

## INCREASE AND BETTER ORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY.

JANUARY 29, 1855.—Laid upon the table, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, made the following

### REPORT.

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was recommitted House bill No. 615, entitled "A bill for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes," have, according to order, had the same under consideration; and, having availed themselves of the oral testimony and written views of several distinguished and intelligent officers of the army, in maturing the details of the bill, they respectfully submit the same to the House, and ask that the accompanying testimony and letters may be printed.

#### *Memorandum of the order of papers.*

1. Winfield Scott's testimony.
2. Letter of General Jesup.
3. Letter of General Totten.
4. Letters of Adjutant General Cooper and Judge Advocate Lee.
5. Letter of General Lawson.
6. Letter of General Gibson.
7. Letter of Colonel Craig.
8. Letter of Colonel Abert.
9. Letter of Major Mordecai.
10. Letter of Captain Maynadier.

## MILITARY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*Examination of Major General Winfield Scott, of the U. S. Army, on the subject of its reorganization.*

WEDNESDAY, January 3, 1854.

Question by Mr. Faulkner, chairman of the committee: What, in your opinion, should be the strength of the army of the United States at this time, in view of our extensive seaboard and foreign frontier; our present and prospective relations with the Indian tribes of the West, and the protection due to our several routes of emigration?

Answer. The increase in the strength of the army, as provided for in the bill submitted by the War Department, now under consideration by the committee, I deem highly necessary. The bill proposes that there shall be two additional regiments of infantry and two of cavalry. This is, I consider, the minimum force that is essential to be added to the army to protect the frontiers against the hostilities of Indians, the present force on the frontiers being entirely inadequate for that purpose. In Texas, the Indian hostilities have been more destructive than at other points, principally on account of the small force stationed in that country. The troops are constantly engaged in encounters with hostile Indians, and the loss of men, when successful, is always in the inverse ratio of our inferior numbers. Hence the proposed increase, simply in reference to Indian frontiers, seems to be dictated by considerations both of policy and humanity, in order that adequate protection may be afforded to our border inhabitants without a useless sacrifice of our brave detachments.

The increase proposed, of two regiments of infantry and two of cavalry, organized like the present forces, and characterized by the like zeal and activity, would, in my opinion, give reasonable protection to our frontiers and overland immigrants.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: Is the proposed increase essential to the present exigencies of the country, without any reference to the probabilities of a foreign war?

Answer. This addition has no reference to war with any foreign power. If such event were anticipated, it is presumed that ten or fifteen times as many regiments would be called for.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: How many companies are there at present on the seacoast of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico?

Answer. But twelve—two of which are at Boston; none east of Boston; two at New York; none between Boston and New York; two at Old Point Comfort; two at Charleston; none on the Savannah; one at Pensacola; one at Key West; and none at New Orleans.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: By the bill now before me the artillery has been reduced two regiments. Is it the idea, by this reduction, to confine that corps to duties on the seaboard?

Answer. The Secretary of War, after a full conference, has allowed me humbly to suggest to the committee (and neither presumes on

more than a suggestion) that that part of the original bill contemplating a reduction in the present artillery be struck out, or that the artillery be left as it is. I would here remark, that it is not intended to withdraw any of the forces from the frontiers until the latter shall be tranquillised. The original bill recommended by the Secretary, provided for four additional regiments of infantry. This number, it is suggested, may be reduced to two if the artillery remain as at present.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: What number of privates and non-commissioned officers should constitute a company in a regiment?

Answer. The Secretary of War and myself are agreed in suggesting the advantages of a *sliding scale*, placing it at the discretion of the President to increase and diminish the number of privates in a company to any number between sixty-four and one hundred, according to the varying exigencies of the service.

In the cavalry no more than sixty-four privates to a company, fit for duty and actually present, are necessary; and it is not to be presumed that the President would authorize the increase of a company of cavalry more beyond the minimum than to provide for unavoidable cases of absence. This sliding scale might vary the number of the rank and file a little more than 33 per cent.

One difficulty which this suggestion would obviate is this: We can never bring the numbers per company (and consequently not those of the army) up to the full extent. If, for instance, the legal complement be ten thousand men, we can never have on the muster and pay rolls more than eight thousand five hundred. If the legal establishment be limited to twelve thousand men, ten thousand would probably be our nearest approach, and so on.

Under the law, we never can recruit up to the maximum, from the fear that we may exceed it. On any given day the government must always be months behind in its knowledge of the deaths and desertions which have occurred at all the distant posts, and with detachments of recruits in route to join those posts. As we cannot assume an average number of casualties in advance, for they vary exceedingly, we are obliged to fall considerably below in order not to exceed the law by a single man. Hence, under the proposed augmentation and the discretion given to the President, the establishment might be set down at 19,000 privates; yet, for the reasons mentioned, we should never have on the pay-rolls at the same time more than 15,500, and *present, fit for duty*, 14,800.

A sliding scale, from 64 to 100 privates in a company, qualified to apply only to companies on remote frontiers, has existed since the beginning of General Taylor's administration. We, army officers, are fully persuaded that a similar provision, applicable to all companies, is equally needed, and I cannot foresee any danger of abuse from the grant of the power.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: Does the increase of regiments, as proposed, make any improper increase in the number of officers?

Answer. The bill takes twenty-eight captains from the Quartermaster's department, eight from the Adjutant General's department, and eight from the Subsistence department; it reduces all the captains

and lieutenants in the ordnance and topographical corps, which makes it necessary to transfer these officers to other regiments, which would make no increase of the *personnel*, but would merely change designations.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: What policy dictates the taking of these officers you have mentioned from the corps stated?

Answer. In the army list, under the head of Quartermaster's department twenty-eight captains, and under the head of Adjutant General's department eight captains, and in the Subsistence department eight other captains, are permanently designated as assistants. Many of these officers are peculiarly adapted for the duties appertaining to their positions respectively; but a few not. Those unfitted for their present positions may be admirably adapted to other duties, whilst other officers belonging to regiments may be just the persons, in point of peculiar adaptation, to fill staff positions. The bill, therefore, by destroying the permanency of such designations, gives a choice amongst the whole army for selections and interchanges according to the development of peculiar talents and accomplishments.

These changes of officers meet generally with the approbation of the army. There are many topographical engineers who would, under the bill, be transferred to the corps of engineers, and these, it is presumed, would be content; whilst there are captains and lieutenants of ordnance, as well as of topographical engineers, who would dislike very much a transfer to the artillery or infantry. Some would abhor it. I do not, however, particularly blame them for accidental preferences; but no reform can be effected without offending interests as well as prejudices. I do not admit that a transfer, in any case, could be called a sacrifice. The topographical engineers was, at first, an anomaly. There ought to be but the corps of engineers. The cause for creating the topographical corps was, we wanted additional officers for surveys, for river and harbor improvements, &c., &c., on which they have been employed with great benefit to the country. The engineers proper were then all employed in the construction of permanent fortifications. Now, the engineers proper, like the topographical engineers, are alike employed on these civil works. There is, then, no necessity for two corps. I do not think there is any particular hardship in transferring captains and lieutenants from one branch of the service into another, according to adaptation. All corps in the army are alike respectable. Juniors of the artillery may, among themselves, imagine that the artillery is more respectable than the infantry, for example; or the ordnance officers, that they are better than their brothers of the artillery, &c.; but seniors always parentally rebuke all disparagements of corps and arms of service. Hence we say all are alike useful, respectable, and honorable, and that there is no violation of honor or right in transfers called for by the good of the service. Some staff officers may be afraid they may be sent to distant and disagreeable posts; hence they dislike the contemplated reorganization. The power should nevertheless exist, to send any officer anywhere required by the good of the service. We should have the power of selecting the men who are best qualified for particular duties, from the whole army. All power, no doubt, is liable to abuse;

and this power as little as any. The grounds are small for apprehending mischief. The army, generally, will be glad of the change, and hope it may be made.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: Why do you propose to confine the details for ordnance officers to the artillery?

Answer. At West Point the graduates who have the highest distinction are generally placed in the engineers, the next in the ordnance, the next in the topographical engineers, and the next in the artillery. None but high graduates are placed in the latter. The ordnance is a scientific corps, and so is the artillery, so that by confining details to the artillery you are sure to get a good ordnance officer. Let it not be understood, however, that all high graduates of the academy prefer the corps in the order mentioned. Some of the finest intellects of that school are now in the infantry—placed in it because they did not excel in particular branches of study—mathematics, mechanical philosophy, &c. One of my aid-de-camps, an infantry officer, was one of the best scholars of his day; but his *forte* was not the exact sciences.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: What is your opinion of the increase of brigadiers general, provided for by the bill?

Answer. I think they are needed. The considerations which have suggested an increase are these: We have five geographical military departments for the convenience of command, inspections, &c. The country on the Pacific, including Utah, is one; New Mexico the second; Texas is the third; the country not embraced in those departments, and west of the Mississippi, is the fourth; and all on this side of the Mississippi is the fifth. The idea is to have a brigadier general for each of those geographical departments; one for the Quartermaster's department, (which would, no doubt, be as at present;) to make the Adjutant General a brigadier general, his rank at present being that of colonel. It is very proper that he should be a brigadier general. The other two the War Department wishes to make inspectors general—not having any direct command of troops, but to make the tour of all the military posts once a year, which would be as much as they could do. They would observe defects, wants, &c., and report promptly upon them. The bill provides, in addition to the foregoing, for a brigadier general of engineers. These brigadiers are highly necessary to the good of the service. It will be better executed with the increase. Two full regiments have always constituted a brigade in the regular service. With the proposed increase, the army would consist of nine brigades and a half, besides the engineers. Taking into consideration the proposed distribution of the brigadiers, and supposing each to be constantly in health, the number would be rather below the wants of the service.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: What is your opinion as to the number of Assistant Adjutants General, as contained in the original bill submitted by the department?

Answer. I satisfied the Secretary of War that eight Assistant Adjutants General were actually necessary for the exigencies of the service, and he authorized me to suggest to the committee the substitution of eight instead of the seven in the original bill.

Mr. Faulkner: General Scott, state to the committee any other changes which occur to you as proper in the bill.

General Scott: The duty of supplying clothing to the troops has for some twelve years been confided to the Quartermaster's department of the staff; it was formerly in the hands of a Commissary General of Purchases. It is proposed to transfer it to the commissariat, (Subsistence department,) to relieve the Quartermaster General, whose department is overburdened with that superadded duty; whereas the Commissariat of Subsistence, with a little aid from the line, would be fully competent to execute the extra duty.

There is a suggested change in the bill as originally submitted, that the words "in cases not provided for in the 98th article of war" be inserted in the 10th section, after the words, "the following rules shall regulate the command and rank officer."

[Here follows 98th article of war.]

This article was adopted in 1775—before the Declaration of Independence—and is a necessary part of the code regulating rank. I also suggested an addition to the end of the rule of rank prescribed in the bill to prevent a junior officer, by virtue of his brevet, being placed, by assignment of the President, above his senior by brevet. Nature does not more abhor a vacuum, than senior officers abhor being placed under the command of a junior.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: State your opinion of the importance of brevet appointments in the army.

Answer. I have always been looked upon in the army as a *stickler* for brevet rank. I am not a brevet officer at this time; I have been. I am persuaded that it gives to government the means of stimulating its officers to the highest deeds of valor and other distinguished conduct.

In a republican government there can be but few rewards for great services. Of these, the system of brevets may be regarded as the principal. It is wonderful how the hope of winning a brevet stirs the souls of young officers, and, indeed, of officers not so young. On the field, when about to engage the enemy, it is common to hear officers, in the act of drawing swords, exclaim, "Here goes for a brevet to-day."

Under judicious legislation, such as this bill proposes, the rule governing brevet rank is so simplified that heart-burnings could scarcely ever be created by bestowing that reward on officers specially distinguishing themselves.

In commenting upon a section of the bill relative to service rations, General Scott said:

I had nothing to do with the provision in the bill relative to service rations. The Secretary of War inserted that without consultation with me. In 1839, by the permission of the Secretary, I prepared an amendment for the consideration of the Military Committee of the House, providing for an additional ration for every five years' service as a *service* ration, which amendment I handed to a member of that committee, who informed me that the committee had agreed to report it, but that the chairman would probably (in the House) speak against and kill it.



You, sir, (addressing Colonel Benton,) were the occupant then of a position which I believe you held for twenty years—that of chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate—and my amendment met with your approval.

When the friend in the House committee found that his chairman (a great economist) would oppose the amendment in the House, he induced the committee to send for me to meet them, and to overcome the objection of the chairman. In discussing the proposition with him, he very gruffly demanded of me, "Have you not pay enough?" I replied, "Yes; strike the general officers out;" and it was done. Thus it is that all officers have since received the service ration except general officers.

The reason of the Secretary of War for placing in this bill generals on the same footing with other officers in respect to service rations, is this: If the bill should pass, general officers will be as liable as others to be placed on the retired list, and without service rations. A major general would receive, in the whole, less money than a colonel on the same list.

Mr. Faulkner called the attention of General Scott to that provision of the bill which related to the suspension of an officer's rations when absent from his post over a certain time, and requested his opinion upon it.

Remarks of General Scott in reply: It is difficult sometimes to get officers back to their regiments as promptly as is wished. Indeed, this difficulty, some years since, necessitated an order similar to the provision in the bill, from which the idea is borrowed. The bill gives an officer ample time, according to distance, to return to his duties. If his leave exceeds that time, it seems reasonable that his *rations* (not *pay*) should be stopped.

Question by Mr. Faulkner: State your opinion as to the expediency of a retired list for the army.

Answer. I think highly of it. We have some forty-odd officers rendered, by diseases, wounds, or premature old age, unfit for active duty. There are some who are from five to seventeen years my seniors: some of high rank, three as low as captain, and perhaps two as low as lieutenant. They are, nearly all, officers who have served most honorably, and continue to be gentlemen of high moral worth; but they impede promotions and the activity and efficiency of the service. Their retirement would greatly improve the army.

No injustice can be done any one, as there are two checks in the way. In the first place, the board for the examination of cases for retirement is a check; and in the next the Senate, which has the confirmation of the successors to the retired officers. We have, then, a double security against injustice.

I consider the additional section, limiting the time for placing officers on the retired list to one year, as very proper. The necessity for a renewal of the power to retire officers would hardly arise more than once in every fifteen years. Indeed, it would take fifteen or twenty years to accumulate a sufficient number of infirm officers to make it necessary to invoke Congress to renew the power of retiring them.

Question. State more in detail the views which caused you to differ from the Secretary of War as to the expediency of reducing the regiments of artillery.

Answer. In the conversation which I had with the Secretary, I regretted the proposed reduction of two regiments of artillery. We conversed freely on the subject, and differed; but finally, we so far approximated that he paid me the compliment to say that he had more confidence in my opinion, with reference to artillery, than he had in his own. In this connexion, let me say that the Secretary was bred in the infantry and cavalry, and was indeed an excellent officer in both. I was bred an artillerist, and on that account, I suppose, he deferred to my judgment on this point.

Our country has now nearly finished an excellent system of defence on the Atlantic and Gulf seaboard by fortifications, on which a great amount of money has been expended, which all military men have become more persuaded are necessary. Each of these fortifications requires small garrisons in time of peace, to keep them in order and save them from dilapidation. The artillery should garrison these fortifications; but we have been obliged to withdraw and send the artillery into the Indian countries.

The artillery has made, in the field, excellent infantry and light infantry. Willing, then, as they have ever been, to do any duty, in peace and in war, which has been assigned them, why should they be deprived of the name in which they have gained distinction?

The cadets who excelled in artillery duty at West Point are made officers in the artillery, and are adapted to that duty, and also make excellent infantry. Seven-eighths of them are now engaged as infantry. In Mexico I often had occasion to witness their excellent conduct with both arms.

Its members have never said, when required to face Mexicans or Indians, "We cannot fight with muskets—we are artillerists."

The chance of returning to their position as artillerists in our permanent forts, so long as their name remains unchanged, cheers them wherever they are—in the swamps of Florida or wilds of Texas.

Mr. Thomas M. Howe, a member of the committee, called the attention of General Scott to that clause of the bill reducing the officers of the ordnance corps, and asked if it would not be doing injustice to those officers, who would, by virtue of a special act of Congress, be entitled to a captaincy after fourteen years' continuous service in that corps, and who, if this bill passed, by being transferred to other regiments, would lose their right to promotion under that act, and by that means be placed some ways behindhand in the line of promotion?

General Scott said: That promotion in the army was effected, more or less, by the stations of the different regiments or corps; that promotion was of course quicker in regiments which were posted at remote, exposed, and uncomfortable stations, where the mortality was greater. As an example in point, officers in the 6th infantry who graduated three or four years after officers in the 4th infantry, are now ahead of the latter in the line of promotion, for the reason that the 4th infantry had generally had pleasant stations, whilst the 6th were for the same time in distant and uncomfortable posts, resulting



in more deaths and resignations. The one made up in pleasantness of service, what the other gained by promotion in service of roughness and hardship.

It is true that, on account of stagnant promotion in the staff corps, Congress recently passed an act giving captaincies to lieutenants therein for fourteen years' service. There was the error, and not in this bill, rendering some of the staff officers liable to be transferred. That provision should have been general. If there was a necessity for it, its provisions, in fairness, should have been extended to the regiments. The officers of staff corps have very generally been engaged on the most pleasant duties, with higher pay and emoluments; while the captains and lieutenants of regiments have generally been at remote, uncomfortable, and unhealthy stations, thus gaining, by mortality and resignations, a quicker promotion.

Reverse the positions of these officers, and no doubt the captains and lieutenants of the staff corps would have performed every duty of the line as cheerfully, gallantly, and efficiently as their brothers. I know them well. They also are capable of braving every hardship and every danger; but those hardships and those dangers have, in fact, and from the circumstances, been actually and more generally met and overcome by the captains and lieutenants of the marching regiments.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, *January 2, 1855.*

SIR: I have been requested by the Secretary of War to present directly to you, as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, my views in relation to the several provisions of the bill reported by you on the 4th instant, for the increase and better organization, &c., of the army; and understanding that it is in accordance with your own wishes that I should do so, I most respectfully present the following remarks:

In relation to the 1st section of the bill, it is proper to observe that our army, spread, as it is, in small detachments over a territory embracing twenty-four degrees of latitude and fifty-seven degrees of longitude, is totally inadequate to the duties devolved upon it; it is in the actual performance of duties equal to those performed by any fifty thousand men in any other service in the world. Long, rapid, and expensive movements have continually to be made to make up for the want of numbers. Every man, therefore, proposed to be added by this section of the bill, will be required for the defence of our extensive frontiers; and in the event of serious Indian difficulties, a volunteer force will often be necessary in aid of the army even with that increase.

I ascribe all the Indian wars which have taken place, since the conclusion of peace with Great Britain at Ghent, to the reduction of the army in 1821. When the difficulties first occurred in relation to our northeastern boundary, Mr. Adams was obliged to withdraw the greater part of two regiments from Florida and the Creek country. Had the force then withdrawn remained among, or near to, the south-

ern Indians, we would, I believe, have avoided the Creek and Seminole wars, with all the heavy expenses attending them, and every Indian of those tribes have been long since west of the Mississippi.

As relates to the 2d section of the bill, the title of "cavalry" is the proper designation for all mounted corps; but in place of the four captains and four first lieutenants to each company of cavalry, artillery, and infantry, I would recommend that a first lieutenant be added to each company of cavalry and infantry, (there are now two first lieutenants to each company of artillery,) and that all the subordinate staff officers of every branch of the service be appointed from first lieutenants to serve in the staff for four years, unless removed by the President, or promoted to a captaincy, in which latter event the officer promoted should join his company. In what further relates to the organization of the companies, the only remark I would make is, to recommend that one of the two farriers, authorized to each company of cavalry, be a competent veterinary surgeon, and have additional pay as such.

In relation to the 3d section, I believe the service would be benefited by uniting the two corps of engineers; but I doubt whether the number of officers should be reduced. The labors of these corps have no relation to the number of the troops composing the army; but as our country, unlike the great States of Europe, whose measures of preparation and works of defence have been completed, has hardly begun to put itself in armor, or to make the surveys required for war, the officers of engineers should be numerous—fully as much so in peace as in war; for it is in peace only that permanent and durable works can be erected, or that scientific surveys can be faithfully made. But if the two corps be blended, and the proposed reduction be made, inasmuch as the officers of both corps have received equal advantages of education, and the officers of the topographical engineers are certainly equal in every respect to those of the engineers of construction, it is a matter of sheer justice that the officers be selected from both corps, and that the inefficient of both, if there are any such, be transferred to other corps of the army. More engineer soldiers are necessary. We will require at least sixty forts for the defence of our extensive maritime frontier in time of war; and those forts can be more cheaply kept in repair by the engineer soldiers, under the direction of engineer officers, than in any other mode that could be devised.

In relation to the 4th section, I would remark, that the labors of the ordnance, like those of the two corps of engineers, are as extensive and arduous in peace as in war; it is then that arms must be fabricated and every munition prepared, and that ordnance depots should be established on all the great avenues leading to the frontier. As to the reduction of the officers of the corps I would prefer to say nothing; but as this is the only corps in which it is proposed to add a considerable number of field officers, the artillery and the staff should share in the promotion, or, what would be more just, officers of the staff, holding the rank provided for, should be transferred to that corps with their field rank.

As to the 5th section, I have to remark, that so far as regards the first class of officers, having a personal interest in the matter, I can

say not a word; that the eight quartermasters will be sufficient, with the assistants provided for in other sections of the bill, for the service of the Quartermaster's department, in peace or in Indian operations, and that they should be taken from the lieutenant colonels and majors of the army; and that as to the supply of clothing, it might well be provided by the Commissary's department; but that the accountability should be with the Pay department, and the clothing accounts of the soldier should be settled every pay-day. There are paymasters enough in the army to do this duty; it can only be done efficiently by them; and if it were so done, many thousand dollars now lost would be saved to the public.

As to section 6, I have only to say that the appointments on the staff should be for four years, unless for cause they should be sooner terminated by the President; and that the officers holding commissions in the staff, particularly those who served through the Indian wars to the south, and the war with Mexico, having faithfully earned their rank, should, as a matter of absolute justice, be arranged to places in the army with the rank they actually hold. If there are not places for them all in the regiments, I recommend that they be attached as supernumeraries until vacancies occur; and that the field officers and captains be attached to the corps from which they were originally taken. One of the lieutenant colonels of the Quartermaster's department was originally in the ordnance.

The 7th and 8th sections could not be changed for the better; and as to the 9th section, it relieves the service from three absurd articles of war, which have produced more difficulty in the service than all other causes combined; and the second paragraph of the section establishes the only correct military rule for the exercise of command. In a territory so extensive as ours, there should be no doubtful authority in the military body; rank implies command, and the senior officer present, no matter of what corps, should always exercise it, and be held responsible for the service. As to the 3d paragraph of the section, I would remark that brevet commissions should not have effect either for rank or pay, unless there be other troops serving besides the regular army at the station where the brevet officer is the senior. The nation should only pay the army according to its organization, unless officers be called on to command troops not of the army, in addition to their regular command. Should the section in regard to increased pay become law, there will not be a plausible reason for the allowance of brevet pay.

The last paragraph, relating to the pay and medical officers, would be improved by allowing them, as commissioned officers, to command all non-commissioned officers and privates in the absence of other commissioned officers; and to sit on military boards, courts-martial, and courts of inquiry, according to their special or assimilated rank.

Section 10 is as it should be; and as to section 11, having a personal interest in its provisions, I can say nothing in regard to it.

As to section 12, the members of all military boards organized under its provisions should act under the solemnities of an oath, as members of courts-martial and courts of inquiry are required to act.

Of the remaining sections of the bill, I have only to say, that they seem to me to contain all the provisions and limitations required.

For my views generally in regard to the organization of the army, I respectfully refer you to a report which I made more than twenty-four years ago, which will be found in House Document No. 61, of the 2d session of the 21st Congress.—[See Appendix.]

I have the honor to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

TH. S. JESUP,

*Bvt. Maj. General, and Quartermaster General.*

Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,

*Chairman Com. on Military Affairs, Ho. of Reps.*

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT,

*Washington, January 22, 1855.*

SIR: In compliance with the wish of the Committee on Military Affairs, communicated to me by the Hon. Secretary of War, that I should express my views, in writing, in relation to the provisions of the bill reported by the committee "*for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes,*" I have the honor to present the following remarks:

Sections 1 and 2. On these sections I have no remarks to make. The necessity for an increase of the regular military force of the country seems to be generally acknowledged, and I do not know that I can make any suggestions of value, either as to the extent of augmentation or the particulars of organization proposed in these sections.

Section 3. My relation to the corps of engineers requires of me, in replying frankly to the call with which I have been honored, to remark at some length on this section.

It contains two classes. The first proposes to add to the corps of engineers, as the exigencies of the service may require, thirty officers and one company of soldiers.

The second proposes to discontinue the corps of topographical engineers, and to transfer its officers to the corps of engineers, or other corps or regiments.

*On the first clause of this section,* I have to state that for several years past I have felt it to be my duty to urge upon the War Department, and the appropriate committees of Congress, the necessity of an increase of the corps of engineers, on the following grounds mainly, viz: that the actual and proper *military* duties of its officers were becoming too numerous for them to bestow due personal presence and supervision; that this necessitated in trusting these duties, to a greater extent than is consistent with the public interest, to assistants hired, temporarily, from civil life—persons who, for want of requisite professional education and experience, are much less competent than engineer officers to discharge these duties intelligently and correctly; and that the expense of this unavoidable alternative is in fact greater, and sometimes considerably greater, than all the authorized allowances would be to officers substituted in their places. It is not strange that, with a seacoast doubled in extent within a few years, its exposed

points growing in value as well as in number, there should arise a necessity for an increase in the number of the officers whose ordinary and most important function is to provide the defences for these coasts, and, in addition, for a long line of land frontier facing the possessions of a powerful nation.

In my annual report for this year, (printed among the documents accompanying the President's message,) I have stated this question quite at large, and beg now to refer to that report for my deliberate views on the subject; merely adding, here, that for such a supervision as the public interests require of the works of fortification and other operations assigned by law to the corps of engineers, there is required, to meet an absolute and positive want, an addition of thirty officers to its members, as speedily as it can *properly be made*.

It appears, then, that the augmentation of the corps of engineers proposed in the bill is in exact accordance, as to numbers, with the present measure of our need.

Considering the grades proposed to be added by the bill, the result will be two colonels, two lieutenant colonels, and eight majors, as the field officers of the corps. I submit, however, that two colonels, four lieutenant colonels, and eight majors, would be a juster apportionment of the field officers—lessening the number of officers below the grade of major by the number (2) added to the field officers, and leaving the total proposed addition (30) unchanged. With an addition to the cost, as proposed in the bill, of \$1,667 50 per annum, every expense included, this would be an important gratification in the line of promotion; and, as I sincerely believe that encouragement, good heart, and *esprit du corps* maintained by such an organization would, as a mere matter of economy, be a material gain, I earnestly recommend this modification of the bill to the committee. And this arrangement will accord much better with the practice of nations of larger military experience than ourselves. In the English service there are in the engineers fourteen colonels, seventeen lieutenant colonels, and seventeen majors; and in the very perfect military organization of the French service, where there are no unnecessary officers or grades, there are twenty-nine colonels, fifty-six lieutenant colonels, and fifty-three majors of engineers.

I have several times asked that another company of engineer soldiers might be provided. The one we have is very useful, but its numbers will not allow of the detachments from it that are desirable. A large part of the existing company is required to aid in giving instruction in practical engineering to the cadets of the Military Academy. Allowing, for the care of the engineer trains, for guards, drills, sick, occasional small detachments for special objects; bearing in mind that a company can never be kept up to its legal organization, and that some of its members are themselves learners, it will be seen that few or none can be left to serve "in overseeing and aiding laborers upon fortifications, &c," and "in supervising finished fortifications," as is provided for by the law establishing the company. (See law of May 15, 1846, vol. IX, page 12, Little & Brown's edition.) Hence, another company is required, on the grounds of efficiency and economy, in this branch of the public service.

On the proposition to place a brigadier general at the head of the corps under the contemplated reorganization I have nothing to say.

I come now to the *second clause of the third section*, which proposes to discontinue the corps of topographical engineers, and to transfer its officers to the corps of engineers, or other corps or regiments, as the President may see fit.

The corps of topographical engineers was first regularly organized in 1838, prior to which time its officers were taken from the regiments of the army, by selecting just as those of the Adjutant General's, Quartermaster General's, and Commissary's departments are now supplied. Whether injustice or undue hardship would result to such officers by returning them to regimental positions is not for me to say. Nor have I any doubt that the duties now pertaining to the corps of topographical engineers are appropriate to the officers of my own corps, who are now liable, under laws or regulations, to do all such duty, and who actually perform such duty from time to time. If, therefore, the question were now presented to me, whether it would be advantageous—supposing that no corps of topographical engineers were now in existence in our army—to make such separate organization, I should say that it was uncalled for, and contrary to the practice of other nations.

But the two corps now exist; and the question whether they can, with propriety, be now blended into one, is of very different import.

My opinion clearly is that they cannot, with propriety, be so blended, and for the following reasons:

Congress has thought proper to declare, in the 63d article of war, that the functions of the *engineers* are generally confined to the most elevated branches of military science, and, in accordance with that declaration, the Academic Board of the Military Academy are required to recommend the graduates for promotion in the following order: 1st. Only a few at the head of the class *for the engineers*, and all other arms of service: a few classes have not afforded any with this recommendation for the engineers. 2d. Others (next below those recommended for the corps of engineers) are recommended for the topographical engineers, and all other arms excepting the engineers. The promotions are made in accordance with these designations by the Academic Board.

Now, I do not mean to say anything as to whether as large an amount of ability and acquirements are, or are not, desirable for the duties of a "topographical engineer" as for an "engineer;" but I think it is plain that the best graduates of the academy do, as a matter of fact, under the foregoing system of promotion, go into the "engineers," and that only the *next best* go into the topographical engineers. And the article of war referred to above states explicitly that the "engineers" belong to the *most* elevated branch of science in our army organization.

The actual class rank of the officers of the two corps is in accordance with the above. It will be seen by reference to the register of the graduates of the Military Academy, up to the year of publication—that is, from 1819 to 1849—that the graduates appointed into the engineers varied from 1st to 7th, and that their average standing is



expressed by  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , (nearly;) some classes, as before said, not furnishing any officers to that corps. The class rank of the graduates appointed to the corps of topographical engineers, in the same time, varied from 1st through 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, to 25, and in one instance to 55, the average being  $11\frac{1}{2}$ . Surely, injustice to the one corps, if not injury to the public service, would result from the *transfer* proposed to be made into the corps of engineers.

But I have thus far examined only the entrance of the graduates into service. Most of our officers have served for years—5, 10, 20, 40 years. The knowledge of his profession, requisite to fit the officer of the corps of engineers for the discharge of his duties, is not to be acquired from books alone, though books have closely to be studied. It is experience, constant and varied, in the application of scientific or technical principles to the endless variety of circumstances, geographical, topographical, and climatic, which gradually raises him, step by step, in the labors and responsibilities of his corps. His studies, which must be unremitting to maintain proper command of the various branches of science that he must make tributary to his wants, must be especially so in those that are peculiar to his profession—those that are exclusively his—those which, of themselves, occupy the mind for life, and suffice, alone, to give historic reputation to such as succeed in them.

The word “engineer”—the title of one of the corps, and part of the title of the other—must not mislead. The “civil engineer,” the “steam engineer,” the engineer—ship-builder of the French, &c., all have a common basis of pure science with the “topographical engineer” and the “engineer” of the engineer corps; and there are certain applications of science that are common; but it is not more so with these than with the other branches of military science—as, for instance, the ordnance and artillery. And it may, in my opinion, be said with perfect truth, that there is no greater fitness in a topographical engineer for the duties of the corps of engineers—for those duties, I mean, that are peculiar to the latter body, constituting its most important functions and characteristics—duties for which it was specially created, has been maintained, and which have yielded its most important fruits—than there is in any other officer whose studies have had a scientific basis. Of course, I am understood in all this to mean nothing like a boast—certainly nothing of the nature of a reproach or slur, for no one has a higher admiration than I have for the services and achievements of the corps of topographical engineers, in which there are several officers that I am proud to reckon as my friends. I mean, simply, that even those officers whose studies have been most severe, and success most brilliant, in the topographical corps, have not included those particular studies, nor had those peculiar applications of science, which are indispensable to the education and experience of the officer of engineers. The great body of the topographical officers are, and for years past have generally been, employed in surveys, in running boundary lines, in the prosecution of intricate and delicate astronomical observations, in works of geology, topography, and hydrography—very important branches, it is true; of the multifarious art of the engineer, but having no affinity

with planning and constructing systems and works of fortification. And it is no more a reproach to say that they are not prepared for the duties of the corps of engineers, than to say that they are not prepared to lay down the lines, to designate the proportions and details, and direct the construction of the hull, spars, rigging, and sails of a ship-of-war.

To transfer them, then, will be to put them in positions for which they are prepared neither by study nor practice. It would be placing them, moreover, above officers who *do* possess these qualifications and whose zealous devotion and efficient service will, I must hope, secure them from such injustice. It will, moreover, be doing the great personal injustice, in several instances, of depressing officers of the highest merit—officers who have rendered most important services, and to whom all the promotion that our army grades could supply would be no more than just acknowledgment—below others who were junior graduates, and who certainly cannot compare with them as to qualification for the duties of the corps. To illustrate this last point, let me add, that it would entitle to the place of second major a transferred officer who was 19 in his class of twenty-three members, at the same time making seventh major of the officer of engineers who not only was at the head of the same class, but who is universally reckoned as one of the ablest men in the army. Again: the senior captain of engineers entered the army in 1819; the junior major of topographical engineers was his classmate, but graduated four files lower; and I could adduce many other cases that would work grievous injustice.

The union of the two corps, then, at this day, will, in my judgment, work a breach of faith to the officers of my corps, to whom the great stimulus to exertion, while at the Military Academy, was the assurance that if they could enter the corps, their relative position there should be determined by the class standing; while it will not facilitate, but positively impede, the discharge of their respective duties, and will work an amount of bitter feeling among officers who, fostered by a common *alma mater*, have heretofore entertained towards each other none but friendly regards, neither justified nor compensated by any advantage to the public interest.

But aside from these considerations, I desire to press upon the committee the urgent necessity for an increase of the corps of engineers by a different process—that, I mean, before mentioned, which is to be found in my annual report. The proposed addition, by the transfer of topographical officers, will not afford the needed relief, for the general reasons stated above; and because they would necessarily bring with them all their present duties, which, I have no doubt, occupy them fully. That corps now consists of forty members; and should thirty of these be transferred, on this latter number would fall all the duties of the forty, which, instead of affording relief, would obviously and very materially add to the present burden of the now overloaded corps.

Called upon to express my views, I could not do otherwise than state them freely when I saw impending over the corps of engineers so serious an infliction. In my desire not to extend these remarks

beyond the point whither I might hope the patience of the committee would attend me, I have omitted several remarks that might have given weight to the general purpose of my argument. The main points are—

1. That the proposed enlargement of the corps of engineers is necessary to the public service, should be entered upon without delay, and can be safely accomplished only by additions to the bottom of the corps of qualified graduates.

2. That the mode of enlargement by transferring into it a portion of the topographical corps, as proposed in the bill—or a portion of any other corps—would not afford the relief contemplated by the bill, but would augment the present excess of duty, would work detriment to the public service, injustice to the corps of engineers, and serious injury to individual officers.

Section 4. All that I have said respecting the transfer of topographical officers to the corps of engineers, applies with at least equal force to such a transfer of ordnance officers. I cannot suppose that this is intended; but the language of the section would authorize it, and should, therefore, be corrected.

My opinion has always been, that, under the present organization, there is too wide a separation of the ordnance from the artillery. If the details for ordnance duties shall generally be supplied by the artillery, it is my opinion it will be better for both, as well as for the general military service.

Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. I have not studied these sections with the care and attention that would justify my occupying the time of the committee with remarks. Most of them, however, have my entire concurrence; and it is only the contemplated change in the mode of providing for staff duties, on which, before I can form decided opinions, I need better opportunities than I have yet had for examination. The routine of my duties has seldom brought me into situations for judging critically of the working of the present system. But on all such points, reliable information will no doubt be communicated by the high officers connected with the several staff departments.

The act authorizing the existing company of engineer soldiers, has recently been so construed as to deprive its members of the benefit of the *per diem* given by law to all soldiers when at constant labor for ten days or more. The effect of this is, that the engineer soldiers when at such work receive less pay than any other soldiers; in some cases less than half as much. The engineer soldiers are enlisted with the understanding and expectation that they are to receive higher pay than those of other arms. It is so provided by the law; and for the reason that none but superior men, men of athletic bodies, mechanics, and educated men, will answer the requirement of engineer duty. But now they lose this advantage whenever they have to be set to work. Thus, suppose a private of engineers and one of dragoons are employed together "as laborers or teamsters" in California: the former will be paid at the rate of \$13 per month, the latter at the rate of \$22 50. If they work together as "mechanics," the engineer will get \$13, and the dragoon \$27. I do not interpret the law in this way; I

am sure nothing of the kind was intended ; but to put the matter beyond cavil, I respectfully recommend the amendment of the bill by the following *proviso*, to be added in the third section, page 2, line 6, after the words "as now provided by law" :

*Provided*, That this company and the company authorized by the act of 15th May, 1846, be, and they are hereby, declared entitled to all the benefits and allowances provided by the acts of 2d March, 1819, and 4th August, 1854, (6th section) for soldiers employed at constant labor of not less than ten days ; except when such labor is performed in the execution of their appropriate peculiar drills and tactical exercises as engineer soldiers.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOS. G. TOTTEN,

*Brevet Brigadier General & Colonel of Engineers.*

Hon. CHARLES JAMES FAULKNER,

*Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, H. R.*

WASHINGTON CITY, *January 23, 1855.*

SIR : We comply with the request of the committee, and submit our views of the bill reported in the House "for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes."

The purposes of the bill seem to be, 1st, to increase the army ; 2d, to reorganize it ; 3d, to increase the pay of officers ; 4th to retire disabled officers.

We do not understand that there is difference of opinion, among military officers, in regard to the 1st, 3d, or 4th of those purposes, or the mode of effecting them. They seem to be measures of great propriety and necessity. We presume, therefore, that the object of the committee, in their present inquiry, is to know the opinions of officers on the organization which the bill proposes.

In this respect the bill is a modification of the bill reported in the Senate by General Shields, in accordance with the plan of organization recommended to Congress by the President and Secretary of War. The general principles of this plan, in what relates to the military staff of the army, as explained and enforced in the report of the Secretary, are, 1st, that appointments on the staff shall be by selection from the officers of the army who are most fit to be selected by reason of their capacity, experience, and meritorious services ; 2d, that these appointments as special commissions to perform special duties shall not confer military command distinct from those duties, and, therefore, that staff appointments shall not carry rank, but the officers serving on the staff shall take rank and command according to their commissions in the army ; and 3d, that the President, as the chief executive authority of the government, shall have power to secure the efficiency of the military administration by removing an incapable staff officer, and returning him to the ordinary duties of his army commission. This plan of organization, in our judgment, rests on sound principles. It removes a prevailing cause of dissension and conflict of rank in regard to the exercise of military command by staff

officers. With the present organization it seems to us very difficult to make a proper general rule to govern in this matter. We shall revert to this point in considering the subsequent clause of the bill which prescribes rules to regulate rank and command. In regard, however, to the proposed organization, we here state our opinion that a law organizing the army staff upon the principles propounded in the Secretary's report, and administered upon them, would be of advantage to the public service. But, as in all legislation which relies on executive discretion, the benefits of the law will depend on its administration. A continuing power of appointment and removal of staff officers may expose the military service to the influences which control appointments and the tenure of office in the civil service of the government.

The Senate bill is well framed in its details to effect the staff organization proposed by the Secretary of War. The House bill differs from it, in a material part, in the mode of providing officers for staff duties. For this purpose the House bill proposes four supernumerary captains to each regiment, or *seventy-six* in all, while all appointments on the staff eligible from the rank of captain, and above that rank, are only twenty-four. The supernumerary captains not appointed on the staff would have no proper employment or position in the army. We think that the Senate bill proposes the proper plan. It gives to companies of cavalry and infantry two 1st lieutenants, as the artillery companies now have. This will afford officers enough for staff details, and all regimental officers not detailed on the staff will have their appropriate regimental service.

In the proposed organization the judge advocate is considered as part of the military staff. We suppose that office to belong rather to the civil staff. But this point is not of importance.

The other changes proposed in the army organization, relate to the artillery, the engineers, and the ordnance.

In regard to the artillery the bills differ. The Senate bill follows the Executive recommendation to reduce the artillery to near one-half its present strength, and convert the other half into infantry. The House bill leaves the artillery of the strength it now is. The report of the War Department states that a large part of the present artillery regiments will, in future, serve as infantry—as they are now serving. This fact seems to us proof that the present artillery organization is excessive. The organization of an army should conform to the wants of the service, and the actual and necessary employment of the troops.

Both bills propose, as recommended by the department, to increase the corps of engineers, and discontinue the separate organization of the corps of topographical engineers. These corps are now nearly of the same strength. Their military employments are of very different importance and magnitude. Of all nations, the United States have the most extensive maritime frontier to defend by fortifications. This work alone, the indispensable fortifications on the seacoast and inland frontiers, would employ actively a much larger corps of engineers than these bills propose. In regard to the military topographical duties of the other corps, these services are, as represented in the report of the War Department, only a part of the duties of engineers;

and, for the reasons stated by the department, it does not seem to us necessary or expedient to retain the separate organization of the topographical corps. In this opinion we have reference only to the military duties of topographical engineers. The use of such a corps to the United States for civil works of survey or construction, is not a military question. The largest and most important of these works, the coast survey, is now under the direction of a civil officer.

The bills propose to transfer the officers of the corps of topographical engineers "to the engineer corps, or other corps, or regiments, as the President may see fit." We discover no objection to this provision. In regard to their transfer to the engineer corps, it has been stated that the higher duties of that corps are of such magnitude and difficulty, that they demand a long course of special study and experience; implying, as they do, the competency to plan and construct fortifications of the first class, and to direct the operations of armies in the attack and defence of fortified places. We presume that there are officers of the topographical corps qualified for these high and difficult employments. We profess, however, not to be competent to judge of this question. But we observe that the bills seem to be cautiously drawn in this particular. They direct the additions to the engineer corps to be made "as the exigencies of the service may require;" and the transfer of topographical engineers to be made into such corps as the President may see fit.

The change of organization of the ordnance department, which both bills propose, seems to us a proper measure. The reasons of it are stated in the report of the Secretary of War. The House bill, in section seven, provides that majors of ordnance shall be appointed only from the artillery. We think the restriction injudicious. The Senate bill made engineers also eligible to these appointments, and we think it important to preserve that provision. The knowledge of an engineer will find useful application in the ordnance corps. That service in our army has had experience of the benefit of an appointment from the corps of engineers. In its other provisions the 7th section of the bill seems to us the proper and necessary law of military promotion, ordinarily by seniority, with express exception in case of disability or incompetency; but the heads of certain corps, and all general officers, as at present, by selection.

The rules to regulate rank and command in the 9th section are among the most important subjects of the bill. The defects of the existing law, in this part of our military regulations, are fully discussed in the report of the War Department; and it appears quite unnecessary to attempt any exposition of them here. With the existing organization there is difficulty in prescribing a rule to regulate the right of officers of the disbursing and supplying staff to exercise military command; whether to confer military command on officers whose special duties are distinct from command, and may have long separated them from the military service of troops, or in respect of the exercise of military command, to consider these branches of the military staff as a civil corps. This embarrassment, however, is obviated in the organization proposed in the bill; and, in connexion with this organization, the rules to regulate rank and command, of the Senate



bill, seem to us correct and judicious. Some changes from these rules are made in the House bill. They seem to us not advisable. They are three in all. The first is in the 7th and 8th lines of section 10, in the reference to the 98th article of war. This reference appears unnecessary, if meant to guard against a repeal of that article, and to secure its operation in the cases it refers to; and improper if meant to forbid, in those cases, the operation of the rules now proposed. The next objection we find to this section of the House bill is in the 19th and 20th lines, providing that brevet assignments shall not take effect over senior brevets. This may defeat the object of assignments; and we see no reason why an officer may not be assigned over a senior brevet, (which is only a qualified, and ordinarily only a titular rank,) if he may be assigned over his habitual senior by proper military rank.

The 22d, 23d, 24th, and 25th lines of the same section, that medical and pay officers shall not be commanded by non-commissioned officers, or by any officer but the commander of the troops, &c., make a provision which appears to us improper.

The words "disease contracted in the line of duty," in the 18th line of the 11th section, will probably be construed to cover all cases of ill health.

The words "horse-artillery batteries," in the 15th line of the same section, are perhaps an error in the use of technical language. All batteries of field artillery with horses, whether technically "horse artillery" or "foot artillery," were probably intended to have cavalry allowances, and that appears to be the law now.

Respectfully, your obedient servants,

S. COOPER,  
*Adjutant General.*  
J. F. LEE,  
*Judge Advocate.*

Hon. C. J. FAULKNER, *Chairman, &c.*

---

SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE, *January 20, 1855.*

SIR: The wish of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, that I should "make a full and careful examination of the provisions of the bill for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes," and "give an expression of my views in writing relative thereto," was communicated to me on yesterday from the Department of War.

In obedience to the authority given, I have critically examined the provisions of the bill, and shall now proceed to set forth, as requested, my views thereupon.

The first section of the bill is in the following words: "That there shall be added to the army two regiments of infantry and two regiments of cavalry, organized as in the existing force, with such modifications as provided in this act."

To this provision of the bill I can present no objection; on the contrary, I am free to say, that a greater accession to the strength of our

military force *proper* will be required to meet the exigencies of the service in Texas, New Mexico, California, and Oregon, for years to come.

The second section provides "that the present regiments of dragoons and mounted riflemen shall be hereafter styled regiments of cavalry, and that, in order to furnish details for general staff duties, there shall be added to each regiment of artillery, infantry, and cavalry, four captains and four first lieutenants; each company of cavalry shall consist of one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, five sergeants, and from six to ten corporals, (one as quartermaster corporal, and one as saddler corporal,) two musicians, two farriers, and from sixty-four to one hundred privates, as the President may direct; that each company of artillery shall remain organized as at present, with the addition of one or three sergeants, the addition of one or three corporals, the addition of two or four artificers, and the addition of from the present number of privates up to one hundred, as the President may direct; and that each company of infantry shall remain organized, as at present, with the addition of one sergeant, four corporals, and twenty-six privates, as the President may direct."

As the present regiments of dragoons and mounted riflemen, as well as the new cavalry corps proposed, will most probably all be armed and equipped in the same manner—that is, with the Minie rifle, &c., &c.—there seems to be propriety in calling them all cavalry. Nor can I present any objection to the increase of the number of privates in the companies of the several regiments of cavalry, artillery, and infantry, although I am not prepared to approve of the very great addition proposed to the present number of non-commissioned officers of those several regiments. I am decidedly opposed, however, to the project of having four supernumerary captains engrafted upon each organized regiment for the purpose of furnishing details for general staff duties, &c., &c.

Under this provision there would be seventy-six captains hanging loosely upon the skirts of the corps for armed service, ready to take upon themselves all the temporary staff duties, with the pay and emoluments of majors. In my opinion there should be but one colonel commanding a regiment, and but one captain to each company of that regiment.

The details for the higher order of staff duties should be made from among the junior field officers of a regiment, and for the duties of an inferior grade of staff officer let the subaltern officer of companies be detailed.

To provide, then, for the discharge of the duties of staff officers, I should prefer that there be added to each company of cavalry and infantry one first lieutenant, making two first lieutenants to each company, the same as now obtains in the regiments of artillery.

The 3d section of the bill provides, "that there shall be added to the corps of engineers, as the exigencies of the public service may require, one brigadier general, one colonel, four majors, eight captains, eight first lieutenants, and eight second lieutenants, and a company of engineer soldiers, organized as now provided by law; and that the

corps of topographical engineers shall be discontinued, and the officers of that corps transferred to the corps of engineers, or other corps or regiments, as the President sees fit."

The requirements of the service in my opinion do not, at this time, call for the additional number of officers to the engineer corps, whether of high or low degree, which is proposed; nor do I believe they ever will be needed; still, as other and better soldiers think otherwise, I shall not positively object to the proposition.

I am decidedly opposed, however, to the annihilation of the corps of topographical engineers, to build up the corps of engineers.

There are highly gifted men and highly educated men in each corps; they are all prepared by their education at West Point for service in either of those corps, and in all the corps of the army. The officers of these corps are also equally distinguished for their service on the field of battle; then why should the officers of the one corps—the bad, if there are any, as well as the good—be retained, while the good, as well as the bad, of the other corps, are given to the four winds of heaven?

There is no doubt that both of these corps have been swelled by partial legislation, from time to time, to an inordinate size; but whether the one or the other is the least useful or the least to be cherished by the nation, is yet to be determined.

We have, I believe, a very full knowledge of our seacoast, and we have batteries at every point heretofore considered as most exposed and important to be defended; while we lack information respecting the interior of our country. It is my opinion, therefore, that the services of the topographical engineers, in exploring the interior of our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean, and developing its natural resources, (as has been exhibited in the recent surveys for a railroad to the Pacific,) are of more immediate national importance than the selection of sites for fortifications, and the erection of batteries on our seacoast, which may never be required.

I am, as you may perceive, opposed to studding our seacoast with fortifications by way of ornament; to expending millions of money in erecting forts at points where there can be no inducement for an enemy to go, and who would not, if he could, occupy the country to be defended. Again, fortifications, however strong, can in a given time be reduced; temporary batteries and other ordinary defences can be turned; but living men with stout hearts cannot be passed. To prevent the immediate rush of a fleet of vessels into a harbor for the purpose simply of plunder or the destruction of a town, I think that sunken hulks in the channel of the river will have all the effect of a fixed battery on shore.

In a war with any foreign power, the sooner matters are brought to an issue the better; all we want is an open field and a fair fight.

With our means of transportation by railroad, steamboats, and other conveyances, we can bring to any point where the enemy may land, from five to ten men against one of any invading force; and if we cannot with that numerical superiority prevail over the foe, we deserve to be vanquished.

My opinion is, that instead of annihilating the one corps to enlarge

the other, the two corps, engineers and topographical engineers, should be consolidated; and that the *corps of engineers*, as now contemplated in the bill, be composed of officers selected from both corps; leaving the remaining officers to be transferred to other regiments and corps as the President may direct.

Section 4th proposes to reorganize the ordnance corps, and provides for one additional lieutenant colonel and four additional majors, and for the transfer of ordnance officers to other corps and regiments of the army.

I cannot myself perceive the necessity of making so great an addition to the field officers of that corps; but as higher authorities think otherwise, and as no positive injury is to be done to any individual or corps, I have no objection to offer to this section as it now stands.

Section 5th provides that there shall be an additional number of general officers—one to be Adjutant General, and one to be Quartermaster General; and that there shall be one Commissary General, to be selected from the regiments or corps, and who shall receive the pay and allowances of a colonel.

In relation to the proposed accession to the number of general officers of the army, I have nothing to say; of the necessity or the propriety of that measure I leave others to judge. As this section of the bill, however, proposes virtually to destroy the office of Adjutant General, of Quartermaster General, as well as of Commissary General of Subsistence, and to bring to Washington from time to time, by detail, officers of the line of the army, to take charge of those bureaus or branches of the staff departments, I must be permitted to make a few remarks.

Now I cannot bring myself to believe that this change would be productive of much good to the service. The bureau system has worked well heretofore, and I think it may be made to operate better with proper pruning. I am of opinion that each department or branch of the military service should have a permanent chief at the city of Washington. Put back, if you please, all the subordinate officers of those departments in the line of the army, but let the chiefs remain. No matter what rank, pay, or emoluments are accorded to them, provided you give them a permanent commission and a fixed position.

But where is the present Commissary General of Subsistence to go? He belongs to no "regiment or corps," but holds his office solely by virtue of his commission as Commissary General. Can it be that this veteran officer, Brigadier General George Gibson, who now and for nearly forty years has faithfully and with great economy administered the affairs of that department, and whom General Andrew Jackson, who was not prone to flatter, was wont to call "honest George Gibson," is to be set adrift "upon the wide ocean of uncertainty," without a rudder or a compass, and with the bare prospect of a reef interposing (the retired list) to bring him up, and save him from destruction? Cut off as many other officers as you please, myself among the rest; but spare, I beseech you, "honest George Gibson."

As relates to the judge advocate of the army provided for in this bill, I am of opinion that that officer, who is charged with the revision of the proceedings of all general courts-martial, and is the adviser of

the Secretary of War in relation thereto, should be a man of high legal attainments, and withal eminent in the practice of the law.

Upon the remaining points in this section I have no remarks to make.

Upon the 6th section I have no remarks to make; nor shall I interpose any objections to the 7th and 8th sections.

In regard to the 9th section of this bill, I propose to confine my remarks to the fourth and last paragraph thereof, which relates to the officers of the pay and medical departments of the army.

In this paragraph it is proposed to place twenty-seven paymasters, and ninety-four medical officers—forty-nine of whom rank either as lieutenant colonels or majors, and the rest as captains and first lieutenants—in juxtaposition with, and to reduce them to the level of, the rank and file of the army. The paymasters of the army are virtually the custodians of the military chest, and some of them have been more than once distinguished on the field of battle. The medical officers are likewise not without distinction. They are necessarily intellectual and highly educated men, or they could not pass the ordeal by which they are introduced into the army. Yet these officers are by this bill ostracised—virtually reduced to the ranks of the army. And why, it may well be asked, is this indignity offered?

The laws which confer rank upon the pay and medical officers of the army prohibit them from exercising “command in the line or other staff departments of the army.” While, then, no officer of either the pay or medical departments can assume the command of troops or of a military post, when any other commissioned officer having military rank is present; they, on the other hand, cannot be commanded by any one but the commander of the post, the regiment, or troops with which they may be serving. It is also a settled principle of military service, that “all persons subject to martial law and not commissioned,” are “subordinate to any commissioned officer in the service, whether the latter be clothed with military rank or not.” (See paragraph 5, General Regulations for the Army, edition of 1841.)

I therefore suggest that the whole of this paragraph be stricken out, and that the following be substituted:

Officers of the pay and medical departments cannot exercise command except in their respective departments; but they shall take precedence according to their rank, on courts-martial, boards, and other military duty, not involving the command of troops. Should it happen that a post or command is left without a commissioned officer having military rank proper, then an officer of the staff, without such rank, will assume the temporary command; for, all persons subject to martial law, and not commissioned, must be subordinate to any commissioned officer, be his rank military rank, or rank assimilated thereto.

Section 10. To the provisions of this section, no objection can be advanced.

Touching the matter of the 11th section, I have nothing to offer.

In relation to the remaining sections of the bill, however, and which have for their object the creation of a retired list, I have to say, for the sake of humanity, and for my country's good, pass, I beseech you, the bill.

I avail myself of the occasion to repeat what I have said in my annual reports, that "in the event of new regiments being added to the present military establishment," a corresponding increase of the medical department, in the proportion of one surgeon and two assistant surgeons to each additional regiment, will be required, and I respectfully submit herewith a projet of a section to accomplish that object.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

TH. LAWSON,  
*Surgeon General.*

Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,  
*Chairman Military Committee, H. R.*

---

SECTION —. *And be it further enacted*, That there be added to the medical department of the army four surgeons, and eight assistant surgeons, to be appointed according to existing laws.

---

OFFICE COMMISSARY GENERAL OF SUBSISTENCE,  
*Washington, January 22, 1855.*

SIR: In compliance with the wish of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, after a careful examination of the provisions of House bill No. 615, I have the honor to present my views relative thereto.

It is with much diffidence that I approach the subject, and trust I may not be deemed intrusive in stating, briefly, my opportunities for acquiring a knowledge of the matters embraced in the bill, that no more than due weight may be given to my opinions.

I entered the army in 1808 as a captain of *infantry*, and served in that corps until 1815, (with an interval during which I acted as military agent in New Orleans,) and having attained the rank of lieutenant colonel, was as such reduced. I was appointed Quartermaster General of the southern division of the army, under General Jackson, in 1816, and served as such until 1818; was then appointed Commissary General of the army, and have ever since served in that capacity.

With those branches of the army in which I have served, viz: the infantry, Quartermaster's department, and Subsistence department, I have a practical acquaintance; with the others, only that arising from professional associations.

I now proceed to the examination of the bill.

Sections 1st and 2d. I deem the increase of the army necessary, and these sections are calculated to give it in the best manner. I omit, however, in these remarks, as an exception, the paragraph—"In order to furnish details for general staff duties, there shall be added to each regiment, &c., four captains and four first lieutenants."

Section 3d. There is ample field for the services of the corps of topographical engineers in the survey and exploration of our vast and almost unknown country, and the information thus gained would be



of incalculable value. How far the blending of the two corps of engineers into one would be beneficial, I am not prepared to say, but I cannot think the addition of a brigadier general necessary.

Section 4th. I see no reason for the increased rank given to a few officers of the corps of ordnance, and believe the transfer of the majority of the officers to other corps, and the performance of their duties by detail, would prove injurious to the service. There would not be the same amount of experience, and the officers detailed would not feel as great an interest in their duties.

Section 5th. I do not think the wants of the service require as many brigadier generals as are here named. The duties of Adjutant General and Inspectors General have been performed heretofore by colonels, and I believe would be equally as well by them as by brigadier generals.

Sections 5th and 6th. The remaining portion of this section and of section 6th have for their object the destruction of the present staff department of the army, viz: the Adjutant General, Quartermaster General, and Subsistence departments of the army, and causing the duties they now perform to be performed by officers temporarily taken from other branches of the service. Upon these, the administrative departments, every military man must admit, depends the very vitality of an army. Without their perfect administration, all its courage and discipline are of no avail. They call for all the knowledge and experience of their officers, and demand their entire devotion to their duties. Their duties are varied and manifold, and long acquaintance and familiarity with them are requisite in an officer. The system proposed would, it appears to me, consider their duties as light, and a perfect knowledge of them as but a secondary part of the knowledge of a regimental officer, and, presenting no inducement but a slight increase of pay to recompense him for the heavy responsibilities and arduous labors, would expect that officer to abandon the only path to promotion and distinction, and take upon himself the thankless and arduous duties of a staff officer.

The system now proposed *retrogrades* to one long since tried and proved defective.

The present staff departments were organized, because of that very deficiency, and have been modified and increased as the wants of the service required. They have been fully tried by the Florida and Mexican wars, and found to work well, and they are now well tested by the scattered condition of our army over our large and uninhabited country. Our troops are everywhere well supplied, and not a single case can be found in which, from not being supplied, they have suffered as the British troops are suffering in the Crimea, and that from the want of such organized departments.

The organization proposed is defective in not giving enough officers for the duties they are to perform. They require as many officers as they now have, and none can be spared, in my opinion; and yet these sections give twenty-three, instead of *sixty-four*. Here, I would respectfully state, there appears an inconsistency between the excepted paragraph of section 2d and the requirements of sections 4th and 5th: the former gives *seventy-six* additional captains for general staff duties;

the latter, if none but captains were employed for staff appointments, require but *thirty-seven*.

The tenor by which the staff appointments are to be held I deem objectionable. If the appointments are desirable, they will be sought by officers; if disagreeable, they will be avoided. In either case, influence will be used, and at each change of administration a change in the staff of the army is likely to occur. These changes, particularly in the disbursing department, will not merely deprive them of the requisite experience, but render less secure the funds in their hands.

The patronage of the administration would be greatly increased under the proposed system; and not only the position and appointment of a disbursing officer, but his character, also, would be at the mercy of the President, for his removal from his position would always carry with it an imputation on his honesty.

The general tendency of the plan proposed would be to render less efficient the administrative branches of the army, to destroy *esprit du corps*, and introduce politics in the army; dissatisfaction would prevail, and demoralizing influences increase.

Sections 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th, appear to me to be based upon too high an estimate of the powers and motives of men, and to violate a principle as applicable to military as to civil life, viz: that of divisibility of labor. Believing, as I do, the best workmen are made by application to one pursuit, I should deem the present a safer system than that proposed by those sections.

The proviso to section 6th, in the transfer of the supply and accountability for clothing to the Subsistence department, I deem objectionable, particularly with the diminished number of officers authorized by this bill. Those duties and responsibilities are amply sufficient for any one officer, and those duties will never be satisfactorily performed until they are separated from all others.

Section 7. I would prefer the principle of seniority in promotions should be adhered to in each corps to the rank of colonel. With the power to retire inefficient officers, it would always work well. Promotion in a corps by selection has many objections.

Section 8th speaks for itself.

Section 9th settles the question of brevet rank, and in conformity with my views.

Section 10th. With present prices the pay of officers is by no means equal to what it was at the time it was fixed by law. It appears to me but just it should be increased.

Sections 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th, in relation to retiring officers, are well fitted to carry out the object, and I believe the service would be greatly benefited by their passage.

Regretting the short time allowed to place my views upon paper, compels me to present them in this imperfect form.

I am, very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

GEO. GIBSON,

*Commissary General of Subsistence.*

Hon. C. J. FAULKNER,

*Chairman Committee on Military Affairs.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1855.*

SIR: In compliance with the wishes of your committee, as conveyed to me by the honorable Secretary of War, for an expression of my views with regard to bill No. 615, for the increase of the army, &c., I have the honor to state, after a careful examination of the bill, I can discover little in its provisions to recommend it to favorable consideration—except the addition of four regiments, the retired list, the attempt to define more clearly the rules which should regulate brevet rank, and probably the increase of pay.

If a reorganization is called for, proper care does not seem to have been exercised in avoiding the infliction of unnecessary hardships on individuals, or in adopting the measures most beneficial for the service.

Section No. 1. The addition of four regiments is not more than is required for the service.

Section No. 2. No good and sufficient reason can be discovered for this addition of one hundred and fifty-two supernumerary officers to the regiments, as provided, for the ostensible purpose of performing duties now discharged by less than one hundred. The cost of this plan will not fall short of fifty thousand dollars per annum; and will not benefit the service, but, on the contrary, will seriously embarrass operations by substituting inexperienced for experienced staff officers. In 1821 a somewhat similar plan was tried, and afterwards proved a failure.

Section No. 3. This is faulty, as it abolishes the corps of topographical engineers as one of minor importance to the military engineers, whilst in fact its duties—the improvement of the internal, commercial, and peaceful resources of the land—will be held in active requisition long after those of the other branch have been brought nearly to a conclusion by the completion of our system of fortifications, the repairs of which will demand a smaller degree of talent.

Section No. 4 provides for the discharge of a number of officers of ordnance. They were *selected* from the graduates of the Military Academy on account of their supposed fitness for the peculiar duties of the department; and having, by length of service and assiduity, acquired knowledge and skill, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to supply their places by temporary detail of officers. The latter practice, whilst it may suit the views of individuals, cannot fail to be detrimental to the public interest. The increase in the number of field-officers will add very considerably to the cost, without the slightest corresponding benefit. I would propose the following as a substitute for the section under consideration, viz: The ordnance corps shall remain as now constituted, *provided* that no appointment thereto shall be made until it is reduced to one colonel, one lieutenant colonel, four majors, ten captains, and the number of store-keepers and enlisted men authorized by law; after which, vacancies in the grade of captain may be filled by transfer or promotion from among the captains or first lieutenants of the artillery, infantry, or dragoons, who may have graduated at the Military Academy above No. 21. This will leave an incentive at the academy for industry and desire of high standing.

Section No. 5. Not knowing the duties that are to be exacted from the new brigadier generals, or the causes inducing a change in the departments of the Quartermaster General and the Commissary General of Subsistence, I refrain from remark, other than an expression of surprise at the proposal to transfer the duties of the Clothing Bureau from the former to the latter.

Section No. 6 refers to matters that will engage the attention of officers of those departments to which they appertain, and who will be able to review them with a better knowledge than I possess.

Section No. 7. Whilst there is a perfect propriety in the selection for general officers, I see no reason for the departure from the long-established rule of promotion to the grade of colonel, in the ordnance department. After a service of more than thirty years in one department, it is to be supposed that an officer would be more useful by continuance therein than by a removal to a new sphere of duties. With regard to vacancies, I have to refer to my remarks on the composition of the corps, under section No. 4, and reiterate the opinion that vacancies in the department should be filled from officers of all the regiments, who may have graduated at the Military Academy above No. 21.

Section No. 8. The Executive already possesses and exercises the power of prescribing the armament of the troops. No legislation seems necessary.

Section No. 9 is understood to aim at the negation of brevet rank in all cases except when assignment is made by the President on mixed commands. This, in my opinion, will be a wholesome law. The latter clause of the section is, I think, unjust to certain officers, and will prove to be injurious to the service. I would propose the following substitute: "Officers of the pay and medical departments will not command commissioned officers of other corps, or departments; nor will they be commanded except by the commanding commissioned officer of the troops with whom they serve."

Section No. 10 is approved.

Section No. 11 is approved, except the restriction of pay and allowances to officers on furlough. This restriction will be unfavorable to officers serving on distant stations, while those in the Atlantic States will not be much affected. Those having power to grant furloughs should see that the indulgence is not abused. The closing paragraph of this section seems to me to be uncalled for, the pay of the general officers having been considered with that of the others in section No. 11.

Sections Nos. 12, 13, and 14. Nothing is seen to be objected to, in these sections.

I have the honor to be, with great respect, your obedient,

H. K. CRAIG,  
Colonel of Ordnance.

Hon. C. J. FAULKNER,

*Chairman Military Committee, Ho. of Reps.*

BUREAU OF TOPOGRAPHICAL ENGINEERS,  
*Washington, January 22, 1855.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your direction to report upon House of Representatives bill No. 615, entitled "A bill for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes."

Your letter directs me to make a full and careful examination of the provisions of the bill, and to give an expression of my views, in *writing, relative thereto.*

It is also stated, that the report should be ready for the committee by its meeting on Tuesday next.

In order to comply with your direction, each provision of the bill will be taken up in order, and the reflections and opinions which occur to me will be stated as briefly as practicable.

Many parts of the bill refer more to other branches of the army than that to which I belong, and will, without doubt, be reported upon by other officers with better knowledge in reference to those branches than I possess; but I will endeavor as far as in my power, and as well as the time for the answer will admit, to fulfil your directions.

Section 1 increases the army by two regiments of infantry, and two regiments of cavalry, which, with the change, in the 2d section, of the mounted rifles into a regiment of cavalry, will make in the whole five regiments of cavalry, four regiments of artillery, ten regiments of infantry—in all, nineteen regiments.

The increase of the army is so necessary, and so desirable, that objections can, to my mode of thinking, be alleged only against the form or kind of troops. I do not perceive the necessity of the two additional regiments of cavalry, but would prefer, as more efficient and less costly, five regiments of infantry. Five regiments of infantry would cost about the same as the two regiments of infantry and the two regiments of cavalry proposed, and would, to my judgment, be more efficient and of more general utility. The change of the mounted rifles to a regiment of cavalry, (section 2,) would furnish as much of that kind of force as could be well employed. Three regiments of cavalry will give three thousand men, exclusive of non-commissioned and commissioned officers. Infantry can much sooner be made serviceable than cavalry, the latter requiring a drill and discipline of both man and horse.

And in reference to the protection of our frontier, for which it is said cavalry is particularly desirable, there is with me no doubt that such protection would be more effectually rendered by a cordon of posts, in which infantry could be stationed, and by cavalry patrols between each of these. For these last purposes, the three regiments of cavalry would, I think, be adequate, and to prevent marauding parties of Indians, and to protect travellers. Such marauding parties are usually small, and can be best pursued and with more rapidity by small parties.

A passion for riding gives, in our country, to cavalry force much of its popularity. The necessity of drilling the horse, of taking care of him and of his equipment, does not so generally enter into the reasoning.

Five regiments of cavalry will be full in reference to officers, but

rarely more than half full in reference to privates. Three regiments carefully kept up full will, therefore, be equally efficient, and much less costly.

The yearly maintenance of cavalry is very costly—forage, &c., farriers, blacksmiths, death of horses—so that it will take time to have small bodies of this arm ready for use, and great vigilance and care to keep them in good order.

Section 2 changes the mounted rifles into a regiment of cavalry; from which fact it may be reasonably inferred that experience has not sustained the supposed efficiency of mounted riflemen.

Also, in this section, in order to furnish details for general staff duties, there are to be added for staff duties, to each regiment, four captains and four first lieutenants.

As there will be nineteen regiments by this bill, the addition for staff duties will be 76 captains and 76 first lieutenants, in all 152 officers, which I think will increase the staff much beyond its present organization—add much to its cost, but not to its efficiency.

The same section also provides for the increase of the cavalry from 64 to 100 privates, as the President may direct; the artillery the same; and each company of infantry may be increased 26 privates. The increase of non-commissioned officers proportional. But the increase herein authorized of privates will add—

1,600	privates	to the cavalry.
1,440	“	to the artillery.
2,600	“	to the infantry.

In all 5,640 privates.

Therefore, at the pleasure of the Executive, the army can be enlarged by 5,640 privates, and consequent expenses.

It appears to me that so serious an increase in our army, by Executive will, is rather a new feature in our mode of military legislation, and will be of serious injury to the army, by making it more the creation of the Executive, and less the creation of law. The whole section appears to me rather indefinite, involving too much of the idea just above stated.

Moreover, this great addition of officers for staff duties is proof that officers are required for those duties. The choice is between a regular organization as now exists, and temporary details, and I am disposed to think that the cost of the plan as proposed will much exceed the one in being, and be far less efficient, because of the subdued qualifications and less devotion of the temporary details.

Section 3 adds to the corps of engineers 1 brigadier general, 1 colonel, 4 majors, 8 captains, 8 first lieutenants, and 8 second lieutenants; and from what follows, it leaves it to be supposed (but is not so directed) that these additions (except the brigadier generals) will be taken from the corps of topographical engineers, which is discontinued by this section, but such is not a direction of the bill; and as the bill is silent in reference to the period when it shall take effect, this period is supposed to be on the final passage of the bill into a law. According to this view, the word “discontinued” is equivalent to the word “disbanded.” Also, the transfer to other corps is not made obliga-



tory; and as it will require some time to consummate arrangements, there will, therefore, be a period when, according to my understanding of the bill, the corps of topographical engineers will be positively disbanded, without pay or employment.

This corps now consists (including brevet second lieutenant graduates) of 42 officers. If the number as named above are put into the corps of engineers, it will leave 13 for other regiments or corps.

Section 4. This section reduces the ordnance corps to 11 officers; it now consists (including graduates as second lieutenants) of 38; there will, therefore, be 27 of the officers of this corps to be transferred to other corps and regiments. It appears to me no more than just to suppose that this corps has not been raised to its present numbers, without reason, or without necessity and propriety. To suppose the spare numbers to be so transferred will be assigned to similar duties as those on which they are now engaged, is to suppose a labored legislation, merely to change names. An ordnance corps has been found necessary with the army organizations of all countries. I do not perceive how it can be dispensed with in ours, without serious injury to the public service, as now organized. It may be said that it is not dispensed with, but reduced; while it may be said of the corps of topographical engineers that it is dispensed with. But with both of these corps (taking it for granted that it is not the intention to disband either) no time is specified about the transfers, or as to what is to become of officers while these measures are being digested; it is therefore suggested that the following addition be affixed to the bill:

"That the officers of the several corps and departments referred to in this law be retained in service, as now organized, until the several transfers, as directed and as authorized to other regiments and corps, shall have been made."

The phraseology of the bill in reference to these two corps is seriously different. In one case it positively directs the transfers to be made; in the other it leaves them in doubt. But in neither is there any provision for the time occupied in making and digesting the transfer arrangements.

Section 5 provides for nine brigadier generals; reduces the officers of the Commissary General, while it increases his duties in giving to his care the clothing department; and provides for one judge advocate. I do not comprehend this, as it is not possible for one judge advocate to attend to all the army general courts-martial. He should be a person of law knowledge, and be able to employ a deputy of law knowledge, if required, for each general court-martial.

Section 6. All commissioned officers to be appointed by the President and Senate, but appointments in the staff (as enumerated) to be appointed by the President. The staff, in its staff appointments, are not, then, commissioned officers. This section evidently contemplates a system of changes from staff to line duties, and from line to staff duties. I do not think such a system will work well. Either the duties of staff officers are excessively simple, (not a general impression,) or some time will be required in becoming acquainted with them. But the detail not being permanent, the officer so detailed foresees no advantage in it, (but mere matter of convenience) or induce-

ments to the study and devotion which staff duties require. While occupied on these he loses by disuse much of his line-duty knowledge, and goes back to the line a worse line-officer than when he left, and was no great staff officer when on that duty.

The present law authorizing commissions in the staff for certain parts, as enumerated, are repealed, and officers "now holding commissions in the staff shall be arranged to places in the army, regard as far as practicable being had to rank."

It seems to me that regard must be had to rank, or the officer will be reduced.

The section is long, complicated, and ambiguous; admitting, to my reading, of various interpretations.

Section 7. 1. "General officers shall be appointed by selection, the engineer brigadier general of engineers from the corps, and the ordnance colonel by 'selection from the corps.'"

2. "In all other cases promotions shall be made by seniority to the grade of colonel, except in cases of disability or incompetency," and throughout the different arms of service.

3. "Vacancies in the grade of major of ordnance shall be supplied by selection from the artillery."

The higher the professional grade, the greater the necessity of professional knowledge, because the more extensive the influence, and the evils of a want of that knowledge; therefore I think promotions and appointments to all grades of the army should be by seniority.

Moreover, the great evil under which the army suffers, and which is the most general subject of complaint, is the slowness of promotion. This evil would be much remedied and much reduced by promotion to all grades by seniority. One promotion from colonel to brigadier, promotes a lieutenant colonel, a major, a captain, a first lieutenant, a second lieutenant, and a brevet second lieutenant, which, with his own, makes seven promotions.

But promotions to the rank of colonel (according to arm of service) are to be by seniority, except in case of disability or incompetency. I think this exception highly proper. The defect (and I think it a serious defect) is in the absence of any authorized mode for ascertaining the "disability and incompetency."

The selections in the two cases of the engineers and the ordnance, it is supposed to be from an admitted necessity that officers of such elevated rank in these corps require professional knowledge. The requirement does not appear to me less necessary in other cases.

Majors of ordnance to be filled by selections from the artillery. This gives to the artillery the advantage of promotion into two corps.

It also appears to me singularly unjust that an officer detached on a duty as a captain, no matter how well informed he may be, or how well acquainted with the duties of the corps, (unless of the artillery,) is forever debarred from promotion in the corps.

Section 8. I do not understand this section. The bill creates cavalry, artillery, and infantry. The arming and equipping of these several arms is a matter well understood, and has direct reference to the arm of service. But if they can be armed and equipped *ad libitum*, I see no use in these distinctive appellations, or in the change of the

mounted rifles to a regiment of cavalry, unless it be to preserve the names of the different arms in the form of legislation.

The entire law usually called the rules and articles of war, could be revised to advantage. A report of a revision was called for in 1832, but I am not aware that the report was made.

Section 9 repeals the 61st, 62d, and 63d articles of the law usually denominated the rules and articles of war. The 61st defines the power of "brevets and former commissions."

This article (in the old law) appears to me clear, free from ambiguity, and easily understood. The only ambiguity is in the word "detachment;" which is, however, made clear by the regulations issued by President Jackson, revised and reissued by President Polk, and which, it is believed, are the governing regulations at this time. The chief trouble has arisen from claims for pay when exercising the brevet authority, and to decide when that pay could be drawn. This trouble could be removed by a simple expression of law, giving the pay, emoluments, and allowance of the brevet rank, to all officers when on brevet duty according to law, and in all cases of dispute the War Department to have power to decide the same.

Article 62 (old law) defines rights of command when different corps join or do duty together, "unless otherwise specially directed by the President of the United States, according to the nature of the case."

The law appears to me very clear in this case, and not adapted to create confusion; and the power given to the President is adequate to remedy and to prevent any confusion.

Article 63 is the one giving some exemptions from command to engineers.

The remedies proposed do not appear to me to simplify the case.

Remedy 1st refers to Article 62. By this, staff officers (by old law) are excluded from such command; the remedy proposed does not exclude them; but I doubt if the remedy, in this single case, is desirable to the staff, or of advantage to the service.

The 2d remedy proposed destroys the brevet, to all intents and purposes, except on assignment by the President. The 63d is merely repealed; but the repeal will enable a commanding officer to order an engineer on any duty, and, in so doing, to take him from any work or existing duty.

Officers of the pay and medical departments cannot exercise command, except in his own department. This could always be done by seniority of commission. The confusion and difficulties now sought to be remedied, arise from having (within a few years) bestowed on officers of these departments military titles and military rank, totally unnecessary to their professional duties; but this error now makes the remedy proposed necessary.

Section 10 gives to officers and soldiers of this bill the benefit of the several pension laws, and makes them subject to the rules and articles of war: all, to my judgment, very proper and necessary.

Section 11 states the pay of different grades, in different arms of service. It would remove much discontent, rivalry, and jealousy, if the pay of all grades were the same for all arms of service; and,

under the liability of section 8, such a course has an appearance of justice.

A rigid equality in the pay of officers of the same grade can never be realized, because equality of condition, place, climate, and of necessary expenses consequent upon places, cannot be realized.

I do not know the officer who has been stationed at or near any of our large cities on the Atlantic, who has not experienced the fact that his pay and allowances do not support him. Officers on frontier stations have experienced a different result; therefore, whatever may be considered the comforts of Atlantic stations, they are more than compensated on the frontier by the avoiding of debt for the necessities of life.

A proviso reduces the allowances of officers when most needed. It extends the service ration to general officers, which is considered both just and proper.

The retired list, section 12. No matter by what name this arrangement is, denominated, it is, in fact, a pension system for aged and disabled officers, and to facilitate promotions by the making of quasi vacancies.

The greater part of section 12 is employed in describing the mode of placing officers on this list. The mode can be resorted to on the application of the officer, and at the judgment of the President of the United States. It appears to me that both of these methods relating to the mode are exceptionable, and adapted to depress the officer; and on these accounts will receive a reluctant attention. It would, perhaps, be better to affix an age at which all officers shall be placed on that list; and in all cases in which an officer is not promoted under the provision for "disability and incompetency."

It also appears to me just, that in all cases in which an officer is placed on the retired list, he should be advanced one grade, and should receive the pay, &c., according to section 13, of that advanced grade.

Section 13 merely provides for the pay, &c., of the officer so retired, and for promotion in his place.

Section 14. There seems to be no ground for objection to this section.

Section 15 merely provides for officers to be placed on the retired list during one year after the passage of this act.

It appears to me that this limitation defeats all the chief objects of a retired list. As age and its infirmities, disabilities, &c., will be in perpetual occurrence, it must be admitted that this list will be liable to diminution from deaths, therefore its perpetuity is not so offensive to economy.

It is, I think, matter of regret that questions of the increase of the army, and of the increase of its pay—so generally admitted as necessary—should be coupled in this bill with so many other questions of rather doubtful utility.

Beviewing the whole bill, I am disposed to think that the increase of the army—the increase of pay under existing staff organizations—will cost much less the year than the propositions of the bill.

There is an important principle, in military matters, for our coun-

try, not, to my judgment, sufficiently cared for in the bill. This principle is, to make the army, in all its rights, privileges, means of support, as much as practicable the creation of law, and as little as practicable the creation of contingencies.

Under existing civilization, armies appear to be an essential component part of all governments, and no government, which pretends to an equality with the nations of the world, can do without them. Therefore, in a government like ours, true policy is to relieve so necessary an institution from unkind prejudices, and from jealousy; and I know of no mode so well adapted to produce such results as that of making our army as much as practicable dependent upon law, and as little as practicable upon contingencies.

Such a course will turn the feeling of the army to the law; will make it the creature of the law; and will relieve it, to a great extent, from the prejudices and the mistrust now extended towards it.

I think it is to be demonstrated that the present bill will be a much more costly arrangement than the proposed increase of numbers and pay, with existing staff organization.

I have not suggested remedies to the defects of the proposed bill, because under the impression that such a course was not expected. But, finding other officers under different impressions, I will respectfully suggest a few general considerations for a bill of this kind.

1st. Immediate necessities call for an increase of the numbers and pay of the army; therefore, a bill involving these considerations has a strong necessity in its favor.

2d. It would be idle to say that existing staff arrangements cannot be improved; but these are not of such pressing necessity. The staff arrangements which now exist are the results of much investigation, of many reports, and of long trial, and will be found to pervade in rights, duties, obligations, &c., &c., many laws (See Hetzel's edition of Cross's Military Laws.) Properly to modify and to improve existing staff arrangements will require time and a careful examination of existing laws.

3d. The retired-list matter is a new measure, hitherto unknown to our military system. It is, without doubt, a necessary and proper measure, but need not be made to embarrass the more necessary wants of No. 1, preceding.

The bill is silent in the regular organization of the higher ranks.

According to our system, (copied from the systems of other nations,) nine brigadier generals call for not less than four major generals, and over the whole there should be one "commanding general." There is an evident reluctance to giving to our army a rank higher than that of major general. But while we have such institutions, (institutions essential to all governments,) it is not, I think, offensive to propriety or to patriotism that such institutions should be adequately organized. On this account, the commission of "commanding general" is brought to consideration.

With me the question is very simple. Either we must cease to consider ourselves among the leading nations of the world, or we must meet the required concomitants of that consideration. Among

these concomitants is a regular army of some size; which being admitted, its proper organization is a mere consequence.

Respectfully submitted:

J. J. ABERT,

*Colonel Corps Topographical Engineers.*

HON. CHARLES JAMES FAULKNER,

*Chairman Military Committee, Ho. of Reps.*

WASHINGTON ARSENAL,

*January 22, 1855.*

SIR: Agreeably to the request of the Committee on Military Affairs, of the 19th instant, I proceed to state, as briefly as possible, my views relative to the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of House of Representatives, for the "increase and better organization of the army."

In doing this, I shall consider the provisions of this bill in connexion with those of a similar bill reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which I have also before me.

The increase of force proposed in the first section of the bill is of too pressing and obvious necessity to require any comment; but the manner of effecting this increase which is proposed in the Senate bill, (first and second sections,) appears to me preferable to the other. Whoever has visited an artillery garrison, or seen a considerable body of our artillery in the field, must have remarked that the greater part of them are distinguished from infantry only by their uniform. Their habitual drill and service is that of infantry; and even at the artillery school of practice which existed for several years at Fort Monroe, infantry exercises occupied the principal share of attention. This anomaly results in great measure from the organization of the artillery. It is arranged in regiments like infantry, and the force is too great a proportion of the whole army to be spared from the active duties of frontier and other service; but as they cannot all serve there in their appropriate arm, they are employed as infantry, and hence the necessity of having them all instructed so as to take turns in this service. If the corps of artillery were reduced to a strength which could be spared from the duties above referred to, the officers and men might be confined to the practice of their own arm, and be constantly employed and exercised in the use of artillery, either field or garrison—a service requiring much greater and much more difficult instruction than that of foot troops. The corps of artillery would not then, in time of war, be subject to the mortifications which they experienced in the late war with Mexico, of seeing volunteer artillery serving a field battery, whilst the regular artillery marched with muskets.

The increase of officers proposed in the second section of the House bill appears to me ill arranged. In expressing the object of the appointment of supernumerary captains and lieutenants of artillery, infantry and cavalry, "to furnish details for staff duties," the proposition would seem to confine these details to those corps, at least by



implication. But there may be a great advantage and propriety, under some circumstances, in the selection of an engineer or ordnance officer for appointment on the staff. A greater objection appears to the addition of four supernumerary captains to each regiment. This would give *seventy-six* (76) supernumerary captains in the army to furnish details for staff duties, (besides the seventy-six lieutenants,) whilst all the staff officers required by the act to be taken from regiments or corps amount to only twenty-four, (24.) Supposing *all* those to be taken from the captains of regiments, (which would not be the case,) what will be the position of the remaining thirty-two captains having no companies? If the addition to provide for these details, or rather staff *appointments*, were made, as in the Senate bill, to the list of lieutenants, no such inconvenience would occur, as the lieutenants would be all attached to companies; and it is well known that at present there are rarely more than two officers present with a company on service. When captains are taken for staff duties, their separation from their companies would probably be of considerable duration, and the lieutenant succeeding to the command would have the same interest as a captain in the welfare of his company. The excellent act of 1799 "for reorganizing the troops," proposed that in such a case as the above, the officer next in grade to the one appointed on the staff should be actually *promoted* to the vacancy; but in case of the staff officer being replaced in his regiment, this arrangement would lead to the inconvenience of supernumerary majors, captains, &c.

The organization of companies in the 2d section of the House bill seems to me too indefinite; and, although I speak with great diffidence on this subject, I should doubt the necessity of increasing so much the number of non-commissioned officers for a company of not more than one hundred privates.

In arranging a new organization for the army, one of the great principles to be attended to, as much as possible, seems to me to be that of simplifying the administration of the army, and reducing that service to the fewest heads. This principle might undoubtedly be applied more extensively than in either of the bills under consideration, without embarrassment, and probably with benefit, to the public service. Why should services of a like kind be performed by different sets of officers? At the same post, or in the same market, why should one officer be employed to purchase flour and other provisions for men, and another to procure oats and other food for horses, with all the complication of a separate set of accounts and vouchers for each of these objects, when a few additional lines and columns in a voucher or an abstract would effect the purpose? In practice, at nearly all the military posts, these services, as regards receiving and issuing supplies to the troops, are actually performed by the same *individual*, although he is subject to a double accountability to two different heads of departments.

In the scientific and constructing departments of the army this subdivision of administration and of duties has also been carried too far, and it is under this impression that I approve of the consolidation of the services of the corps of topographical engineers with the corps of

engineers, proposed in the 3d section of the bill. Their military duties are entirely similar, and should be conducted under the same general direction, as is well argued in the annual report of the Secretary of War.

The organization of the ordnance department, proposed in the 4th section of the bill, is that which, in its general features, I have always considered the best for our service, and I was accordingly opposed to that provision of the bill of 1838 by which lieutenants were attached permanently to the corps. The higher and important duties of the ordnance department demand continued study and reflection, aided by careful and laborious experiments, which require the attention of officers devoted to these investigations, and pursuing them through a long time, without danger of interruption by duties unconnected with them, or by transfer to posts where the necessary facilities do not exist, &c. Although I was one of the officers originally appointed in the ordnance corps, when it was reconstituted in 1832, I do not fear contradiction, or the imputation of improper motives, when I say that the very great improvements introduced into the armament and military supplies of the troops since that time have fully justified that measure, and shown the utility of a special corps of officers for this service. But the inferior and routine duties of the ordnance department require nothing more than ordinary intelligence, care, and honesty, and the more important duties to which I have referred cannot generally employ a large number of officers. I consider it better, therefore, that the junior officers for this service should be taken from the regiments. The knowledge which regimental service would impart to them, with regard not only to military practice and administration, but with regard to the practical working and effects of arms and military equipments in the field, will be of great value in the performance of the special duties of the ordnance department; and the knowledge and experience in the construction and use of artillery, arms, and ammunition, which they may acquire in the performance of ordnance duties, will be of still greater value to them in the execution of their regimental duties; furnishing, in some measure—what the scattered condition of our troops now prevents their enjoying—the opportunity of practice which would be given by regimental or other schools of practice.

The only question in this connexion is as to the grade of the lowest permanent officers of ordnance. As their number is small and their duties alike, I think the proposition of having none lower than *majors* a good one. Officers appointed to these places will have had greater experience in command of troops, to qualify them for taking such command when it may fall to them, by virtue of the provisions of section 9.

The first lines of section 5 probably do not express what was intended, as they would have the effect of legislating out of office the general of engineers authorized by section three. If the wording of the corresponding section of the Senate bill be insufficient or objectionable, this section 5 may be made to read thus: "In addition to the number of brigadier generals now authorized by law, and the

brigadier general of engineers, there shall be *seven* brigadier generals, one of the brigadier generals to be Adjutant General," &c.

The provisions of this section simplify, in some degree, the organization of the army, by reducing the number of officers devoted permanently to special duties. It is certainly true that the usual, and especially the routine, duties of any department, will be more readily performed, like any other business, by those long practised in the execution of them; but it appears to me that intelligence, a good professional education, and respectable business capacity, are sufficient, with moderate experience in details, for the performance of the administrative duties of the general staff, and that it is not necessary in this case to incur the inconvenience of complicating the system, and of separating a large number of officers entirely from service with troops.

◀ Whilst there appears, therefore, to be no necessity for the organization of separate permanent corps for performing the duties of the several departments of the general staff, it is highly desirable to avoid the evils which are almost inseparable from this permanent organization. This is, I think, well accomplished by the arrangements proposed in section 5, which would not only offer all the present facilities of selecting competent officers for staff duties, but would afford the means of correcting errors of selection by replacing in the regiments officers who, whilst they may be well qualified for regimental duty, shall have been found deficient in administrative ability, or otherwise unsuited to their positions on the staff.

It may be said that the objections to special organization apply also to the corps of engineers, so far as relates to their succession to command. This is true to some extent; but *their* duties absolutely require training and constant practice, and the evil cannot be avoided in this case without incurring a greater one. All that can be done is to limit its extent as much as possible.

The provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 are intimately connected with those of section 9, regulating rank and command; and the latter I consider among the most important sections of the bill, in promoting the harmony of the service, and preventing the scandalous and even hazardous quarrels (hazardous to the success of military operations) which have frequently occurred in our army.

Perhaps it may be said that these regulations for rank and command could be adopted without a reorganization of the army; but the consequence would be, that a young officer entering the ordnance corps at its foot, or appointed in the general staff, may attain the rank of major, lieutenant colonel, or colonel, without any experience or knowledge derived from active command of troops, and may by right of his rank be placed in a position to command a detachment, or even an army in the field. This would lead to practical inconveniences which ought to be avoided, if possible. The evil consequences of a well-established and indisputable rule on the subject of rank and command are too frequently felt in the service to require further remark, and it is of the greatest importance that some definite rule on this subject shall be adopted. The simple principle that an officer shall have the right to command all those of inferior rank who are on duty with him

appears to be obviously proper. Admitting this, care must be taken that an officer having this right shall have had opportunity to qualify himself for exercising it without prejudice to the public interests. Hence the staff must be composed of officers of some experience in the service of troops; or else it must form a civil corps, like the medical and pay departments, ineligible to military command.

The rules of promotion laid down in section 7 of the bill are, I think, good. Those relative to the selection of general officers and of the Chief Engineer are the same that now exist by law. It would be difficult, and perhaps dangerous in our army, to extend the rule of selection very far; and the exception to the right of promotion, in case of disability or incompetency, may be sufficient to guard the service from the inconvenience of intrusting high and important duties to an officer of known inability to perform them. I think it important that the right of appointing majors of ordnance from the *engineers*, as well as the artillery, should be preserved, as in the Senate bill. Some of the duties of the ordnance department are so closely connected with those of the engineers, that it will be of great benefit to the service of both departments to have some of the ordnance officers practically acquainted with the details of engineering.

There may be a doubt about the propriety of the limitation put (in section 9) on the President's right of assigning a brevet officer to command a senior brevet. There are cases, for instance, when a lieutenant may have the brevet of major senior to that of an old captain and brevet major; and it would seem unjust to prevent the commanding officer from availing himself of the experience or ability of the latter by placing him in command of a detachment; whilst, on the other hand, the proposed limitation would not prevent him from placing the lieutenant in command over a *full* major or captain having no brevet. The rule respecting the right of officers of the medical and pay departments to command is expressed in the Senate bill in the terms of the present law on the subject; the addition made to it in the House bill seems to be unnecessary and inexpedient.

The increase of pay proposed in section 11 is obviously just and proper. The present rates of pay were established in 1806; and it is only necessary to compare the cost of the necessaries of life and the ordinary rates of wages at that period and this, to be convinced of the propriety, and indeed necessity, of an increase in the compensation of officers. The principle, besides, is fully recognised by Congress, in advancing the salaries of nearly all other government officers.

The part of the first proviso which allows full pay to officers absent from duty on account of "disease contracted in the line of duty" is too vague in its application, and will be liable to abuse. The third proviso, allowing service rations to general officers, seems to me eminently just and proper. The commanding general of the army, after forty years' service as a major general, and the most distinguished services, receives rather less pay now, I believe, than he did in 1815.

The provisions of the remaining sections, relative to a retired list, are of the utmost importance to the vigorous administration of the military force, by enabling the officers who have been worn out by age or infirmity to give place honorably to younger men fitted for

active service. This measure recommends itself so strongly and unanimously to the army, that the committee can have no doubt of the opinions of officers in its favor.

In thus expressing freely my views on the proposed bill, I have considered the question only in its general bearing on the wants of the army and of the country.

I have not regarded at all the probable effect of these measures on the interests of individuals, because that consideration must be subordinate to the general good. But it appears to me that if the whole bill (with the alterations which I have suggested) should be adopted, there will be no difficulty in making a suitable arrangement of the present officers without injustice to any of them.

If conflicting views should prevent the committee from recommending the adoption of all the provisions of the bill, much good may be effected by obtaining the *increase of force* which the condition of the frontier demands; the *retired list*, which is indispensable for making the force effective; and the *increase of pay*, which is an act of sheer and tardy justice to the officers.

A. MORDECAI,  
*Major Ordnance Department.*

HON. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,  
*Chairman of Committee on Military Affairs, H. R.*

---

WASHINGTON, January 22, 1855.

SIR: In compliance with a letter from the Secretary of War, of the 19th instant, I have made a full and careful examination of the bill (H. R. 615) "for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes," and respectfully submit the following views relative thereto.

The general principles of the bill are, in my judgment, sound and well calculated to promote the efficiency of the whole army. Its provisions are calculated to prevent controversies, now so frequent, in regard to rank and command; to diffuse the knowledge of staff duties among the whole army; to attain greater efficiency in the performance of those duties by giving a wider field for the selection of staff officers, who would also have a knowledge, gained from the experience of previous service with troops, of their wants and the best mode of supplying them; to remove jealousy and produce harmony and good feeling between the staff and the line, and to infuse new vigor and life into the army by retiring officers, incapacitated from performing their duties, and advancing the capable and competent to their places; at the same time making a fair provision for those who have been worn out or disabled in service; accelerating promotion, and establishing a rate of compensation somewhat commensurate with the services rendered, the responsibilities incurred, and the hardships endured by those actively employed in the army.

But while the bill contains these sound principles, and promises these valuable results, some of its details are, in my opinion, objectionable; so much so as, if not corrected, to raise an amount of oppo-

sition to it sufficient to defeat its passage, and thus lose the many advantages it is intended to secure to the military service of the country. These objectionable details are susceptible of correction without abandoning any essential principle of the bill. The modifications which I would suggest for this end, consist in making the proposed reorganizations of the different branches of the military service *gradual*, instead of *immediate*, and in effecting them in such a manner as not to disturb existing relations, or do violence to what may be regarded as vested rights. I have noted these modifications on the printed bill, herewith enclosed, in sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. I ask attention to them, and claim for the bill, as so modified, the following advantages over it in its original shape: It will displace no one, and will thus disarm in a great measure, if not entirely, the opposition to it as it now stands, which is not unlikely to cause its defeat. The disadvantages of the present organization of the general staff, the engineers and the ordnance, will become, every year, less and less, and in time (and not a long time either, with the help of the retired list) will entirely disappear. It will give each officer, after entering the army, an opportunity of learning practically, every branch of the military profession, and of showing for which of them he has the best qualifications and most aptitude; and will thus afford the best criterion for selections, when permanent appointments in any of the staff departments or corps are to be made. It will assure to every officer hereafter entering the army a period of service with troops, which will give him a practical military experience, invaluable in any branch of the service he may be subsequently called to act in. It is not with me an opinion, but a fixed conclusion, that it is a serious disadvantage to any graduate of the Military Academy to be entered, at the beginning of his army service, into one of the staff corps, without knowing his qualifications, taste, or aptitude for the peculiar duties of that corps. Class standing at West Point is by no means an infallible evidence of such qualification. The peculiar talent and aptitude, whether for active duties with troops in the field, or for the scientific or business pursuits of the staff, will be subsequently developed in the course of service, while the practical military knowledge acquired by service with troops in the first years of military life will never be forgotten, and never cease to tell advantageously in whatever branch of the army the officer may afterwards be placed. I would, therefore, have no lieutenants permanently attached to the staff, or to any staff corps; but would provide for the performance of duties therein, pertaining to subaltern officers, by details from other corps of the army.

For these reasons I propose my amendments to the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th sections of the bill; remarking more particularly, in reference to the *number* of extra lieutenants, stated in the amendment to the 2d section, that it provides officers for details only as the wants of the service may require them, and that the greatest number authorized for the purpose, viz: seven for each regiment—133 in all—is but enough to make up for details, as follows:

Forty for engineer duty, instead of the same number of that grade provided by the 3d section of the bill, but omitted by my amendment;



Seventeen for ordnance duty, which with the nineteen permanent officers provided by the 4th section as amended, will make up the number of the corps as now organized;

Nineteen for quartermasters' and commissaries' duties, being one for each regiment, as authorized by the 5th section of the bill; and

Fifty-seven for separate posts, as authorized by the same section.

The bill, if modified according to the views I have indicated, will attain the same ends that are proposed by it, as it now stands; the difference being, I conceive, that the mode of attaining those ends will, by my plan, obviate many serious objections to the bill as reported, and that the modified bill will be more likely to pass.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. MAYNADIER,

*Captain of Ordnance.*

Hon. C. J. FAULKNER,

*Chairman Committee on Military Affairs.*

---

*Bill, (H. R. 615,) with amendments proposed by Captain Maynadier, to accompany his letter of the 22d January, 1855, to the Hon. C. J. Faulkner; prepared in compliance with a request from the Committee on Military Affairs to communicate his views relative to this bill.*

A BILL for the increase and better organization of the army, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there shall be added to the army two regiments of infantry and two regiments of cavalry, organized as in the existing force, with such modifications as provided in this act.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That the present regiments of dragoons and mounted riflemen shall be hereafter styled regiments of cavalry, and that, in order to furnish details for engineer, ordnance, and general staff duties, there may be added to each regiment of artillery, infantry, and cavalry as many first lieutenants, not exceeding seven, as the exigencies of the service may require; each company of cavalry shall consist of one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, five sergeants, and from six to ten corporals, (one as quartermaster corporal, and one as saddler corporal,) two musicians, two farriers, and from sixty-four to one hundred privates, as the President may direct; that each company of artillery shall remain organized as at present, with the addition of one or three sergeants, the addition of one or three corporals, the addition of two or four artificers, and the addition of from the present number of privates up to one hundred, as the President may direct; and that each company of infantry shall remain organized as at present, with the addition of one sergeant, four corporals, and twenty-six privates, as the President may direct.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That there shall be added to the corps of engineers one brigadier general and a company of engineer

soldiers, organized as now provided by law; that the corps of topographical engineers shall be discontinued, and the officers of that corps transferred to the corps of engineers; that vacancies in and below the grade of captain in the corps of engineers shall not be filled until it shall be reduced to consist of one brigadier general, two colonels, two lieutenant colonels, eight majors, and twenty captains; and such additional officers as may be from time to time required for the performance of engineer duties, shall be detailed from the other corps of the army.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That vacancies in and below the grade of captain in the ordnance corps shall not be filled until it shall be reduced to consist of one colonel, two lieutenant colonels, eight majors, eight captains, and the military storekeepers and enlisted men now authorized by law; and such additional officers as may from time to time be required for the performance of ordnance duties, shall be detailed from the other corps of the army.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That including the number now authorized by law, and the one to be at the head of the engineers, there shall be ten brigadier generals—one to be adjutant general, one to be quartermaster general, and two to be employed as inspectors general, when required by the state of the service; and vacancies in the Subsistence, the Adjutant General's, and the Quartermaster's departments shall not be filled until these departments shall be reduced to consist of one commissary general, one judge advocate of the army, eight assistant adjutant generals, eight quartermasters, and six commissaries; and all vacancies, subsequently occurring in either of these departments, shall be filled by officers selected from the regiments or corps, and who shall receive each the cavalry pay and allowances of the grade next above that which he holds in his regiment or corps, except the commissary general, who shall receive the pay and allowances of a colonel; and there shall be as many assistant quartermasters and assistant commissaries as the service may require, not exceeding one to each regiment and each separate post, who shall be selected from the lieutenants of the army, and shall receive not more than twenty dollars nor less than ten dollars a month in addition to their pay, and be subject to duty in both departments: *Provided*, That the duties now performed by the quartermaster general, in relation to the supply and accountability for army clothing, be hereafter performed by the commissary general.

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That all commissioned officers of the army authorized by this act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Appointments on the staff, to wit: of adjutant general, quartermaster general, inspectors general, and to fill vacancies in the Subsistence, Adjutant General's, and Quartermaster's departments, shall be made by the President, shall confer no additional rank in the army, and shall be revoked, and the officer returned to the ordinary duties of his commission, whenever, in the judgment of the President, the public service may thereby be promoted; and the assistant quartermasters and assistant commissaries, authorized by this act, shall be appointed and removed under such regulations as the President may adopt; and

these appointments and selections of officers for staff duties shall be without prejudice to their rank and promotion in their respective regiments or corps; and all laws now in force authorizing the appointment, by commission, of inspectors general, of officers in the Adjutant General's department, in the Quartermaster General's department, in the Subsistence department, and of judge advocate of the army, and of the appointment of regimental quartermasters, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and the officers now holding commissions on the staff shall be arranged to places in the army, regard, as far as practicable, being had to rank.

SEC. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That general officers shall be appointed by selection; the brigadier general of engineers from the corps of engineers, and the colonel of ordnance by selection from the corps of ordnance; in all other cases promotions shall be made by seniority to the grade of colonel, inclusive, except in case of disability or incompetency. In the artillery, infantry, and cavalry, promotions to the rank of captain, inclusive, shall be made regimentally; above that grade, through the lines of artillery, infantry, and cavalry, respectively. Promotions in the engineers and ordnance shall be confined to the respective corps. Vacancies in the grade of captain of engineers or ordnance which may occur after these corps are reduced to the respective organizations provided by sections three and four of this act, shall be supplied by selection from the other corps of the army.

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That the President shall have power to prescribe the manner in which the troops shall be armed and equipped, according to the nature of their service.

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That articles sixty-first, sixty-second, and sixty-third of section first of the act of April ten, eighteen hundred and six, entitled "An act for establishing rules and articles for the government of the armies of the United States," be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and the following rules shall regulate the command and rank of officers in cases not provided for in the ninety-eighth article of the act just recited:

When different regiments or corps join and do duty together, the officer highest in rank there present on duty shall command the whole.

Officers shall take rank and do duty in the regiment or corps to which they belong, according to the commissions by which they are mustered therein. Brevet commissions shall not have effect, either for rank or pay, except in commands composed of different regiments or corps; and then only by assignment by the President, or such officer as he may empower to make such assignments; but no officer, by virtue of his brevet, shall be placed over another of higher rank by brevet.

An officer of the pay or medical departments cannot exercise command, except in his own department; nor shall he be commanded by a non-commissioned officer, nor by any but the commander of the post, the regiment, or troops with which he may be serving.

SEC. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That the officers and men authorized by this act shall be entitled to the same provisions for wounds and disabilities, and their widows and children to the same allow-

ances and benefits in every respect, as are allowed to those of other troops composing the army of the United States; and the officers and men shall be subject to the rules and articles of war, and the men shall be recruited in the same manner as other troops, and with the same conditions and limitations.

SEC. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That the monthly pay of officers shall be as follows: a major general, two hundred and sixty-five dollars; a brigadier general, one hundred and sixty-five dollars; a colonel, one hundred and thirty-five dollars; a lieutenant colonel, one hundred and fifteen dollars; a major, ninety-five dollars; a captain of cavalry, eighty-five dollars; a captain of artillery and infantry, seventy-five dollars; a first lieutenant of cavalry, sixty-five dollars; a first lieutenant of artillery and infantry, fifty-seven dollars; a second lieutenant of cavalry, fifty-five dollars; a second lieutenant of artillery and infantry, forty-seven dollars; a cadet, thirty-three dollars; and the surgeon general and paymaster general shall have the pay and allowances of a colonel; and the pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men belonging to horse artillery-batteries shall be the same as the pay and allowances of the corresponding grades of cavalry: *Provided*, That an officer absent from duty, except by reason of wounds received in action, or from disease contracted in the line of duty, for a longer period than at the rate of one month per year, shall, for the time of such absence, be entitled only to his pay and service rations, and no other allowances: *Provided, however*, That in cases of leave of absence from distant posts, the President of the United States may, in his discretion, extend the period from one month to fifty days, during which time the pay and allowance of such officer shall continue: *And provided further*, That service rations be allowed to general officers in like manner as to other officers.

SEC. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever any officer of the army shall be incapable of performing the duties of his office, and shall voluntarily apply to be retired from active service, or, on being ordered to perform the duties appropriate to his commission, shall report himself unable to comply with such order, or whenever, in the judgment of the President of the United States, any officer of the army shall be in any way incapable of performing the duties of his office, the President, at his discretion, shall direct the Secretary of War to refer the case of such officer to an army board, to be composed of not more than thirteen nor less than five commissioned officers, to be detailed from those of superior rank to him whose case is under consideration, as far as his grade and the interest of the service will permit. And the said board shall determine upon the case referred to them; and their opinion thereon, with a record of the proceedings, shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War, to be laid before the President for his approval or disapproval. If, in the judgment of the board, the officer be incapable of performing the duties of his office, the board shall report whether, in their opinion, the disability is to be traced to vicious habits. If not, and the President approve such judgment, the disabled officer shall thereupon be placed on the retired list. But if the board are of opinion that the disability is the result of vicious habits, and the President concur in that opinion, then

the disabled officer shall not be placed on the retired list, but shall be dropped from the rolls of the army.

SEC. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That when an officer is placed on the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of this act, he shall be withdrawn from active service and command, with the pay of the rank held by him at the time in his regiment or corps, and the service rations to which he may then be entitled, but without any other allowances; and the officer next in rank shall be promoted to the place of the retired officer, according to the rule of service. And the same rule of promotion shall be applied successively to the vacancies consequent upon the retirement of the disabled officer as herein provided: *Provided*, That if the disability be the result of wounds received in action, the officer shall have the pay of his highest rank by brevet or otherwise.

SEC. 14. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever the President shall deem it advisable to cause an officer who has been withdrawn from active service and retired from the line of promotion, as herein provided, to be placed on any duty not incompatible with his condition, such officer shall, for the time he may be so employed, be entitled to all the pay and allowances of the grade with which he was retired from service.

SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That during one year after the passage of this act, officers may be placed on the retired list, after which time no more officers shall be placed on the retired list without further authority of law.

---

## APPENDIX.

---

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Washington City, October 20, 1830.

SIR: In compliance with your order directing a report under a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 26th of April last, which requires the views of the Secretary of War to be presented to that House at its next session, as to the propriety of reducing the number of officers of the army, and as to the most efficient organization in conformity with the reduction proposed, I beg leave to remark, that whether any of the officers composing the army can be discharged without injury to the public service must depend upon the objects for which that body is maintained, and the duties it is required to perform.

The nature of our political system, with the advantages derived from our geographical position, enables us to dispense with large standing armies in time of peace; but the obligation to be at all times prepared for war, imposed upon us by a prudent regard to our own security, is not thereby lessened; on the contrary, it is a solemn duty, which we owe to ourselves and to the cause of free government, to be able to call into action the whole physical energies of our country

whenever circumstances may require it. This is peculiarly so at the present time, when revolution pervades the eastern continent, and it is uncertain whether liberal or despotic principles are ultimately to prevail. The representative system has existed on this continent nearly two centuries without interruption; it is, therefore, no longer an experiment: its results are to be seen in the liberty, the happiness, and the prosperity of our country. The *moral* influence of that system, without any physical effort on our part, is silently, but gradually and certainly, sapping the foundations of every absolute government in the civilized world. Those interested in perpetuating ancient abuses are aware of the source of their danger, and are fully sensible, if our institutions continue in successful operation, there will be no security for them. They have, therefore, all those motives of interest and of sympathy which so powerfully influence human action to unite against us; and should the contest now going on result in the ascendancy of despotism, nothing can save us from their attempts but the most erect and determined attitude on the part of the nation, and its ability to return, with interest, every blow aimed at it. Our peace establishment has, therefore, more important duties to perform, and higher destinies to achieve, than any other army on the globe. But, before we proceed to enumerate the duties which devolve upon it, let us examine the objects for which the armies of other countries are maintained.

If we look to the great states of Europe, we perceive in their past history that the reasons for supporting their large establishments in peace are, to protect the person, secure the authority, and enforce the edicts of the sovereign; and, in addition to those duties, to defend the country, and to carry on offensive operations in war; but if we recur to our own condition, we must be sensible that the former of those objects were never intended to be attained by military force. Public opinion is strong enough here to guaranty the execution of the laws, to secure the internal peace of the country, and to protect the public functionaries in the performance of their duties; and the small force composing our peace establishment, dispersed as it is over a territory embracing nineteen degrees of latitude and twenty-eight degrees of longitude, could never have been calculated to meet even the first shock of war. Hence it is manifestly maintained for other and different objects, some of the more important of which are, to acquire and preserve military knowledge, and perfect military discipline; to construct the permanent defences, and organize the material necessary in war; to form the stock on which an army competent to the defence of the country may be engrafted, and, by means of depots of instruction, directed by intelligent and able officers, hastened to maturity, to present a rallying point to the militia, and, by means of instructors, and an intelligent administrative staff, to impart to that essential arm of the national defence a part of its own efficiency. Many of these important duties devolve on officers without the agency of troops. All that relate to defences, reconnoissances, arming and equipping the militia, the formation of depots, the construction of military roads, and the preparation and preservation of arms, munitions, and stores, must be performed, whether we retain a single private soldier or not;



and the duties of the officers immediately connected with the troops depend not so much upon their numerical force as upon the extent of the national territory, and the consequent extent of the frontiers to be covered, and the number of posts to be occupied.

It is, therefore, apparent, that we require a much larger proportion of officers in time of peace, compared with the rank and file, than most European nations, with their large force and small territories, could find employment for; the more especially, as, with them, those works of defence and measures of preparation, which, with us, can hardly be said to have commenced, have been accomplished. If we recur to the military condition of France, for instance, we find her frontiers covered with fortresses, her arsenals filled with arms and munitions, her interior depots established, her bureaux filled with maps, plans, and topographical surveys, the valuable results of the labors of her staff; all her communications, such as roads and canals, which afford her the means of rapid concentration, complete; besides, occupying, as she does, a small territory compared with her immense population and resources, she requires but few officers connected with those important works compared with her large military force.

The United States have, on the contrary, an extensive frontier; their population and resources are dispersed over a widely extended territory; the internal communications of the country, so necessary for rapid military movements, whether projected by national or State authority, are incomplete; and, in short, in all their military relations, they present, when compared with France, the most striking contrast. It is not the policy of the country to retain, in time of peace, a large military establishment, particularly a numerous soldiery, but it is of the utmost importance to educate and retain a body of officers sufficient for all the labors preparatory to war, and capable of forming soldiers, of supplying them, and putting them in motion, in the event of war.

If these views be correct, it is not easy to perceive how any of the officers making part of our military establishment, as authorized by the act of 1821, or by subsequent acts, can be dispensed with. Our companies are now sufficiently large for all the purposes of instruction, and for the services required at most of our minor posts, and the officers are barely sufficient for the duties actually required to be performed.\*

---

\* For the exercise, in time of peace, of an artillery company, four pieces with four caissons are sufficient. The pieces should consist of two six-pounders, one twelve-pounder, and one howitzer. A captain should command the whole, and each section of two pieces should be commanded by a lieutenant. The line of caissons should be directed by a lieutenant, who should be conductor of ordnance, and receive and account for the stores of the company. An orderly sergeant is required to assist the captain in the military details; and an ordnance sergeant to assist the conductor of ordnance in the administrative details. A non-commissioned officer and eight privates are required for each piece, and one with two privates to each section of two caissons, and three artificers to each company; and there should be at least one lieutenant to each company, for the duties of the several staff corps.

The company for peace would then consist of—

- 1 captain to command.
- 2 lieutenants to command sections.
- 1 lieutenant, conductor of ordnance.
- 1 lieutenant for topographical, ordnance, and other staff duty.

The infantry and artillery furnish most of the assistant professors at West Point, two-thirds of the officers on topographical duty, all those on ordnance duty, and, with four exceptions, all those attached to the Commissary's and Quartermaster's departments. It is true, the officers serving with those corps might be permanently attached to them, and the regiments be reduced to a corresponding extent; but the measure would be one of transfer merely and not of reduction. The supernumerary officers, however, attached to the army, from the academy, and waiting for vacancies, being no part of the establishment, as authorized by the laws referred to, might be reduced; they now amount to eighty-four, and increase at the rate of about fourteen annually. The cadets at the academy might also be reduced from 250 to 150; the services of the supernumerary officers are not required; and 150 cadets, constantly in the course of education, would be sufficient for all the vacancies of the army in peace, and for those of the engineers, the ordnance, the artillery, and the topographical.

- 
- 1 orderly sergeant.
  - 1 ordnance sergeant.
  - 2 sergeants, and } attached to pieces and caissons.
  - 4 corporals,
  - 2 musicians.
  - 3 artificers.
  - 32 privates.

---

45

---

Being five officers and forty-five rank and file, or an aggregate of fifty; being ten less than our present companies.

In war, a company serves six pieces, with a caisson to each; and, in addition to the number of officers, non-commissioned officers, and privates, to the pieces and caissons, a farrier, a saddler and harness maker, five additional artificers, are required for the company, and two drivers to each piece and each caisson.

The company for war, without allowing for a single casualty, or a single officer for the staff, would then consist of—

- 1 captain to command.
- 3 lieutenants, commanding sections.
- 1 lieutenant, conductor of ordnance.

---

5

---

- 1 orderly sergeant.
- 1 ordnance sergeant.
- 3 sergeants, and } attached to pieces and caissons.
- 6 corporals,
- 2 musicians.
- 1 saddler and harness maker.
- 1 farrier.
- 8 artificers.
- 24 drivers.
- 48 privates, attached to pieces.
- 6 privates, attached to caissons.

---

101

---

Making five officers and one hundred and one rank and file, or an aggregate of one hundred and six; which force is barely sufficient for a company in the field, without allowing for a single casualty, or furnishing a single officer for the staff.

corps in war. The legal authority to appoint and retain either supernumeraries or cadets is extremely doubtful. If the cadets do not make part of the corps of engineers, there is no law in existence to authorize the appointment of more than ten; if they do form part of that corps, they are retained with it by the act of 1821; but as that act limits the officers of the army, and provides for no supernumeraries, there is no legal authority to attach the graduated cadets to the companies as such.

As to the organization which may be considered the more proper or the more efficient for a peace establishment, we should, regardless of European organization, be governed by our own situation, and the circumstances of our own country. The body of the army should be so formed as to admit of the greatest extension on the approach of war, and the staff should be so constituted as to be attached to either the regular force or the militia: this latter is the more necessary, as the militia must, in the event of war, form the greater part of our defensive force.

As but little progress has been made in the fortification and military survey of the country, both corps of engineers should be numerous; they should be as much so in peace as in war; for it is in peace only that scientific surveys can be faithfully made, and that permanent and durable works can be erected. The number of officers in both corps should, then, depend upon the works to be executed, and not upon the number of troops in service. We have more duty for them to perform, though our army is but six thousand strong, than France with her three hundred thousand men.

The ordnance department should be so organized as to require no augmentation in war: its most important labors are performed in peace: it is then that arms must be fabricated, and every munition prepared, and that depots should be established on all the great avenues leading to the frontiers. The operations of this department were paralyzed by the act of 1821, which merged the corps in the artillery. As its labors have but little relation to the peace establishment, but depend upon the whole military force, regular as well as militia, either in service, or liable to be called into service, in war, it is of the utmost importance to the future defence of the country, perhaps to its security and the preservation of its liberties, that the officers be separated from the body of the army, in order to devote themselves, exclusively, to their own peculiar duties. It is desirable, not only that our whole population be armed, but that the arms be of the best quality, for on their excellence, as well as on the skill of those who use them, depends their effect. So little attention had been paid to this branch of service previously to the late war, that it sometimes happened, out of ten thousand stands of arms taken to the point of distribution, not more than seven or eight hundred could be put into the hands of the troops; and it is a fact, which, so far as I am informed, public men have not yet dared to tell the nation, that, before the close of the war, we were unable to furnish arms to the troops at the various points assailed, and that we could not have armed, properly, a force of forty thousand men, had a campaign been necessary in 1815. Surely, if the lessons of experience be not entirely lost upon us, we

would not again place ourselves in so perilous a situation. Our citizens are all acquainted with the use of fire-arms, and it should be our policy to perfect that knowledge as far as possible; if we could quadruple the effect of our fire, compared with that of the troops of European nations, one of our soldiers would be equal to four of theirs; the effect might be increased tenfold; but it is to the ordnance, more than to any other department, we must look for this improvement.

The Adjutant General's department requires but few officers. We have an adjutant general to the army, and an adjutant to each regiment. To perfect the organization of that branch of service, an assistant adjutant general should be attached to each geographical department; those officers should be taken from the lieutenant colonels and majors of the line, as a detail might be made from those grades with less inconvenience to the service than from any other.

The inspector's department is one of the most important in the army, but the officers are not sufficiently numerous. Each inspector general should have an assistant, to be taken from the lieutenant colonels and majors of the line. This addition to the department, as well as that to the adjutant general's department, would involve no increase of the officers of the army, but would merely change the duties of four field officers. The inspectors, with this addition to their number, would be able to direct their attention to every department and branch of service, embracing all the fiscal concerns of the army, as well as its discipline and police. The change, though important to the public interests, would cause no additional expense: indeed, the expense might be lessened by dispensing with the inspections now made by the colonels of artillery.

The labors of the Subsistence and Quartermaster's departments depend upon the dispersed situation of the troops, and the number of posts they occupy. Those labors are increased by every movement made, and by every new position taken by the troops. For peace, the organization could not well be improved; and, in the event of war, nothing more would be required for the Subsistence department than a purchasing commissary for each geographical division, and a receiving and distributing commissary for each army; and for the Quartermaster's department, a regimental quartermaster to each regiment, a small number of forage, wagon, and barrack masters, and a corps of artificers. No army, however well appointed in other respects, could long keep the field in this country without an efficient commissariat; nor could it operate with effect without an able quartermaster.

The efficiency of those departments is much more essential to success here than in any other country, because the military, having no right to command the civil power, can derive from it no other than voluntary aid, whilst, in other countries, the civil power is made to co-operate with, and is, in some respects, subservient to the military. Even in Great Britain it is made, by law, the duty of every magistrate to facilitate the movement and supply of the troops.

The labors of the Pay department depend more upon the number of troops than those of any other branch of the administrative staff. Those labors, however, are considerably increased by the number of

posts occupied, and their great distance from each other. The organization of the department could not well be improved.

In regard to the body of the army, it may be proper to remark, that if military knowledge be essential in war, it is the true policy, not only of this, but of every free country, to adopt such an organization of the military force as shall, with the smallest numbers, preserve that knowledge in peace, and give it the greatest extension in war, for this is the only means by which a competent defence can be provided for the State, without the expense of supporting a large military establishment in time of peace. To attain this object, with certainty, the true principle of organization is this: *present the largest possible base from a given numerical force*. Our present establishment, though defective in its organization, approximates this principle. The defect in the organization of the infantry consists in having ten companies, and that of the artillery in having nine companies in place of eight, to a regiment. That is the best organization which admits of the greatest facility in manœuvring. A regiment of ten companies cannot be manœuvred, unless two of its companies be thrown out of the line; it may be divided into two divisions of five companies each, but there the division must stop; whilst a regiment, composed of eight companies, is susceptible of division down to sections and files. It may be said the supernumerary companies are to act as light troops; but why have two kind of troops in the same corps? Do we not, in this case, make a distinction without a difference? Are not the officers, as well as the soldiers, formed, armed, and equipped in the same manner, and disciplined according to the same principles? And have they not similar duties to perform? By incorporating light troops into our regiments we have adopted the *forms* of European service, without regard to the *principle* which governs there, or to the peculiar circumstances of our own country. In Europe, militia and volunteers are seldom used, and are never relied on; hence, as light troops are required in war, they are necessarily maintained in peace. But in this country, where we are compelled to use large bodies of both, we have always too great a proportion of light troops; all our regular troops should, therefore, be formed and organized for the duties of the line. But if we must so far sacrifice utility to the prejudices of the day, as to have light companies, let them be formed into regiments, have the most convenient organization for manœuvring, and be so instructed as to take their place in the line, or not, as the interests of the service may require.

To present my ideas the more clearly on the subject of organization, I annex to this report paper marked A, which is a copy of a tabular statement presented by me to one of your predecessors about ten years ago. It exhibits the plan of an organization adapted to a base of six thousand men, with the proposed extension in the event of war. The simple inspection of that paper will give a better idea of the practicability and advantages of the proposed plan, than the most labored report that could be written. With our army organized upon the principles there laid down, we should, on war becoming probable, be able to double our force by doubling the private soldiers of our companies; and should it become inevitable, we have only to add to each

regiment an additional battalion of eight companies, and we convert our peace establishment of six thousand men into a division twenty-four thousand strong, with the certainty of imparting to the whole, in less than two months' time, the discipline and efficiency of veteran troops. With such a foundation, we might prepare for the field, in six months, an army of a hundred thousand men; not mere recruits in uniform, but well instructed soldiers, partaking, in a great degree, of the character and efficiency of the original base of six thousand. To effect this important object, nothing more would be necessary than to establish, in convenient situations, fifteen or twenty depots of instruction throughout the country, and attach to each a well instructed field officer, one or two captains, and three or four subalterns. The instruction at those depots should not be confined to the regular army alone, but might be extended to all the militia officers, and to all the volunteer companies in the country. There are those, I am aware, who, in opposition to the facts of history, and the convictions of experience, deny the necessity of previous instruction and of practical military knowledge to the military commander: with such gentlemen it would be useless to reason; but it is proper to remark of them, that their own practice, in the most ordinary concerns of life, is in direct opposition to the principles they profess, and the opinions they hold; for, whilst they declaim against the necessity of professional knowledge and experience in those to whom the important duty of defending the country is confided, they require both, even in the laborers and domestics whom they employ. Not one of them would engage a carpenter to make his coat, or a tailor to build his house; and he would think the man insane who would ask a lawyer to set a broken limb, or a physician to conduct a suit at law; and yet there would be as much propriety in either, as to expect a farmer, a merchant, a lawyer, or any other citizen, without previous study, careful preparation, and experience in the practice of service, to become an able and accomplished officer.

Without referring to other countries, we have only to turn over the pages of our own history, to be satisfied of the deplorable consequences resulting from a want of timely preparation, as well in the personnel as the materiel of the army. We had, previously to the late war, submitted to outrages upon our commerce and our citizens, until forbearance had ceased to be a virtue. The voice of the whole country was for war, and we plunged into it without a proper organization of the army, or any of those preparations which it was our duty to make, and which an ordinary degree of foresight must have demonstrated to be necessary; and having committed the blunder, we neglected the only means by which the disastrous results of our measures could have been averted. In place of calling forth the intelligent and well instructed officers of the old corps, and employing them where their talents and acquirements would have been useful to the country, the higher ranks of the army were, for the most part, filled by men, selected rather for their political influence than their military fitness. The consequence was, we had no discipline or subordination in our corps, no accountability in the administrative departments, no well digested plan of operations, no combination or concert in the move-



ment of the different armies ; but the strength and resources of the country were wasted in puny and unsuccessful efforts, without use or object, on extensive and distant frontiers, and we presented the singular spectacle of a powerful nation with more than a million of men capable of bearing arms, with resources vastly exceeding those of any other nation of equal population, with two hundred thousand men actually under arms, invaded and defeated at all points, several of our posts captured and held by the enemy, our capital taken, our credit destroyed; and all this effected, too, by a petty province, aided at no time by more than twenty-five thousand men from the mother country, including the whole force that assailed us on every frontier. This is a picture, it must be acknowledged, by no means flattering to our national pride; but it is a true picture; and the time and the occasion require that the truth be told.

One great moral advantage certainly was gained by the war; and it is, perhaps, full compensation for all our misfortunes. We demonstrated, that we have, among the body of the people, men with capacity for every exigency; and we settled the question in regard to the permanency of our institutions, by proving that they were strong enough for war. But what, let me ask, would have been the character of the country, under its accumulated defeats, but for the victories on the ocean, achieved by officers who were masters of their profession, and those gained on land, either by men who had forced their way forward from the old corps, or who had been formed during the war, partly in the militia, and partly in the regular service, and had qualified themselves to lead to victory by the practice of two campaigns.

Had there been the requisite military information in our councils at the commencement of the war, that policy which pressed like a nightmare on the nation, and paralyzed all its energies, had been avoided; and, in place of being compelled to close the war, not only without having gained a single object for which it had been declared, but by conceding to the enemy the right of retaining a part of his conquests, to which he asserted a claim, and of making stipulations in favor of the Indians within our territories, whom he had chosen to designate as his allies, we had been able to dictate the terms of peace. History was open before us, and we had only to profit by its lessons to strike our enemy in the most vital point. The statesman, or the military man, accustomed to trace the current of human events through the history of the preceding century, could not but have observed the astonishing rise of the French naval power, and its rapid decline; and, if in the habit of tracing effects back to their causes, he must have perceived that this power rose with the possession, and declined with the loss, of the northeastern coast of this continent, and the islands adjacent to it. That coast, and those islands, are as important to Great Britain as they were to France; they formed, when war was declared, as they form now, the principal pillar of British naval power; they were within our grasp; we could have reached the more important parts of them without naval force; and had timely preparations been made for war, and the national energies been properly exerted, the first campaign must have placed them in our possession, with as little difficulty as a single campaign has placed Algiers in the posses-

sion of France. It is hardly possible to estimate the effects of so important an acquisition on the character and events of the war, or its influence on the negotiations for peace.

The length to which this paper has run admonishes me that it should be brought to a close; but I deem it due to myself to add, that, although I deprecate the reduction of the officers of the army proper as a measure fraught with the most injurious consequences to the national interests, I am not to be understood as including my own case. I leave it to others to determine the importance to the public of the station which I hold, as well as the value of the services which I perform; for I could not, consistently with a proper self-respect, be induced, on this or any other occasion, to offer a single argument as to the necessity for any office on which my official existence may depend.

I am, sir, respectfully, your obedient servant,

TH. S. JESUP,

*Brig. General, and Quartermaster General.*

Hon. J. H. EATON,

*Secretary of War, Washington City.*

## A.

Table of the organization proposed for the peace establishment, with a view of its practicable extension in the event of war.

PEACE ESTABLISHMENT.																			
Organization.	Major general.	Brigadier general.	Aids-de-camp.	Colonels.	Lieutenant colonels.	Majors.	Adjutants.	Captains.	First lieutenants.	Second lieutenants.	Sergeant majors.	Quartermasters' sergeants.	Principal musicians.	Sergeants.	Corporals.	Musicians.	Privates.	Total.	Aggregate.
Company.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	3	3	2	42	50	54
Regiment.....	.....	.....	.....	15	15	15	15	8	8	16	1	1	2	24	24	16	336	400	435
The line of the army*	.....	2	2	15	15	15	15	120	120	240	15	15	30	360	360	240	5,040	6,000	6,527

EXTENSION TO A WAR ESTABLISHMENT.																			
Company.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	.....	.....	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	4	6	2	88	100	103
Regiment.....	.....	.....	.....	15	30	15	1	16	16	16	1	1	2	64	96	32	1,408	1,604	1,656
The line of the army.....	2	4	8	15	30	15	30	240	240	240	15	30	30	960	1,440	480	21,120	24,060	24,846

\* The principles upon which this extension is made are: 1st. To double the rank and file of companies. 2d. Add a battalion consisting of eight companies to the regiment, with an additional lieutenant colonel. 3d. Promote the first lieutenants of the old companies to captaincies in the new battalion, and one of the second lieutenants of each of the old companies to first lieutenants in the new battalion. 4th. Assign half of the companies of the old battalion to the new one, and in the like manner receive half the companies of the new battalion into the old one.

- 1 regiment light artillery.
- 4 regiments foot artillery.
- 10 regiments infantry.
- 15 regiments.