

A Statement.

Relative to the different Appointments which can in any way be supposed to have been the Appointments of Officers from other Regiments into the Blues; from the earliest periods to which any official Documents reach.

1 June 1708 - Captain George Walker - to be Captain - to bear date 1705/6.

22nd March 1711 - Andrew Percival Esq. - to be Captain of the Troop whereof Captain Pray (now made Lieut. Colonel to the Marquis of Hardwick's Regiment) was Captain.

31st January 1712 - Greenhill Woodger Esq. to be Captain in the room of Lieut. Colonel John Roushet.

3rd March 1712 - Capt. Rupert Browne to be Captain of the Troop whereof M. G. Wroth was late Captain.

Observations

The instances here brought forward shew that four Officers bearing the Rank of Captain and five Gentlemen from civil Life were at various periods appointed to Troops in the Royal Horse Guards. Although it is not stated from what Corps the former were removed yet it may be presumed from the Rank they held that they were transferred from Troops or Companies in other Regiments, and therefore such precedents shew of themselves that no right of Regimental succession was acknowledged

19th Nov: 1712. Mr: James Hawkins
to be Captain vice Backwell
resigned -

15th May 1717. Cornet Carey to
be Captain vice Hawkins.

2nd July 1717. Colonel George
Fielding to be Captain vice
Marsham deceased -

5th Sept. 1722 - The Earl of March
to be Captain vice Carey deceased.

11th March 1728. Lord George
Broucker to be Captain vice
Lord W^m Broucker

12th Dec^r 1728 - Lieutenant John
Lloyd, from Sabine's Regiment vice
Caldwell put upon 1/2 Pay.

30th April 1734 - Capt. James
Maddan vice Lord Nassau Pautette

7 May 1734 - Ensign Theodore
Hoste from the 3^d Foot Guards to
be Lieut: vice R. Cooke

29th Nov: 1750 - Major J. Johnston
from 1/2 pay of the late 4th Troop of
Horse Guards, to be Major, in the
room of Major Sir J. Chamberlaine
preferred -

acknowledged to exist in The
Regiment - and the introduction
of Gentlemen from civil Life
shows that no consideration
whatever was given to The Military
claims of The Officers of The Blues.

This is a direct precedent in
support of the late Promotions given
out of The Regiment

It may be presumed that this is
also the removal of a Captain
from another Corps.

Another direct precedent against
the present pretensions of the Royal
Regiment of Horse Guards. -

- do - already mentioned
by The Duke of York to The
Duke of Northumberland.

24th April 1755 - D'Arcy Hepden,
or Hebdens, from $\frac{1}{2}$ pay of the 14th Troop
of Horse Guards to be Captain
vice Migt deceased. -

Another precedent against the
pretensions of the Blues. -

N.B. This last is only from an
old Army List of 1755. -

6 Oct. 1812 - The Hon^{ble} Charles
Murray from the $\frac{1}{2}$ pay of the
28th Light Dragoons to be Captain,

ditto

6th Oct. 1812 - Henry Arthur
Mogennis Gent. to be Cornet

Appointed through the Commander in
Chief's recommendation in the same
manner as Cornets Elley &
Cumberland in 1793/4 and as Cornet
Parker had been in 1805.

Observations

The entries in The War Office
Books previous to the end of 1728,
appear to be so irregularly stated,
as not to make it possible to
distinguish The Officers, who were
promoted in The Regiment, from
those who might be appointed
from other Corps. -

It would, however, appear,
that all The Officers mentioned
previous to 1717, were not appointed
from

It would appear from this
that The Corps never could have
enjoyed any such privilege -
otherwise

from other Reg^{ts}, but had the Commission of Captain at once, without having held any previous Commission --

This would appear also, the case with the Earl of March, (Father to the late Duke of Richmond).

It appears that the Colonel Fielding, appointed Captain 2^d July 1717, was a Cornet in the Regiment in the Year 1703, and therefore probably got his Troop by Promotion in the Regiment.

And it would appear as if Capt. Madden was appointed from the Regiment on the 2^d April 1724, to the 1st Regiment of Horse, and brought back again in 1734 to the Regiment.

It is to be observed, that at the time the late General Johnstone (then Major) was appointed to the Regiment from

the

otherwise so little consideration could not have been given to the pretensions of the Officers as to supersede them at once by Individuals from Civil Life - which certainly must be considered more grating to the feelings than to be superseded by Military Men.

If Colonel Fielding got his Troop in regular succession it shows that a discretion was exercised by the Sovereign at that period as well, as the present, according to the pretensions of the Individuals.

This case would of itself put the Blues upon a footing with the Lins in regard to promotion by showing that Officers were promoted from & to that Corps according to discretion.

If the Royal Horse Guards ever enjoyed the privileges which are claimed they could not have been deprived of them because

the $\frac{1}{2}$ pay of the 4th Troop of reduced Horse Guards, 29 Nov. 1750, there was neither any Colonel, nor Lieutenant Colonel to the Reg^t: the Regiment having remained vacant from the Death of the Duke of Richmond in August 1750: - and it was in consequence of the ^{death of the} late Lt Colonel Jenkinson, that Major Johnston was appointed to The Majority vice Sir James Chamberlaine, appointed Lieutenant Colonel. -

It has been said, that the appointment of Captain Murray from $\frac{1}{2}$ pay to the Regiment, and of Mr. Magennis, was occasioned by its being an augmentation of Officers; and therefore that the Officers of the Corps had no reason to expect the indulgence of a general promotion through the Regiment to Two Troops. - There have, however, been two augmentations of Officers

because no Colonel was upon the strength of the Regiment. Had such been the case it would shew that the advantages of a Corps must depend upon the personal consideration due to a Colonel - which is a principle it would be difficult to justify. -

In this respect the pretensions of the Royal Horse Guards were considered upon the same principle as would have been applied to any other Regiment under similar circumstances. One of the standing of Officers in succession gave them a claim to the whole of the augmentation with reference to the general pretensions of the Service they would have obtained in the Blues or any other Corps in the Service. - - In the

Officers during the time His Grace, the late Duke of Richmond, was Colonel of the Regiment, and His Royal Highness The Duke of York Commander in Chief.

The first in 1799, when all the Promotions went in the Regiment: and The Duke of Richmond was permitted to recommend all the new Cornets upon that Occasion.

The second in 1803, when the Troops were taken from the Field Officers. In this instance, the three eldest Subalterns were appointed to all the three Troops: and The Duke of Richmond was again indulged with the recommendation of all the Cornets appointed upon this

occasion, viz. Messrs. Terry, & Farrier were appointed by purchase. Besides Farrier & Napier. Besides

His late Grace was always indulged with the appointment

the instances of augmentation here alluded to, it will appear that the Officers of the Blues were upon an equality of Service with the Subalterns throughout the Cavalry Service at that time. — The augmentation was general throughout the whole Cavalry Regiments of the Service — and therefore no occasion offered for bringing an Officer into the Blues as all other Regiments equally afforded opportunities for promotion & removals of Officers from $\frac{1}{2}$ pay.

At present the case is quite different — The augmentation granted to the Blues was not general throughout the Service, — and the claims of Lieut. Jett (tho' he may be senior to an Officer who formerly succeeded upon an augmentation) bear no comparison with those of other Subalterns of Cavalry — and the opportunity therefore offered a fair occasion for bringing an Officer from $\frac{1}{2}$ pay — which was done also in the case of each Reg^t of the Life Guards by the Prince Regent himself without the recommendation of the Colonel. The Duke of Richmond therefore had no indulgence that was not given to other Colonels & Corps upon that occasion — as the particular case suggested.

The Duke of Richmond was not so indulged — From July 1795

to all the Cornets vacant, without purchase, during the whole time he was Colonel: And, upon his recommendation, the following Cornets were all appointed without any interference whatever, viz.
 Messrs Foster, Berkeley, Lamb, Parker & Hill

1795. to December 1805, a period of nearly 12 years, there appears to have been only 6 Cornets given in The Indies without purchase. Five of them were at the recommendation of His Grace - but Mr. Parker was appointed by The Com^{rs} in Chief's sole recommendation to The King according to the request of Lord Milton as stated in the accompanying Copy of a Letter from His Lordship to The Duke of York: -
 If any such Privilege as is now assumed then existed it would have been violated in this instance at least - and no person would have been more tenacious of such violation than The Duke of Richmond - yet His Grace offered no objection or observation upon the subject - Nor did Marshall Conway, The Duke's immediate Predecessor, offer any remonstrance against the Appointments of Capt. Harcourt and Cornets Elley and Cumberland. -

It has been said, that one cause of the Appointment of Captain Murray from the 1/2 Pay

Although an Officer is eligible to promotion when he shall have served Three Years

as

Pay, was owing to Lieutenant Jebb, the eldest Lieutenant of the Regiment, being too young an Officer to be promoted to the Command of a Troop - To this objection there are two very forcible answers.

Imprimis - By the standing Orders of the Army, issued by His Royal Highness the present Commander in Chief, every Officer may be appointed a Captain who has served for three Years - and,

Secondly - upon the very last augmentation in 1803, Lieutenant Horsley, who was appointed to one of the Troops, had been less time in the Army than Lieutenant Jebb: - as was also the case in the instance of the late Captain Fenwick, who has just quitted the Regiment - the Dates of their ^{several} Commissions being as follows, vizt.

	Cornet	Lieut.	Capt.
John Horsley	24 May 1799	2 May 1800	25 June 1803
G. A. Fenwick	2 July 1803	9 June 1804	12 June 1806
John Jebb	10 March 1808	11 May 1800	Capt. Murray app. 6 Oct. 1812

as a Subaltern, yet it by no means follows that he should have a claim upon such grounds to succession without purchase, because he has been accidentally brought to the head of His Rank in his own Regt. Such eligibility goes little further than to facilitate a young Officer's promotion by purchase - But when the vacancy is without purchase, it becomes a matter of discretion whether or not, according to the circumstances of the case, the promotion shall be given to the Officer in succession, or to another candidate; and as Lieutenant Jebb is but a Lieutenant of 1809, and as he appeared to have obtained four steps in the Regiment since December 1811 - it was conceived that he could not suffer any grievance upon the score of His Military pretensions by having an Officer brought in for 42 Pay for the vacant Troop; as in awaiting another vacancy.

From

From this it appears that Lieutenant Jebb is an older Officer & Lieutenant, than either Hensley or Fenwick were when they were promoted to Troops - in addition to the standing Order of the Army being in favor of Lieutenant Jebb. -

A fact ^{has} likewise been stated positively, to me; which appears very strong, in favor of the Blues being promoted to vacant Commissions, without any Officer being brought in from another Regiment; for I have been assured that, upon its being intended long ago to appoint Capt Davis, late of the Life Guards, to a Troop in the Blues, His present Majesty was graciously pleased to put a stop to such Appointment; and declared that no Officer from another Regiment should be appointed to The Blues. Captain Davies can best state, whether

This circumstance was never mentioned directly or indirectly to The Commander in Chief - and as it is not denied that it has been an invariable rule for The Officers holding that Commission always to submit Promotions and Appointments in The Blues to The King, it is to be presumed that had the Appointment been really in agitation, He would have been apprised of it.

whether this Fact is true or not.

It is to be hoped, that the conduct of the present Officers belonging to the Regiment, has not been such, as to merit the present great Deviation from the indulgence, which, by the above account it appears they have certainly enjoyed, with hardly any exception, for upwards of Eighty Years, and, from the Year 1755, without a single instance to the contrary, till on the present Occasion.

It has never been intended to cast any imputation upon the conduct of the Officers of the Blues. — On the contrary every Consideration consistent with the usages of the Service has been afforded them to which they were so justly entitled — But it is expressly denied that this Statement has proved that they have enjoyed an undeviating right of succession, or that the Colonels have enjoyed the exclusive recommendation to original Commissions — It would have been fair in this Statement to have acknowledged those instances wherein the practice has been at variance with the principle now for the first time assumed: — Instead of no "single instance to the contrary having occurred since the year 1755 till on the present occasion" — it will appear, as formerly observed — that
Captain

Captain Harcourt in the year 1704 was removed to The Blues and that Cornets Elley and Cumberland and Parker were appointed by The King to their original Commissions at the recommendation of The Commander in Chief, without any interference whatever on the part of The Colonel - and so few instances of such having been the case, is a sufficient proof of the indulgence which has been extended to such a distinguished Corps: - It was never contemplated that a course of such indulgence could have been construed into a matter of right - without any one Occurrence to shew that a privilege of such a Nature was ever conferred upon The Royal Horse Guards.

The Duke of
Northumberland

Decr. 1812.

(On the Claim of certain
Rights as Colonel of
The Blues, to name to
The Commission in the
Regiment.)