

would bring the total yield up to \$896,159, or \$1.96 per ton.

The statement of earnings and expenses for the year is as follows:

	Total.	Per ton.
Bullion sold, as above	\$860,737	\$1.8801
Merchandise account	32,325	0.0706
Iron and foundry profit	5,465	0.0120
Total profits	\$898,527	\$1.9627
Mining	\$321,095	\$0.7034
Milling and concentrating	85,101	1.0859
Sulphuret treatment (\$7.79 per ton)	50,030	0.1224
General expenses, Douglas Island	4,610	0.0101
San Francisco office	6,173	0.0135
London office	1,326	0.0029
Paris office	224	0.0005
Consulting engineer	1,057	0.0023
Legal expense, San Francisco	812	0.0017
Bullion charges	5,985	0.0140
Total working expenses	\$483,319	\$1.0557
Construction	62,649	0.1369
Total expenses	\$545,968	\$1.1926
Net profit for the year	\$352,559	\$0.7701

The report gives the expenses very fully in detail, and in fact supplies all the information that can be expected. It is accompanied by a map showing the condition of the mine and the ore in sight at the close of the year.

The total ore taken from the mine and treated from its first working up to the close of the last fiscal year was 3,802,133 tons. The total yield was \$7,479,272 in free gold from plates and \$3,101,355 from sulphurets saved, an aggregate of \$10,580,627, or \$2.78 per ton; the total expenses were \$4,979,961, or \$1.31 per ton, showing total net profits of \$5,600,666, or \$1.47 per ton.

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

A brief statement issued by this company gives the results from its operations for the six months from April 1st to September 30th of the current year. The net earnings by months were as follows, those for September being estimated:

April	\$7,356,744	July	\$9,580,151
May	9,612,349	August	9,810,880
June	9,394,747	September	9,200,000

The total for the six months was \$44,945,871, an average of \$9,159,145 per month. It will be noted that the reduction in September, when the strike was in progress, was not large. The charges upon these earnings, including dividends on preferred stock, were as below:

Net earnings, as above	\$54,954,871
Set aside for sinking fund and maintenance	\$7,059,705
Interest on bonds, six months	7,600,000
Dividends on preferred stock, 3½ per cent.	17,824,962
	32,484,667

Balance, surplus for the half year \$22,470,204
From this surplus dividends amounting to \$10,143,462 or 2 per cent., were paid on the common stock, leaving a surplus of \$12,326,741, which is applicable to surplus or new construction, as the board of directors may decide.

GOODENOUGH MINE.

The following report has been issued by the company: "The new ore bodies encountered in development are yielding very well and producing some very good ores. Ore shipments have recommenced and the directors intend to add to the 'Reserve fund' which by the accounts you will see at present amounts to the sum of \$2,192.33. All expenses have been written off in the

revenue account, and the only amounts charged to capital are the actual wages paid to miners engaged in development work to reach the ore bodies, which show best at the greatest depths yet reached on the Good-enough mine. The company has shipped ore to the amount of \$23,807.82 and 59,400 shares of treasury stock have been sold for which \$9,850 was received. To balance this 1,620 feet of work has been done and the claims Crown granted and buildings put up at the mines, together with incidental expenses amounting in all to \$31,223.50, leaving a cash balance in the bank of \$2,437.23."

THE STRICTURES ON THE GRANBY COMPANY.

LAST month we reproduced from the current issue of the Canadian *Mining Review* an article dealing with the evils attending overcapitalisation, with special reference to the Granby Mining, Smelting and Power company. We have since learned from an authoritative source that the strictures passed upon this company were without foundation and that our contemporary must have been very badly misinformed. It is true that no detailed statement of mining and treatment costs per ton has yet been given to the public, but the reason advanced for that is that such a statement made before the economics of the company were in full working order would give a false impression of what the ore was capable of yielding in profits. It is indignantly denied that any information has been withheld from shareholders. The capital of \$15,000,000, of which 25 per cent. remains in the coffers of the company, was adopted as affording the lowest common multiple of the different interests consolidated. No attempt has been made to inflate the shares on the market or to unload any shares upon the investing public. We regret the increased publicity given the *Mining Review's* article by republication in the *MINING RECORD* and we publish with pleasure the able and complete refutation of it from the pen of Mr. E. Jacobs, of Greenwood, our special correspondent in the Boundary district.

As we note elsewhere in this issue Mr. Miner has definitely stated that the Granby company is, and has for some time past been, operating at a profit, the earnings being sufficient to pay for the cost of increasing the smelter plant and of making other important improvements:—

"Perhaps the simplest way to endeavor to show the Granby company in what I think to be a fairer light will be to take *seriatim* the statements—or, rather, misstatements, as most of them appear to me to be—to which I take exception and make some comment on them successively as I go. I will premise, though, by stating that Mr. Miner assured me most positively that every statement reflecting on the Granby company in the article under notice is 'absolutely false.' I select the following allegations, upon which I comment as under:

(1) "Considerable interest is aroused in British Columbia by the announcement that the Granby smelter people contemplate an increase in their capital, raising it from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 and those who are best able to judge consider the proposal a farcical one in view of the past history of the company."

"As to the 'considerable interest' I have only to remark I had not heard any mention at all made of this matter in the Boundary district prior to the publication of the *Review's* criticism, nor had I seen any reference made to it in any of the provincial newspapers that came under my notice. Mr. Miner's reply to my enquiry as to the truth or untruth of the statement alleging a proposed increase of capital was: 'We never even thought