

## AN INCOMPLETE REVIEW.

**A** BOOKLET on the "Mineral Resources of Canada" has been published by the *Canadian Mining Journal*, of Toronto, Ontario. This has been done (quoting from the title page of the booklet) "to celebrate the visit of the British and Continental mining engineers and metallurgists to Canada in the summer of 1908." A useful resource map of the Dominion, by the Geological Survey branch of the Department of Mines; several sketch maps of individual provinces; some 30 excellent coloured representations of important minerals; 17 pages descriptive of the economic minerals of Canada; a summary of the Mineral Production of Canada in 1907; and 44 pages of information concerning the mineral products of the several provinces, together make up a publication to which, but for the great injustice, or lack of justice, done to British Columbia, we would have had much pleasure in referring to in terms of warm commendation. As it is, though, we think it our duty to make a strong protest against the utter inadequacy of the information given relative to the metalliferous mineral resources of British Columbia. We make no complaint as to coal, for the summary given is a fair, though necessarily brief, presentation of matters relating to the mines of the three companies in the Province producing coal on a large scale. To demonstrate, though, the reasonableness of our protest regarding metalliferous mining, we quote from the British Columbia section of the booklet as follows:—

"Copper, Lead, Silver, Iron.—The metalliferous mines of southern British Columbia are too well known to require specific mention. The smelters of the Boundary and adjacent districts produce all the lead, and much of copper and silver credited to the Dominion. On the coast the Tyee copper smelter is but the beginning of what will become in time a large industry. Cheap fuel, water transportation and large bodies of copper and iron ores, make it imperative that smelters be erected at suitable points on Vancouver Island, or at other well-situated localities on the mainland."

Presumably the booklet was published primarily for the information of the over-seas visitors. If so, what did they know of "the metalliferous mines of Southern British Columbia?" Practically nothing, prior to their visit to the Province. But since nearly every other line of this curt dismissal of British Columbia's important metalliferous resources contains an inaccuracy, perhaps it is well his appalling ignorance on this subject prevented the writer of that paragraph from getting farther out of his depth.

Just a few comparisons: Nova Scotia was given 7½ pages in this booklet, Quebec 12 pages, Ontario 9 pages, and British Columbia 4¼ pages. Copper mining in Nova Scotia was given 10 lines—its production last year was 2,741 tons of ore. British Columbia's copper industry was noticed in part of an

s-line paragraph; its production of copper (not of ore) in two years, 1906-7, was nearly \$4,000,000 lb., valued at about \$16,500,000. Quebec was given 12 pages; the notice of its copper, lead, zinc and silver occupied 40 lines notwithstanding that most of the mines have been shut down. Lead in Ontario was given 12 lines, but what of its production? The booklet says, elsewhere, "the entire output of lead in Canada comes from British Columbia." Just one more comparison to show the prevailing very great disproportion so unjust to British Columbia: During ten years, 1898-1907, British Columbia produced gold, silver, lead and copper to the approximate total value of \$113,500,000 as against \$55,500,000 for all parts of the Dominion east of the Rocky Mountains.

We trust the *Canadian Mining Journal* will defer again essaying the task of enlightening visitors from other countries as to British Columbia's mineral resources until such time as its own evident gross ignorance of them shall have been effectually dispelled.

## ROSSLAND A THEORY?

**O**NE WALLACE MACLEAN has been writing to the *Toronto Globe* on the Cobalt mines. We do not know what Mr. Maclean's especial qualifications are to warrant his publishing his opinions on mining camps, but if he is as far from the truth in his statements concerning Cobalt as he is in his references to Rossland camp those who accept his assumed dictum will be misled by him. What this Mr. Maclean says or thinks of Rossland camp is of little moment, though, for as an authority on mining very probably he is a nonentity. But it is important that a newspaper having so large a circulation as the *Globe* has, should have given wide publicity to unmerited reflections on a British Columbia mining camp, and this simply to unfairly use it as an alleged contrast to an Ontario camp which surely has abundant evidence of its phenomenal richness at hand without the slightest necessity to endeavour to make its great wealth more manifest by the unwarranted depreciation of any other camp, whether the latter shall have been productive over a comparatively long series of years, as Rossland certainly has been, beside giving abundant proof that it will continue to be, or another camp not yet established as an important producer.

The *Globe*, in a prominent headline, asserts that Mr. Maclean "gives the truth" about Cobalt mines. May be he does, but he certainly does not about Rossland. He opens his bragging article with this sentence: "Rossland was a theory"; and follows with: "In Rossland they used the assayer's crucible to prove values. Cobalt proves values by putting car-loads of ore through the smelter. If you had a lively imagination you could discern the course of leads and veins in the Rossland camp." This is smart writing, or rather it is intended to be. But what are the facts? Was, or is, Rossland only a theory? A dictionary at hand defines a theory as