

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	109	Press
212-213		Mis.
Dated	11- 1-	1873 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
11th January 1873.*

No. 212. Read the following letter from R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., F.R.I.B.A., Consulting Architect to Government, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 10th December 1872:—

With due submission I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to solicit Government to re-consider the question of my architectural fees for building the new Central Railway Station, disposed of in G. O. No. 1,341, dated the 23rd May last.

2. The order quoted is based on the representations of Colonel Shaw-Stewart in his letter No. 237, dated the 10th May last. In this letter Colonel Shaw-Stewart objects to disburse a further sum to me on the following grounds:—

1st.—That I *agreed* to perform the full duties of an Architect for the sum of Rupees 3,925 already received by me (paragraph 7, clause 2).

2nd.—That this sum has handsomely remunerated me for the work performed.

3rd.—That as I draw a salary from the State I am not entitled to receive anything over and above that salary.

3. I would beg to point out that the first objection arises from erroneous impressions; the second is a matter of opinion; the third a question only to be decided by Government.

4. The first point to consider is, what are the full duties of an Architect. Rule 15, "Royal Institute of British Architects," states, "All of the following requirements for building are included in the ordinary charge of 5 per cent:—

(1.)—"Preliminary Sketches.

(2.)—"Working drawings and specifications, sufficient for an estimate and contract.

(3.)—"Detailed drawings and instructions for execution.

(4.)—"General Superintendence of works (*exclusive* of Clerk of the Works).

(5.)—"Examining and passing the accounts (*exclusive* of measuring and making out extras and omissions).

Note.—"If the Architect should have drawn out the design complete with plans, elevations, sections, etc., ready for estimate, the charge is half the usual commission abovenamed, namely, 2½ per cent."

5. The questions which now present themselves are, what duties did I undertake to do, and what duties have I actually performed. By Colonel Shaw-Stewart's own showing I undertook to furnish "General and working drawings, quantities and specification, and to afford such information in respect of details as might be called for during the construction of the building (paragraph 2, letter No. 237), for a commission of 2½ per cent.," and what I have actually done may be gathered from Mr. Elwin, in his letter No. 294, paragraph 4, which states, "without wishing in the least to detract from the good services rendered by Mr. Hardinge, I think I am justified in saying that not possessing the qualifications of an Architect, he would have been unable to have perfected the building in all its details, without frequent professional counsel and assistance from Mr. Chisholm."

As Colonel Shaw-Stewart has never met me, or heard what I could urge in support of my views, he no doubt imagines that the "professional counsel and assistance" spoken of by Mr. Elwin is the same as the "information in respect of details during the construction of the building" spoken of by Mr. Smart. That they *both* mean, in point of fact, full architectural duties. That this impression is erroneous is proved beyond doubt by the Appendices A, B, and C. In my letter dated 24th May, Appendix B, I state that I will furnish all working drawings, specifications, etc., for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the estimated cost." Now, these duties alone do not constitute "*the full duties of an Architect*," neither is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the fee for such duties, but as if to place the matter beyond all doubt, I go on to say "that this (the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.) is the usual fee in England (for the duties to be undertaken)," the fee in England for full duties being 5 per cent. as shown above; had full duties been contemplated by me, I would have said 5 per cent., not $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Still further bearing on this point I state "I do not think you can do the work cheaper in your *Office*," showing that *Office* work alone was intended. Again, Mr. Smart says (Appendix C) "Government has sanctioned my proposition to obtain *drawings* of the new Central Station from you." Not one word is said on either side about either "full duties of an Architect or Superintendence." Thus, neither Mr. Smart nor myself had any doubt as to the extent of the duties to be performed, and had a doubt existed at the time, why, I may venture to observe, was no reference made to me? In further proof of the fact that superintendence was not contemplated, I would refer to the words quoted by Colonel Shaw-Stewart, "and will afford such information in respect of details as may be called for during the execution of the work." These words are meaningless if applied to any man in full architectural charge. To sum up, it will be seen from the correspondence that I really undertook to perform half duties at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

6. Colonel Shaw-Stewart seems to admit the fact that I have actually performed whole duties, but lest any doubt should arise on this point I may as well state that every drawing of any kind from the commencement to the termination of the works has been furnished by me. *Every order in connection with the construction of the works* has been given by me, and the whole *responsibility* of carrying the building into execution has rested with me.* The drawings themselves prove the truth of the first statement. The extracts from the Order Book (Appendix D), the truth of the second and third statements.

7. The second objection raised that I have already been "handsomely remunerated," is a matter of opinion.

8. I have been engaged on this work for the past six years, for which I have received Rupees 3,925, equal to, say, 55 Rupees per mensem, and had the additional sum of Rupees 3,000 been granted, the total monthly stipend of the Architect of the works would be about one-third of the salary of the Overseer! With all due submission I would respectfully ask is this scale of remuneration "handsome?" Would any professional man living, knowingly accept heavy responsibility on these terms?

9. The third objection (stripped of the somewhat confusing element of the agreement already commented on) is that as a salaried officer of the State I am not entitled to further remuneration from the Indian Exchequer.

* See Postscript.

10. While bowing with humility to any decision Government may be pleased to issue on this point, I would beg leave to note the fact that it is a wise, just, and equitable rule almost universal, for special services to be rewarded by extra remuneration; the instances of servants of the State drawing money for special duties are too numerous to require particularizing. The services rendered by me have involved an amount of care and anxiety far beyond the care and anxiety attached to the carrying on of even the largest works in the Western World where skilled labour and worthy materials are easily procurable; and that without hope of special reward I could not have worked as I have done.

11. In conclusion I deeply regret the position I am now placed in that of suing for a sum of money already denied. I feel supported, however, by the consciousness of the fact that two gentlemen, so zealous in the cause of the Railway Company, as Messrs. Anderson and Elwin, would not have recommended this expenditure on other than the strongest possible grounds.

P.S.—I append a letter received from Mr. Anderson and the drawings to which he refers. I see from his closing paragraph that I have unintentionally done an injustice to Mr. Hardinge and the Railway authorities. By "whole responsibility" I meant "whole responsibility" of my share of the work as Architect.

APPENDICES.

A.

MADRAS, 24th May.

MY DEAR CHISHOLM,—Before I can incur any expenditure for the new station I must obtain sanction. Will you therefore let me know what you would consider an adequate remuneration for a design. I shall want elevation front, end, etc., but not detail drawings nor specification. We can manage that in the office. Will Rupees 500 meet the case? Let me know soon, and I will put the matter before the Finance Committee on Tuesday.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) W. G. SMART.

B.

24th May 1866.

MY DEAR SMART,—If you only want sketch elevations like the one I previously furnished I shall be very happy to furnish them to you gratis, and then if you like after to present me with any gift other than money by way of thanks and appreciation I shall be very grateful. I would rather not value these productions.

I could furnish you with all detailed and working drawings, quantities, and specification for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the Contractor's Certificates, which is the usual fee in England. I don't think you will be able to do the work in your *Office* cheaper, however command me in any way you please.

I should like to see the plan again with you before commencing work.

C.

SATURDAY, July—.

MY DEAR CHISHOLM,—You will be glad to hear (if you are not I am) that Government has sanctioned my proposition to obtain drawings of the new station from you. You may there-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
11th January 1873.*

fore proceed to business as soon as you like. I shall send you back the two drawings you left with me.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) W. G. SMART.

D.

Random Extracts from the Daily Diary kept on the Works of the New Central Station.

8th April 1870.

Mr. Chisholm inspects at 6 P.M. Approves of dog-tooth moulding put on for muster with ornamental bricks over one of the front verandah arches (8'-7"), and orders all the front verandah arches to be finished like it. Orders to get ready sharp the two black columns in carriage exit. These to be of Palaveram stone, as it polishes better than Cuddapah stone. I pointed out the arch we turned yesterday in roof of luggage-room; he ordered the centring to be struck, examined the centring and the arch turned, and approved of both, he says the wooden keys we are now using in the iron clips ought to be a little tapered. Cancels his order of 17th March 1870 for three ventilators in the west wall of luggage-room, and orders only two to be put in. Roof to be completed like the muster arch approved of, except at the ends where the arches are to be turned of a buckled shape, curved from all sides—this requiring centres different from those we are now using—says, tiebars in the roof are quite unnecessary. Rolled girders being bolted on to the main girder is all that is necessary. Orders to discontinue using these in the other parts of the building, as they come in the way of turning the arches in the roof: says the method of fixing the tiebars into the wall with an iron plate and key is not according to his design, but still it will do.

Orders the rise of arches in roof of luggage-room to be lessened to 5½" from 7" as shown in his detail, in consequence of the thickness of these arches with terrace bricks being 6½" and not 5" as intended, with hollow bricks.

The above memorandum was written by Mr. GEORGE HARDINGE, C.E., in charge of the Station works.

18th July 1871.

Mr. Chisholm inspects at 7-30 A.M., and enters the following orders in my pocket book:—

1. *Back of front arch of Tower Lower Story.*—Cut away the top of the spandril, lower arch of tower as per sketch.
2. *Passenger's Shed-roof.*—Add a single couple of X braces in roof of shed at northern end over six spans.
3. The transom at springing of turret upper arches and ties, and should be cramped with gun metal or copper cramps, run with lead, two to each stone, metal 1½" X ¼". Galvanized iron will do as well as the other metals.
4. *Roof "Offices" West.*—Asphalte the east end of roof as far as the west side of covered way.
5. *Passengers' Shed-roof.*—Leave out the ventilators to the last ten trusses north end.
6. (a.) *Station Master's dining-room.*—Make a 10 feet opening north end of Dining room, same springing as other openings 3 feet sill.
(b.) Also a window centre of maty's room 3 feet sill and 5 feet, same springing as others.
(c.) Close up the trifol windows below dining-room with 9 work, centre of wall.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
11th January 1873.*

7. I think it would be advisable if the centre openings in Telegraph Office and Waiting-room be closed with brick. They are bearing their full weight, but look light for the work they have to do; they are bearing a calculated weight of 11 tons per foot.

The Acting Chief Engineer visited the works at 6 P.M. on 18th July, and give instructions that Mr. Chisholm's recommendations as above should be carried out. Mr. Chisholm advised that the buffer frames should be moved forward about 12'-6"; this Mr. Going ordered to be done. Mr. Chisholm ordered that black stone was to be omitted in cornice, front verandah, and Sholingur stone 18" X 4" set in its place, the chamfered cornice to be altogether omitted.

(Signed) G. HARDINGE.

11th October 1872.

Mr. Chisholm explains how to make the slope in front and back of upper arch tower, and sees this slope laid out full size on Booking Office floor. Sees patterns of heads of 5" and 9" rain pipes and pattern of bracket gutter upper roof, altered for ¼" metal, and orders one of each to be cast and sent up here for inspection; approves of Mr. Hardinge's instructions to me about ridge in upper verandah roof, laid out full size on Booking Office floor, and orders a small rafter to be joined on to the ridge piece. A stronger job not to cut any rebate, but bolt purlin through truss—see Indent No. 241, 3rd November 1871. A rebate of one inch to be cut into the purlins, and the purlins let down by that depth below the truss, rafters. Purlins to be fastened with 6" iron spikes. Inspects brick-work going on in turrets, also granite cornice setting in south-east turret, and orders brick-work next and above this cornice to be gone on with to receive the mansard roof. Top and bottom of C. I. columns. Relieving arches to be cleaned quite free of white lead and painted afresh with red lead before erecting.

The above was written by Mr. T. M. PEFEILE, C.E.

I receive over charge of new Central Station, i.e., from Mr. T. M. Pefeile this day.
(Signed) G. HARDINGE.

E.

From BERESFORD ANDERSON, Esq., Chief Engineer, to R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., dated Madras, 18th December 1872, No. 1,226.

I HAVE perused your letter dated 10th instant to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, and cannot help thinking that you have left out a point which deserves notice.

2. Referring to the extra drawings supplied by you for works not included in your agreement, Colonel Shaw-Stewart says, in the 9th paragraph of his letter No. 237, dated 10th May 1872, "I am surprised to find them even alluded to."

3. The accompanying tracings of these drawings will show that they were worthy of some little consideration, and I have no objection, if you think fit, to your appending them to your letter.

4. With reference to your 6th paragraph I take it for granted that when you speak of "whole responsibility" you allude to the responsibility arising from instructions given by you, approved by me, and carried out by Mr. Hardinge.

No. 213. ORDER THEREON, 11th January 1873, No. 109.

RAILWAY, No. 27.

His Excellency the Governor in Council on re-consideration of the nature of the duties actually performed by Mr. Chisholm as compared with those with reference to which the remuneration

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
11th January 1873.

already made to him was fixed, is pleased to sanction the payment of an additional sum of Rupees 3,000 in token of appreciation of his valuable services in connection with the designing and execution of the new Central Station of the Madras Railway.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Architect.
.. Consulting Engineer for Railways.

"By Order of the Secretary to Government."

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

Appendix E

No 1226

Madras Railway Company
Chief Engineer's Office
Madras 18th December 1872

My dear Fisholow.

I have perused your letter dated 10th instant to the Secretary of Government P.W.D. and cannot help thinking that you have left out a point which deserves notice.

Referring to the extra drawings supplied by you for works not included in your agreement, Colonel Shaw Stewart says, in the 9th para. of his letter No 237 dated 10th May 1872. "I am surprised to find them even alluded to."

The accompanying tracings of these drawings will shew that they were worthy of some little consideration, and I have no objection, if you think fit, to your appending them to your letter.

With reference to your 6th para. I take it for granted that when you speak of "whole responsibility" you allude to the responsibility arising from instructions given by

Plans, Elevations, Sections, &c., ready for Estimate, the charge is half the usual commission abovenamed, viz., 2½ per cent."

by you, approved by me, and carried out by
Mr. Hardinge.

Yours very truly,
R. F. Chisholm

Chief Engineer

R. F. Chisholm, Esq.

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

MADRAS, 10th December, 1872.

FROM

R. F. CHISHOLM, F. R. I. B. A.,
Consulting Architect to Government.

TO

COLONEL G. W. WALKER, R. E.,
Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

SIR,—With due submission I have the honor to request, that you will be good enough to solicit Government to reconsider the question of my architectural fees for building the New Central Railway Station disposed of in G. O. No. 1,341, dated the 23rd May last.

2. The Order quoted is based on the representations of Colonel Shaw Stewart in his letter No. 237, dated the 10th May last. In this letter Colonel Shaw Stewart objects to disburse a further sum to me on the following grounds:—

First.—That I agreed to perform the full duties of an Architect for the sum of Rs. 3,925 already received by me (Para. 7 Clause 2.)

Secondly.—That this sum has handsomely remunerated me for the work performed.

Thirdly.—That as I draw a salary from the State, I am not entitled to receive anything over and above that salary.

3. I would beg to point out, that the first objection arises from erroneous impressions; the second is a matter of opinion; the third a question only to be decided by Government.

4. The first point to consider is, what are the full duties of an Architect. Rule 15, "Royal Institute of British Architects," states:—"All of the following requirements for building are included in the ordinary charge of 5 per cent:—

- (1.) "Preliminary Sketches.
- (2.) "Working Drawings and Specifications, sufficient for an Estimate and Contract.
- (3.) "Detailed Drawings and instructions for execution.
- (4.) "General Superintendence of works (*exclusive* of Clerk of the Works).
- (5.) "Examining and passing the accounts (*exclusive* of measuring and making out extras and omissions).

Note.—"If the Architect should have drawn out the design complete with Plans, Elevations, Sections, &c., ready for Estimate, the charge is half the usual commission abovenamed, viz., 2½ per cent."

5. The questions which now present themselves are, what duties did I undertake to do, and what duties have I actually performed. By Colonel Shaw Stewart's own showing, I undertook to furnish "General and working drawings, quantities and specification, and to afford such information in respect of details as might be called for during the construction of the building (para. 2, letter No. 237), for a commission of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.," and what I have actually done may be gathered from Mr. Elwin, in his letter No. 294, para. 4, which states, "without wishing in the least to detract from the good services rendered by Mr. Hardinge, I think I am justified in saying that not possessing the qualifications of an Architect, he would have been unable to have perfected the building in all its details, without frequent professional counsel and assistance from Mr. Chisholm." As Colonel Shaw Stewart has never met me, or heard what I could urge in support of my views, he no doubt imagines that the "professional counsel and assistance" spoken of by Mr. Elwin, is the same as the "information in respect of details during the construction of the building" spoken of by Mr. Smart. That they both mean in point of fact full architectural duties. That this impression is erroneous, is proved beyond doubt by the Appendices A, B, and C. In my letter, dated 24th May, Appendix B, I state that I will furnish all working drawings, specifications, &c., for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., on the estimated cost." Now, these duties alone do not constitute "the full duties of an Architect," neither is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the fee for such duties, but as if to place the matter beyond all doubt, I go on to say, "that this (the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.) is the usual fee in England (for the duties to be undertaken), the fee in England for full duties being 5 per cent., as shown above, had full duties been contemplated by me, I would have said 5 per cent., not $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Still further bearing on this point, I state, "I do not think you can do the work cheaper in your Office," showing that Office work alone was intended. Again Mr. Smart says, (Appendix C.) "Government has sanctioned my proposition to obtain drawings of the New Central Station from you." Not one word is said on either side about either "full duties of an Architect, or Superintendence." Thus, neither Mr. Smart nor myself had any doubt as to the extent of the duties to be performed, and had a doubt existed at the time, why, I may venture to observe, was no reference made to me? In further proof of the fact that Superintendence was not contemplated, I would refer to the words quoted by Colonel Shaw Stewart "and will afford such information in respect of details as may be called for during the execution of the work." These words are meaningless if applied to any man in full architectural charge. To sum up, it will be seen from the correspondence, that I really undertook to perform half duties at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

6. Colonel Shaw Stewart seems to admit the fact, that I have actually performed whole duties, but lest any doubt should arise on this point, I may as well state, that every drawing of any kind from the commencement to the termination of the works has been furnished by me. Every order in connection with the construction of the works has been given by me, and the whole responsibility of carrying the building into execution has rested with me. The drawings themselves prove the truth of the first statement. The extracts from the Order Book (Appendix D), the truth of the second and third statements.

*. *See postscript.*

7. The second objection raised, that I have already been "handsomely remunerated," is a matter of opinion.

8. I have been engaged on this work for the past six years, for which I have received Rs. 3,925, equal to say, 55 Rs. per mensem, and had the additional sum of Rs. 3,000 been granted, the total monthly stipend of the Architect of the works, would be about one-third of the salary of the Overseer! With all due submission I would respectfully ask, is this scale of remuneration "handsome?" would any professional man living, knowingly accept heavy responsibility on these terms?

9. The third objection (stripped of the somewhat confusing element of the agreement already commented on) is, that as a salaried Officer of the State, I am not entitled to further remuneration from the Indian Exchequer.

10. While bowing with humility to any decision Government may be pleased to issue on this point, I would beg leave to note the fact, that it is a wise, just, and equitable rule, almost universal, for special services to be rewarded by extra remuneration, the instances of servants of the State drawing money for special duties, are too numerous to require particularizing. The services rendered by me, have involved an amount of care and anxiety far beyond the care and anxiety attached to the carrying on of even the largest works in the Western World, where skilled labor and worthy materials are easily procurable; and that without hope of special reward, I could not have worked as I have done.

11. In conclusion, I deeply regret the position I am now placed in, that of suing for a sum of money already denied, I feel supported, however, by the consciousness of the fact, that two gentlemen, so zealous in the cause of the Railway Company, as Messrs. Anderson and Elwin, would not have recommended this expenditure on other than the strongest possible grounds.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

B. F. Chisholm. F.R.I.B.A.

P.S. I append a letter received from Mr. Anderson and the drawings to which he refers. I see from his closing paragraph that I have unintentionally done an injustice to Mr. Hardinge and the Railway Authorities. By "whole responsibility" I meant "whole responsibility" of my share of the work as architect.

B. F. C.

S P 3
13

APPENDICES.

Appendix A.

MADRAS, 24th May.

MY DEAR CHISHOLM,—Before I can incur any expenditure for the new Station, I must obtain sanction. Will you therefore let me know what you would consider an adequate remuneration for a design. I shall want Elevation Front, End, &c., but not detail drawings nor specification. We can manage that in the office. Will Rs. 500 meet the case? let me know soon, and I will put the matter before the Finance Committee on Tuesday.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) W. G. SMART.

Appendix B.

24th May, 1866.

MY DEAR SMART,—If you only want sketch Elevations like the one I previously furnished, I shall be very happy to furnish them to you gratis and then if you like after to present me with any gift other than money by way of thanks and appreciation, I shall be very grateful. I would rather not value these productions.

I could furnish you with all *detailed and working Drawings, Quantities and Specification for 2½ per cent. on the Contractor's Certificates, which is the usual fee in England.* I don't think you will be able to do the work in your Office cheaper, however command me in any way you please.

I should like to see the plan again with you before commencing work.

Appendix C.

SATURDAY, July

MY DEAR CHISHOLM,—You will be glad to hear, (if you are not I am) that Government has sanctioned my proposition to obtain drawings of the new station from you. You may therefore proceed to business as soon as you like. I shall send you back the two drawings you left with me.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) W. G. SMART.

Appendix D.

Random Extracts from the Daily Diary kept on the works of the New Central Station.

8th April, 1870.

Mr. Chisholm inspects at 6 p. m., Approves of Dogtooth Moulding put on for muster with ornamental bricks over one of the Front Verandah Arches (8' 7") and orders all the Front Verandah Arches to be finished like it. Orders to get ready sharp the 2 Black Columns in Carriage Exit. These to be of Palaveram stone, as it polishes better than Cuddapah stone. I pointed out the arch we turned yesterday in roof of Luggage room, he ordered the centring to be struck, examined the centring and the Arch turned, and approved of both—he says the wooden keys we are now using in the Iron clips ought to be a little tapered. Cancels his order of 17th March 1870 for 3 Ventilators in the west wall of Luggage room and orders only 2 to be put in. Roof to be completed like the muster arch approved of, except at the ends where the arches are to be turned of a buckled shape curved from all sides—this requiring centres different from those we are now using—says, Tiebars in the roof are quite unnecessary. Rolled girders being bolted on to the main girder is all that is necessary. Orders to discontinue using these in the other parts of the building as they come in the way of turning the arches in the roof—says the method of fixing the Tiebars into the wall with an iron plate and key is not according to his design, but still it will do.

Orders the rise of arches in roof of Luggage room to be lessened to 5½" from 7" as shewn in his detail, in consequence of the thickness of these arches with terrace bricks being 6½" and not 5" as intended, with hollow bricks.

The above Memo. was written by Mr. GEORGE HARDINGE, C. E., in charge of the Station works.

18th July, 1871.

Mr. Chisholm inspects at 7-30 A. M., and enters the following orders in my pocket book:—

1. *Back of Front Arch of Tower Lower Story.*—Cut away the top of the spandril, lower arch of Tower as per sketch.
2. *Passengers Shed Roof.*—Add a single couple of X braces in roof of shed at northern end over 6 spans.
3. The Transom at springing of Turret Upper Arches and Ties, and should be cramped with gun metal or copper cramps, run with lead, two to each stone, metal 1½" x ½". Galvanized iron will do as well as the other metals.
4. *Roof "Offices" West.*—Asphalte the East end of Roof as far as the west side of covered way.
5. *Passenger's Shed Roof.*—Leave out the ventilators to the last 10 Trusses North end.
6. (a.) *Station Master's Dining Room.*—Make a 10 feet opening north end of Dining room, same springing as other openings 3 feet sill.
(b.) Also a window centre of Maty's room 3 feet sill and 5 feet, same springing as others.
(c.) Close up the Trifoil windows below Dining room with 9 work, centre of wall.

7. I think it would be advisable if the centre openings in Telegraph office and waiting room be closed with brick. They are bearing their full weight, but look light for the work they have to do:—they are bearing a Calculated weight of 11 Tons per feet.

The Acting Chief Engineer visited the works at 6 P. M., on 18th July and give instructions that Mr. Chisholm's recommendations as above should be carried out. Mr. Chisholm advised that the buffer frames should be moved forward about 12' 6"; this Mr. Going ordered to be done. Mr. Chisholm ordered that black stone was to be omitted in cornice, front verandah, and Sholingur stone 18" x 4" set in its place the chamfered cornice to be altogether omitted.

(Signed) G. HARDINGE.

11th October, 1872.

Mr. Chisholm explains how to make the slope in front and back of upper arch Tower—and secs this slope laid out full size on Booking Office floor. Sees patterns of heads of 5" and 9" rain pipes and pattern of bracket gutter upper roof, altered for ¼" metal, and orders one of each to be cast and sent up here for inspection—approves of Mr. Hardinge's instructions to me about ridge in upper verandah roof, laid out full size on Booking Office, floor and orders a small rafter to be joined on to the ridge piece. A stronger job not to cut any rebate, but bolt purlin thro' truss See indent No. 241 3. 11. 71. Arebate of one inch to be cut into the purlins, and the purlins let down by that depth below the Truss, rafters. Purlins to be fastened with 6" Iron spikes. Inspects Brickwork going on in Turrets, also granite cornice setting in S. E. Turret, and orders brickwork next and above this cornice to be gone on with to receive the mansard roof. Top and Bottom of C. I. Columns. Relieving arches to be cleaned quite free of white lead and painted afresh with red lead before erecting.

The above was written by Mr. T. M. PEFEILE, C. E.

I receive over charge of N. C. Station, i. e., from Mr. T. M. Pefeile this day.

(Signed) G. HARDINGE.

Public Works Department

Letter from the Consulting Architect
to Government dated 10th December 1872.

Circulated for
orders with reference to
the Minutes of Members
of Government on which
G. O. No. 1341 dated
28th May was based

I think Mr. Chisholm's letter
shows that in their order upon
him any further remuneration the
Govt had not contemplated the
nature of the work performed by
Mr. Chisholm in connection with
the New Railway Station. -
He has shown I think conclusively
that he has performed the duty
of General Superintendent of works
Mr. Darling of the Railway having
acted under Mr. Chisholm as Clerk
of the works. Whether this work
should properly have been performed
by the Govt Architect may be questionable
but it has been so performed. &
I think Mr. Chisholm is fairly &
logically entitled to the very moderate
remuneration he claims.

W. H. D.

Walker Collrs
Secy to Govt P.W.D.
- May former
note & last May letter.
If Mr. C. did extra
work - & this seems
admitted by the Railway
I think he is entitled
by the Commission. 1872

P. 1872
10 December 1872
No 6345.

Mr. 7. Chisholm J.R.I.B.A.
Audited.

To
Mr. G. H. Walker R.E.

Deborah to Govt.

Enc 1
Planning & Construction
Subject
Regarding Architectural
for Building the New
Railway Station

No 109-11 May 1873.

Dec 23 May 1872 P.W.D. 109

P.C. 10 May 1873
to Mr. Chisholm

Uj

Ad. 1000000
247



Paul S. Smith

№ 109 Рн - РнД 6

MR

execution of the new
Central Station of the
Hachas Railway -

EMH

(15)

For
See Cons² Architect's
" C. Eng^r for Rys
" Ex^r of Rys
Re-s design 11/1/72 to be the former
P-C - 6/2/73 to all

C/6345

Govt. of 1873 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Consulting Engineer
Architect

Date

4-2-74

Recd.

Encl. 10

G. O. 11th Aug 1873. No. 109.

No. 212 & 213

New Central Station,
Madras Railway.

Sanctioning the payment
to Mr. W. C. Fisher
of an amount of
Rs: 3000 for services
rendered in connection
with the new station.