an excellent tamasha for the people and would no doubt gratify the Chiefs as it would allow them each to make his own characteristic display.

This was what was done at Agra in 1906-07 at the station at the State arrival of the Viceroy, and on that occasion in order to avoid difficulties of precedence, the Chiefs' processions were sent off from the station by different routes to their various camps.

The question then for the Foreign Department to decide is, having eliminated the possibility of the Chiefs taking part in the King's procession, each with his own retinue, whether it will be better for them to ride, say, four abreast without their retinues in the same way as the European Kings did at His late Majesty's funeral, or whether they should have their own separate processions after that of the King, passing round the same route with their full sawari.

The Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, &c., will of course be treated in the same way.

The latter seems to be the simplest solution and, judging from past experience, one which the Chiefs themselves will be likely to prefer. That, however, is a question for the Foreign Department.

Of course, another solution of the difficulty will be not to have any Chiefs or Governors at the railway station at all but to have them all in the pavilion on the Ridge, as proposed by Sir David Barr. Then there will be no question as to which alternative should be adopted, and the procession would obviously be that of His Majesty alone.

The only objection I see to this is that the Chiefs will be deprived of taking part in the procession and the populace will not have the extra tamasha which their processions afford.

I understand that Their Highnesses the Native Members of the Committee attach considerable importance to the Chiefs appearing in procession with His Majesty and along the same route as His Majesty on the occasion of the State entry.

V. GABRIEL,—2-3-11.

DEMI-OFFICIAL.

No. 1167, dated Calcutta, the $\frac{9}{10}$ th March 1911.

From—LIEUTENANT-COLONEL F. A. MAXWELL, V.C., D.S.O., Military Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy,

To—The HON'BLE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL SIR A. H. McMAHON, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

Herewith a rough plan of the "King's procession" prepared after discussing it with you, and now approved by the Viceroy. His Excellency has decided that Members of his Executive Council, the Chief Justice and the Metropolitan should not be in the procession, but that after being presented to the King on his arrival at the station, they should find their way back to the Ridge, or to Camp, as considered most suitable.

2. In view of the opinion so strongly expressed to you by Jaipur (and known to be held by other Chiefs also), that Ruling Chiefs, rather than * ride in the King's procession without their retinues, would prefer to be elsewhere with them, the Viceroy agrees to your proposal that after the Royal procession there should follow another separate one composed of Territorial Groups, each self-contained and including its Governor (Lieutenant-Governor or Agent to the Governor-General, &c., as the case may be), Staff and Chiefs, and each settling for itself its mode of progression, *i.e.*, whether in carriages, riding elephants, or on horseback.

The Viceroy would be glad if you would send the scheme for the Royal and Territorial processions to Sir John Hewett for his consideration, and comment, if necessary. His Excellency does not think it need go before the Committee.