

EAST AFR. PROT

C. O
31377

REC'D
AUG 20 1914

31377

Governor
Belfield 701

1914

24th July

LAKE STEAMERS
EXPENDITURE

Last previous Paper.

b.a.
8163

Reports as to excess expdre on "Usoga" and
"Kavirondo" and the installation of oil fuel apparatus.
Any responsibility would appear to rest with Mr
Sandiford.

Mr Sandiford retired some time ago
& I do not think that it is going
to be pursued further.

Part by

at once.

b. J. R.

21/8/14

Part by

Next subsequent Paper.

400756 88/20

C. O.
31377

87

RECD
GOVERNMENT HOUSE, 4
NAIROBI,

EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

BRITISH EAST AFRICA

No. 701.

July 24th, 1914.

Sir,

6. a
8163

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 232 of the 13th of March on the subject of the excess expenditure in connection with the vessels "Usoga" and "Kavirondo" and the installation of oil fuel apparatus in the Lake Steamers of the Uganda Railway Marine.

2. I have caused enquiries to be made from Mr. Grant as to the reasons for the large excess over the estimated expenditure in local charges. The Crown Agents state in their letter of the 4th of January 1912 that Mr. Grant estimated the cost of re-erection for the steamer at £5,000 and for the tug at £1,000. Mr. Grant however denies that he ever made such a statement

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LEWIS HARCOURT, P.C., M.P.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,
DOWNING STREET, LONDON, S.W.

C O
31377

statement, and adds that he would hardly be likely to offer an unconsidered opinion on such a matter when he was unaware, both of the tonnage of the vessels and of the likelihood that they were to be ordered immediately. On one occasion only, in November 1911, did Mr. Grant call on the Crown Agents, when in company with Mr. Tritton he called upon Major Carmichael to know whether he was in a position to settle the tenders. A general discussion arose as to the money voted, and the various tenders received, and Mr. Grant is confident that he expressed the opinion at the time that the balance available for re-erection was totally inadequate.

3. I am inclined to the opinion that Mr. Grant is correct in what he states, as in November 1913, when the enquiry into the already existing excess was being made and before the re-erection charges were known, he remarked that he hoped the cost of erection would be within the estimate, but that he was by no means confident as his original estimate was cut down no less than three times by the orders of Mr. Sandiford when acting as

General

- 3 -

General Manager, so that in spite of the greatly increased charges for labour and material only some £11 per ton was allowed for erection as compared with £14-5-0 for the S.S. "Nyanza", £15-8-0 for the S.S. "Clement Hill" and £22-1-0 for the S.S. "Winifred" and S.S. "Sybil". Any responsibility in the matter would therefore appear to rest with Mr. Sandiford.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,

W. Monday Blythe

GOVERNOR.