

cities as Chicago, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, etc., are issuing bonds in this form to indicate how general it is becoming.

VARIETY OF MATURITIES.

It was formerly claimed that there was a limited market for instalment bonds, because investors preferred to have their investments mature at one period, some years distant. This objection has little weight in view of the fact that with such important issues as the larger municipalities will put out from time to time there will always be a choice of maturities, running from one to say 20 or 30 years, and that such variety will suit the varying needs of a greater body of investors.

BETTER PRICE OBTAINED.

It is confidently believed, based to an important extent upon the experience of first-class municipal loans, that municipalities adopting the instalment method would enhance their credit and prestige and consequently would be able to secure their loans, given equal market conditions, at lower rates of interest. In this connection the following statement, made a short time ago by Comptroller Prendergast, of New York, at the time of the sale of that city's bonds, is significant,—“I have no hesitation in saying that the element which produced the success of the sale was the offering of the \$25,000,000 of serial bonds. This departure of the usual city bond offering (Sinking Fund) was very helpful in giving investors an opportunity to vary the form of their city holdings, and, I am certain, has proved very attractive.”

LARGE FINANCIAL SAVING.

I have examined the money by-laws of a number of our Ontario municipalities, passed in the year 1914, with the object of ascertaining the saving that would have been made if the bonds authorized had been issued on the Instalment Plan instead of on the Sinking Fund plan. In one municipality alone, which issues all of its bonds according to the Sinking Fund Method, I found that the annual levy for interest and Sinking Fund amounted to \$863,050. If these bonds had been issued according to the Annuity Instalment Method the annual levy for interest and payment of debt would have amounted to only \$818,180, or \$44,870 per annum less than by the Sinking Fund Method. The present value of this excess annual charge for the life-time of the bonds amounts to \$596,052. This last amount represents the actual loss to the citizens, as between