

## THE "TENDER" SUBJECT IN CORK.

TOWARDS the close of the late year the Cork Corporation invited builders and contractors to tender for the re-building of the boundary wall of the Cattle Market. Three tenders were received, namely, £219, £178, and £78, the latter being that of Mr. Michael Walsh, Clogheen, which was accepted subject to the approval of the engineer. At a meeting of the Corporation a few days ago the City Engineer reported with reference to the tender which he had accepted, and sent for Mr. Walsh to give him directions, but that gentleman wrote to say that he had made a mistake of £100 in his tender. Alderman Jones and Alderman Finn proposed and seconded that the tender of £178 be accepted. Two other members of the Corporation proposed and seconded a motion to advertise for tenders again, and, and a vote being taken, this amendment was carried.

The conduct or procedure illustrated above is simply dishonourable and disgraceful. We recently used strong but just language in reference to a similar case, where the tenderer put in an absurdly low price, and, as in the Cork case, wrote afterwards to say he made a mistake. The Cork Corporation should have accepted the second lowest tender, and have paid no attention to builders who are not ashamed to plead a huge mistake in a very small matter. The builder who honestly tendered at first for the work at the sum of £178 was in due cause entitled to the contract. The fresh tenders are to be sent in by the 19th inst., and then "we shall see what we shall see," perhaps insult added to injury. In our opening article in the present issue the Cork magnates and others will find food for reflection and digestion.

[Taken from *Irish Builder*, Vol. XXIV, 1882, p.31]