ight reply by ling of Canada the same date, London mar.

ole parallel to in the money d three large at rate, whils ours, without 3 shows a surs, aggregating 9,164 sterling or more that operty of the a net revenue bt, which in C Abstract for ia is equal to

t a Province on the same head ?

and Toronta Government in placing its 99 ½ ; but I own benefit

me terms at

the opulent and prosperous colony of Victoria or the cities of Montreal and Toronto, what does it signify ? The great question is to ascertain whether we got the worth of our bonds. The securities of a government, like all other merchandize, sell for what they are worth in the market; now, what were the bonds of the Province of Quebec worth in London when our loan was issued ? On the 3rd January, our 5 per cents were quoted at from 111 to 113, giving an average of 112. Now, at 112, 5 per cents are equivalent to par at 4.25 per cent interest. On the same date, our 4½ per cents were quoted at from 105 to 107, giving an average of 106. But, 41, yer cents at 106 are equivalent to 4.25 per cent at par. Lastly, 4 per cents at 961 which is the figure we obtained from the Credit Lyonnais, are equivalent to about 4.16 % at par, that is to say, that we effected our loan on terms which give a larger return than the current value of the bonds of the other loans of the Province, when the operation took place, though it is well known that, to negotiate new bonds, it is necessary that they should present advantages over the previous issues, as otherwise nobody would have an interest in purchasing the new securities:

These considerations, which must strike all business men, clearly show that our transaction was an advantageous one for the province and that we got for our bonds not only the full amount, but even more than the full amount of their current value:

The paper of Mr. White, a future Finance Minister, it appears, has reproached us for having sold the whole loan to the Credit Lyonnais.

If my memory be good, that paper did not make the same reproach in 1876 to Hon. Mr. Church, when he sold the whole of his loan to the Merchants" Bank. In 1883, Mr. Wurtele sold the last £500,000 sterling of the loan of 1882 to the Bank of Montreal and yet the *Gazette* did not breathe a word on the subject. With what grace, then, does it assail us because we did the same thing in 1888? If the competition was advantageous in 1888, it should have been equally so in 1876, 1880 and 1883. Why did not the *Gazette* claim it to be then as it claims it to be now ?

Moreover, we created the competition by calling for tenders, which was