Public Works (189) Department.

G.O., No. 624 W

DATED 9.3.98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Connemara Library Tower. The honorary title of Assistant Engineer withdrawn from Mr. Mahony as a mark of the displeasure of Govt. for his neglect of duty in permitting bad workmanship on the —

S.aw
9.3.98

[P. W. 25.
1,000—30-11-97.]

Indexed. 14/B

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

B/ from orders

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 1383 of 1898, dated 11. 2. 98, from the C.A. to Govt.
" " " 189 , " , "
" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER.

No. 624W, 9·3·98

In para 20 of G.O. No. 3527W dated 16 December 1897, Mr. P. Mahony, Hony. Asst. Engineer, was called upon to explain his neglect of duty in permitting the bad workmanship on the Connemara Library Tower referred to in para 21 of the Chief Engineer's note printed with the G.O. The explanation has now been submitted through the Cons. Architect & is briefly as follows.—

(1) Owing to frequent alterations during construction and to the settlement of the Tower, the brickwork is not now what it was

(2) The works provided for was only "ordinary" brick-work.

(3) He had so many other works on hand at the time, that he could only devote a portion of his time to the Tower, & that he had only two maistries to assist him.

2. Mr Mahony also calls attention to the fact that in 32 years' service, he has never once been reprimanded.

3. The Consulting Architect supports Mr Mahony's contention that he had too much to do to supervise the Commemoration Tower properly, and trusts that it will not be found necessary to punish him. If it is considered necessary, he gives him an excellent character with a view to mitigation of punishment.

4. In the first portion of his explanation, Mr Mahony begs the question altogether. No amount of alteration or settlement could have produced the bad work complained of. It was, and could be, due to nothing else than defective supervision, & it would hardly have been possible if Mr Mahony had inspected the work effectually once a week.

5. His second statement that only 'ordinary' brick-work was provided for also shows how little he appreciates the gravity of his fault. ~~As is understood that~~ Excellent ~~the~~ "ordinary brick-~~work" ...~~" to that being done in Madras ~~under~~ the present consulting Architect ~~is perfect~~, while the "ordinary" brickwork on the Tower was extraordinarily bad.

6. In his contention that he had not sufficient time to

devote to this important work. Mr Mahony is supported by the Cons. Architect, but the Govt. is convinced that with more efficient superior supervision, Mr Mahony would have found ample time to supervise the work.

7. 143. The Govt. in Council is therefore of opinion that Mr Mahony has by no means exonerated himself from blame in this matter, & that he deserves to be punished. ~~But~~ In consideration however of what has been urged in his favour by the Cons. Architect, the Govt. refrains from reducing him in departmental rank or ordering his removal from Madras, but

that the failure of the Tower was largely due to his insufficient supervision of the work. It is impossible to overlook altogether so grave a neglect of duty, but, in consideration of what has been urged in his favour by the Cons. Architect, the Govt. resolves to ~~inflict~~ ~~a [illegible] punishment~~ take the most lenient view possible

and to mark its displeasure at his conduct, ~~the~~ by ~~[illegible] hereby~~ withdrawing from Mr Mahony his honorary title of Assistant Engineer.

Cir WHL 8.9.84

S ron 8/3/98

Cir S.A.W.

E R

C.A. to Govt.

Secy P.W. Dept

(extract from "The Govt. resolves to take ~~hereby withdraws~~" to end.)

Seen

[43/500]

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1383

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.
THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.
THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

SUBJECT.

Mr Malony's explan= of his neglect of duty in the Connemara library tower.

FOR ORDERS.

In para 4 of G.O. No. 3527 W d/ 16th December 1897 Mr. P. Mahony, Honorary Assistant Engineer, is called upon to explain his neglect of duty in -- permitting the bad workmanship on the Connemara Library Tower referred to in para 21 of the note printed --- with the G.O. This explanation is -- herewith submitted and is briefly as follows:-

(1) Owing to frequent alterations -- during construction & to the settlement of the tower the brickwork is not now what it was.

(2) The work provided for was only 'ordinary' brickwork.

(3) He had so many other works on -- hand at the time that he could only devote a portion of his time to the tower, & he had only two maistries to assist him.

2. Mr. Mahony also calls attention to the fact that in 32 year's service

Mr. Mahony's Hon. title of Asst. Engineer is withdrawn.

A.G.H
6.3.98

service he has never once been reprimanded.

3. Mr. Harris, the Consulting Architect, supports Mr. Mahony's contention that he had too much to do to supervise the Connemara Tower properly & ~~hints~~ trusts that it will not be found necessary to punish him. If it is considered necessary, he gives him an excellent character with a view to mitigation of punishment.

4. In the first portion of his explanation Mr. Mahony begs the question altogether. No amount of alteration or settlement could have produced the bad work complained of. It was, and could be, due to nothing else than defective supervision. It would hardly have been possible if Mr. Mahony had inspected the work effectually once a week. It is quite certain that if Mr. Harris had been over him at the time Mr. Mahony would have found ample time to supervise the work properly.

5. His second statement that only ordinary brickwork was provided for also shows how little he appeciates the gravity of his fault. 'Ordinary' brickwork is now being done under Mr. Harris all over Madras, and is perfect. The 'ordinary' brickwork on the Tower was extraordinarily bad.

6.

6. In his contention that he had not sufficient time to devote to this important work, Mr. Mahony is -- supported by Mr. Harris, and it is no doubt true that many of our upper subordinates are overworked, but it is impossible to get over the fact that if Mr. Harris had been the Consulting Architect during the construction of the tower Mr. Mahony would have found ample time to --- supervise the work, and the quality of the latter would have been excellent.

The prime cause of all this bad work was the laxity of supervision exercised by Mr. Irwin, but it is impossible to acquit his subordinate of all share in the blame.

7. I am therefore of opinion that Mr. Mahony has by no means exonerated himself from blame in this matter, & that he deserves to be punished. This punishment may take one of three -- forms:-

(a) Withdrawal of his honorary title of Assistant Engineer.

(b) Reduction from Sub Engineer 1st grade to Sub Engineer 2nd --- grade, i.e. from Rs. 400 to Rs. 300 per mensem.

(c) Removal from Madras, where he has been since 1888.

The

The second is much the most severe, and Mr. Harris is very unwilling that Mr. Mahony should be moved from Madras, because of his intimate acquaintance with the various buildings there & the brickfields. Perhaps therefore the first would be the best form of punishment.

I leave Mr. Harris' plea in mitigation for His Excellency's consideration. My own opinion is that Mr. Mahony's fault is a very serious one, because if the work had been quite sound it is probable that the tower would be standing now; but it is, of course, the case that in punishing Mr. Mahony we shall not be punishing the principal offender, & this, coupled with Mr. Mahony's previous good character, may, perhaps, be taken in mitigation. It may also be said that he has only 1½ years more to serve

W. 4.3.98

4.3.98

4.E.4-3-98 R 7-3-98.

4
300—14-10-97.

DEPARTMENT.

5

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. of 189 , dated , from
" " " 189 , "
" " " 189 , "

Zair

W.S.

For ORDERS

In Para 4 of G.O. No 3527 W dated 16 Dec 1897 Mr S. Mahony Assistant Engr is called upon to explain his neglect of duty in noticing the bad workmanship in the Connemara Library Tower referred to in Para 21 of the note forwarded with the G.O. His explanation is herewith submitted & is briefly as follows

(1) ~~The~~ Owing to frequent alteration during construction & close settlement of the tower, the brickwork is not now what it was.

(2) The work provided for was of 'ordinary' brickwork -

(3) He had so many other works in hand at the time

that he could not devote a portion of his time to the Tower, & he had not 2 maistries to assist him.

2. Mr Mahony also calls attention to the fact that in 32 years service he has never once been reprimanded.

3. Mr Harris the Cons. Architect, supports Mr. Mahony's contention that he had too much to do to supervise the Commemoration Tower properly & thinks that it will not be found necessary to punish him. If it is considered necessary he gives him an excellent character with a view to mitigation of punishment

4. In the first portion of his explanation Mr Mahony begs the question altogether. No amount of alteration or settlement could have produced the bad work complained of. It was, I consider, due to

---

[4
5000 14-10-97.]

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. of 189 , dated , from
,, ,, ,, 189 , ,, ,,
,, ,, ,, 189 , ,, ,,

2

~~ORDER.~~

nothing else than defective supervision. It would hardly have been possible if Mr Mahony had inspected the work effectually once a week. It is quite certain that if Mr Harris had been over him at the time Mr Mahony would have found ample time to supervise the work properly.

5. His second statement that not ordinary brickwork has troubled him also shows how little he appreciates ~~in~~ the gravity of his fault. 'Ordinary' brickwork is now being done under Mr Harris all over Madras,

that
is perfect. The ordinary brickwork in the Tower was extraordinarily bad.

6. In his ~~third~~ contention
2 that he had not sufficient time to devote to this important work, Mr M. is supported by Mr Harris. and it is no doubt true
2 that many of our upper subordinates are overworked, but it is impossible to get over the fact that if Mr. Harris had been Civil Architect during the construction of the Tower Mr Mahony would have found ample time to supervise the work, & the quality of the latter would have been excellent.

The prime cause of all this bad work was the laxity of supervision exercised by Mr Irwin, but it is impossible to acquit his subordinate of all share in the blame.

7. I am therefore of opinion that Mr Mahony has by no means exonerated him

---

[4 / 97]

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. of 189 , dated , from
" " " 189 , " , "
" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER.

-self from blame in this matter, & that he deserves to be punished. This punishment may take one of 3 forms.

(a) Withdrawal of his honorary title of Asst Engr.
(b) Reduction ~~of~~ from Ext Engr 1st grade to Ext Engr 2nd grade, i.e. from Rs 400 to Rs 300 per mensem.
(c) Removal from Madras, where he has been since 1888.

The second is much the most severe, & Mr Harris is very unwilling that Mr Mahony should be moved from Madras, because of his intimate acquaintance with the various buildings there, & the Litchfields' Sketch therefore the first would be the best form of punishment.

I leave Mr Harris' plea in mitigation to His Excellency's consideration. My own opinion is that Mr Mahony's fault is a very serious one, because if the works had been quite sound it is probable that the tower would be standing now; but it is of course the case that in punishing Mr Mahony we shall not be punishing the principal offender, & this, coupled with Mr Mahony's previous good character, may perhaps be taken in mitigation.

11.2.98

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1383

From The Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras

No. 2837

Dated 11th February 1898

Received } 24.2.98
Registered }

Enclosures

Spare copies

Order

W/ For orders.

21-2-98

SUBJECT.

Submitting, with remarks, Explanations from Mr. P. Mahony, Hony: Asstt: Engineer regarding material & labour employed for the Connemara Library Tower

BACK PAPERS.		FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	Date.	No.	Date.
3527 W	16-12-97		
32/3527 W	16-12-97		

C.A./39 1,920—21-7-96.

CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
R. No. 1757
11 FEB. 1898

No. 569.

CONSULTING ARCHITECT DIVISION,
III Sub-Division Office,
~~Chepâk~~, Govt: B. Fields. 27th Jany: 1898

From
P. Meahony Esqr.
OFFICER IN CHARGE,
III SUB-DIVISION,

To
THE Consulting Architect
to the Government
Madras.

ENCLOSURES.

SIR,

With reference to your endorsement No 2537, dated 11th January 1898. on G. O. No: 3527 W. dated 16th December 1897 calling upon me to explain the quality of brickwork in a portion of a wall adjoining the Tower of the Connemera Library, I have the honor to state that the brick work in the walls now under reference is not at present as it was originally constructed for the following reasons.

1. Grooves 5" wide and 5" deep were made in the walls to receive the down fall pipes, but after the roof was completed the slope was changed and these grooves were closed by removing the face bricks and inserting others in their stead.

2 After the walls were raised their full height an iron door was provided for, to be fixed at the Institute end of the passage. To do this the walls had to be broken open and stone gudgeons inserted to receive the bolts and hinges. After this was, completed orders were received to remove the Gate and refix it at the other end of the passage, the stone gudgeons had to

to be removed, and their places filled in and refixed at the other end, which accounts for the hearting complained of by the Chief Engineer.

3. Owing to the settlement of the Tower this passage was dragged down at one end 4½, and I ask you to consider what effect this would have on a rigid piece of wall that had set, as the settlement of the Tower did not commence till the 5th Storey was being raised. The bricks cracked and crushed, there were large gaping cracks and the Arches were slanting & bulging out. It was then decided to dismantle this portion of the building after the Tower had finished settling, but in the meantime it had to be patched up from time to time to give the walls a good appearance espescially just before the opening ceremony as they looked dangerous. Besides this a great portion of debris from the dismantled Tower has fallen on to this brickwork and has reduced it to the state it is in at present.

But as regards the brick work in the Tower itself I respectfully beg to state that I consider it very hard against me to say that because a portion of the brick work adjoining the Tower has been injured for reasons stated above that the brick work in the Tower should also be condemned when it is admitted that the

weight

weight on it was 4 times as much as it ought to have been or 17 tons per square foot equal to in my humble opinion to good English brickwork.

The Estimate provided for ordinary brick work only which was inspected by the Consulting Architect while in progress and carried out according to his instructions. As the bricks were being turned out in large quantities for the several works then in progress and for the Railway, from different parts of the Brick fields, where the quality of the clay differed, consequently there were differences in the size of the bricks and the rate in the Estimate did not provide for selected bricks being used. I was not in a position at the time to know the height the Tower was to be raised as the plans were given me in parts for each Storey as I required them until the 5th Storey was completed.

I devoted as much time as I possibly could to this work. I had no upper Subordinate to assist me but a couple of temporary Maistries who could neither read or write English, I had therefore to be constantly present to explain details and select patterns for coloured glass and designs for ceilings and other ornamental works for the approval of the Consulting Architect.

Further most of the work was foreign to what the workmen were accustomed to and I had to see to the details being carried out.

When the 5th Storey was commenced cracks in the brickwork in the ground floor commenced to appear, this was represented to Mr. Irwin who had a light terrace roof constructed for the remaining Storeys instead of domes. Finding this insufficent the weight of the Pinnacle on the 9th Storey was materially reduced. On my own responsibility I had the top of the walls from the 5th Storey upwards constructed of brick in cement mortar from 1'3" to 1'9" in height to bind the walls together.

While the Technical Institute was in progreſs I was also incharge of the undermentioned works viz:

1. Maternity Hospital.
2. Opthalmic Hospital.
3. School of Arts.
4. Government House Guindy.
5. Teacher's College Saidapet.
6. Government Brick Fields & Lime Kilns.
7. And a number of other petty works.

In the premises of the first 5 during the time the Tower was in progreſs

I, constructed new building from 1 to 3 Storeys high costing over 2 lacks of Rupees all of which to this day are in good condition, I also carried on repairs and minor new works to the amount of one lac Rupees.

The out turn from the Government Brick Fields and Lime Kilns was at times as high as 12,000 Rupees per mensem. Further the Patent Kiln not being capable of supplying the bricks required for the works then in progreſs I had to have recourse to a Punjab Kiln, the management of which was not understood by the workmen in Madras, I had therefore to attend to this myself till the men learned the work.

Terracotta also was lately introduced, and as I was only able to obtain one man from the School of Arts who understood the work a little, I had to get the common bricklayers to learn the work. I had to attend to the stock, accounts of this large manufacture, the daily receipts and issues amounting to as much 600. Rupees. I had to prepare bills and take measurements of works in progress, each bill of the Connemara Library alone taking as much as 15 days to prepare, besides this I had numerous estimates to prepare for the

the repairs for the buildings in my charge for the coming year.

I was also deputed to prepare plans and estimates for a Reformatory School and after several proposals were sent in, it was decided to enlarge and improve the existing Reformatory at Chingleput. the estimate for which amounted to over one lac Rupees. I hardly completed this when I was asked to prepare plans and estimates for enlarging and improving the Lunatic Asylum Madras. The plans of which numbered over 25 and estimates amounted to very nearly a lac of Rupees. All this works as I said before, I had to carry out without any assistance except a few temporary maistries and I therefore respectfully ask if I could have devoted any more of my time to the Connemara Library than I did.

I would respectfully ask that my anticedents in the Department during the 34 years of my services be considered from which it will seen that I have never been even once reprimanded. Under these circumstances I earnestly request that the

the Acting Chief Engineer will be pleased to reconsider the severe strictures he has passed on me for a fault over which I had no personal control, so that my future prospects in the Department may not be marred for the few remaining years of my services.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
J. W. Malony
Assistant Engineer

No. 2837 d/ 11. 2-98

D. P. W.

Forwarded with the following remarks:–

On such a work as the Museum an Asst. Supr. or at least a skilled & trust worthy subordinate should have been employed with instructions to see to every bit of material put in, & never to leave the work whilst in progress:–

Mr. Malony had only a couple of Maistries of a poor class in charge:– Of the other works he was employed upon, the Brickfields alone (from which

a

a very large out turn of bricks, pipes, tiles, terra cotta etc etc – was daily turned out) would take up a large share, if not most, of his time – and I quite fail see how he could give the proper attention required to this work. He has therefore reason in contending his inability to have done so:– If Mr M. had been placed entirely on this work, with strict & definite instructions. There would have been no excuse for him, under the circumstances, there is some excuse for him:–

Mr M. however contends that only ordinary brickwork was provided for, inferring thereby that such has been provided – he is wrong here:–

I trust that it will not be found necessary to punish Mr Mahony, after taking all circumstances into consideration – but if so, with a view to mitigation, I here say, that since I have held charge of this office – Mr M. has been of great service to me – he is knowledgeable quick & resourceful – and all work he has turned out for me has been excellent:– he is most respectful, & in address & manner most fortunate.

his [illegible] 10/288 CA.

6

a very large [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

would take up a large share [illegible]

of the time – and I quite feel [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] found

necessary to [illegible] [illegible] making [illegible]

all [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]