

royalty has been abolished, so that nothing has been changed except the nature of the imposition. It is quite true there has been an increase in the tax on coke and one of the strongest reasons for this, as explained by the minister of finance, is that the industry has not been carrying its proper proportion of the annual taxation, and it is his aim to utilize the increased revenue from this source for reducing the personal property tax now paid by the individual. I think most people will agree that his object is most praiseworthy and worthy of support, and particularly since it works no very great hardship on anyone. The chief taxpayer in this respect will be the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, and based on last year's production of coke, the total increase amounts to about \$11,000. A glance at the company's annual report just published will convince any disinterested person that the effect of this taxation will hardly be felt. However, the finance minister has declared that for the future his policy will be along the line of general reduction of taxation so far as the same is consistent with the needs of the country."

We acknowledge with thanks the courtesy of Mr. Frederic Keffer, of Greenwood, Boundary District (who presided at the recent annual meeting of the Canadian Mining Institute, held at Ottawa, Ontario, until the election of his successor as president was formally announced), in sending us a copy of the first *Quarterly Bulletin of the Canadian Mining Institute* and several of the printed papers that were also distributed at that meeting. We welcome the *Bulletin*, through which medium we hope to keep better informed concerning the doings and progress of the institute than has been practicable in the past. The *Bulletin* is edited by the secretary of the institute, Mr. H. Mortimer Lamb, and we regard its publication as a progressive step, and one the council is to be commended for authorizing and the secretary for undertaking. Doubtless it was an oversight, but it is to be regretted that no mention was made in this official publication of the Western Branch of the Institute, which was organized at Nelson, British Columbia, on January 15, last. It may be that the *Bulletin*, though dated February, was really printed before receipt by its editor of the report of the proceedings at the Nelson meeting; this notwithstanding we think that the proposal to form such branch should have been mentioned, seeing that the nominations for officers and council of the branch were made with the approval of, if not actually by, the council of the institute. This omission is the more noticeable under the circumstances that there was printed in the *Bulletin* a paper which was shown as having been prepared for the "Nelson, B.C., Meeting, January, 1908." We repeat that we think the omission of reference to the Western Branch was unintentional, and we confidently expect to find the proceedings of this important branch given due prominence in future. We suggest that in all future numbers of the *Bulletin* there be printed the names of the officers and

members of council of the institute, as is regularly done in the *Bi-Monthly Bulletin of the American Institute of Mining Engineers*, so that members may always have at hand such list should it be required, as is sometimes the case. We wish the *Bulletin* a long and useful life, and would bespeak for it the hearty interest and co-operation of all members of the institute.

The "Preliminary Report on the Mineral Production of Canada in 1907," printed on pages 109-114 of this issue of the *MINING RECORD*, shows that as compared with the production of 1906 there was in 1907 a net increase in total value of \$7,126,169. The comparisons made in the report are interesting and indicate the respective increases or decreases made by the various minerals. It is a little unfortunate that in one paragraph an injustice is done the Yukon. Attention is called to this not in a carping spirit, but with the object of pointing out that comparatively small as was the showing the Yukon made in 1907, it was not quite so small as the paragraph referred to makes it appear, no doubt unintentionally. Under the sub-head "Gold" the statement is made that "less than half as much gold was obtained from the Yukon in 1907 as in 1906." It is quite evident that a mistake has been made here, for on one page of the report the Yukon is credited with a production in 1907 of \$3,150,000, while on another the decrease as compared with 1906 is stated at \$2,450,000. The value of the production in 1906 was thus placed at about \$5,600,000, half of which would be \$2,800,000; it is, therefore, a manifest error to represent the 1907 production as being in value "less than half of that of 1906, when it is estimated as having been \$350,000 more than one-half. Apart from this and two errors in the "Annual Production" table, the report appears to have been carefully prepared and, having been published early in March, the important information it gives was made available while still recent enough to be of much value. It is gratifying to note that in each of three metals British Columbia's production was of greater value than that of all the rest of the Dominion combined. These, with their approximate value, were: Gold, \$4,842,000 (\$3,422,765); copper, \$8,338,000 (\$3,140,644); lead, \$2,283,000 (\$249,836). The figures in brackets show the production of all other parts of the Dominion. Of the total value of the production of metalliferous minerals—\$42,434,000—British Columbia's share is about \$17,200,000. Other parts of the Dominion produced silver valued at about \$6,600,000, as compared with \$1,728,000 for British Columbia; iron, \$2,028,000; nickel, \$9,535,000, and miscellaneous metallic minerals, \$265,000. British Columbia did not produce any iron or nickel, and only about \$50,000 in miscellaneous minerals. Of a Dominion total for coal and coke of \$24,560,000, British Columbia's proportion was about \$7,638,000. On the whole this Province produced largely as compared with the remainder of the Dominion.