

financial questions, and a Bank Manager resolves problems of civil engineering.

The report addressed by Mr. Schreiber, chief engineer of the government, shows that he formally declared the nullity of a Bank stamp, and one of the last paragraphs, to which we call attention, will display a banker pronouncing judgment on public works.

OTTAWA, Feb. 11, 1882.

*To the Manager, Montreal :*

DEAR SIR,— I have your letter of the 10th inst, *in re* McDonald and Charlebois cheque. The enquiry by telegram on the 6th inst. was by request of Mr. Bradley, Secretary to the Minister, who called and exhibited the cheque stamped as "good for two days only from 24 inst." He desired to know if it was still good, merely, but while telegraphing for a special reply from you as to this—in order to inform the Department—I would further ask for how long it would be held, so this he said might do at the same time. Although his enquiry was only if it was still good, on receipt of your reply that it was so and would be good until paid, I went over personally to the Department and mentioned your reply to the Secretary. The cheque I did not again see, but by request I left your telegram with him, as the authority to deal with or treat the cheque as it stated. I had no knowledge at the time as to whether any decision or not had been arrived at in respect to the tenders to which the cheque had reference, and which were given in and opened on the 1st inst, nor until the 9th was I made aware that it had been awarded to Mr. Onderdonk by his calling here in reference to his security through the head offices. I naturally inferred after leaving your telegram with the Department that it would be quite satisfactory, and that as authorized, the restrictive clause would be struck out : but I infer from an expression of the Deputy Minister yesterday, that while in their possession it was held such an alteration of the terms could not legally be done, and that the cheque at the time of opening the tenders was informal, from the time it was limited to having previously elapsed. I presume, therefore, that under the circumstances their tender under the regulations was excluded from consideration. The difference is not great, however between their tender and that of Onderdonk, and both, being low, they might have had an unprofitable or losing contract, while he, having a large amount of plant there already, could make it pay with his appliances and means. Mr. McDonald, along with Judge Coursol, called this morning about the matter, apparently desirous to remove any impression with the Department that the cheque