

COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF THE MINERAL PRODUCTION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA IN 1905.

SUBSTANTIAL progress in production was made in 1905, as is evidenced by the statistical tables and comments that follow. They clearly demonstrate the extent of the advance made and afford grounds for much satisfaction, the more so since they give proof of the fact that the year's production was a record one in the history of mining in the province.

TOTAL MINERAL PRODUCTION IN TEN YEARS.

The totals of mineral production in British Columbia during ten years, 1896-1905 provide an object lesson to which, in the interests of the mining industry of the province, too much prominence cannot be given, so they follow:

Year.	Total Value.
1896	\$ 7,507,956
1897	10,455,268
1898	10,906,861
1899	12,393,131
1900	16,344,751
1901	20,086,780
1902	17,486,550
1903	17,495,594
1904	18,977,359
1905 (estimated)	21,203,000

Total for ten years\$152,857,610

The considerable advance made in the year just closed is the more gratifying for the reason that the increase is not alone due to the higher average prices of copper, silver and lead as compared with those of 1904. A materially increased tonnage of minerals has also contributed largely to the gain made, and in this respect the improvement appears to be permanent rather than temporary, which is still more satisfactory. It is true that in several districts there has been a decrease, but in only one, viz., the Coast, has this been serious, and even here there is the sufficient reason that this was in part brought about by a labour difficulty that prevented one colliery from contributing its ordinary share to the year's total production. The other disturbing factor—the reduction in output of the Tyee mine, Mt. Sicker—will in 1906 (even should the Tyee not be again as productive as before, which it may be) be more than compensated for by a much larger output from the Britannia mines, which late in the year commenced shipping to the smelter and may be expected to produce to a steadily increasing extent from now on

TOTAL VALUE OF MINERALS PRODUCED IN 1904 AND 1905.

	1904.	1905.
Gold, placer	\$ 1,115,300	\$ 1,110,000
Gold, lode	4,589,609	4,640,000

Total gold	\$ 5,704,908	\$ 5,750,000
Silver	1,719,516	2,045,000
Copper	4,578,037	5,430,000
Lead	1,421,874	2,368,000
Zinc		320,000

Total metalliferous\$13,424,335 \$15,913,000

Coal	3,760,884	3,330,000
Coke	1,192,140	1,210,000
Building materials, etc....	600,000	750,000

Total non-metalliferous.\$ 5,553,024 \$ 5,290,000

Summary—

	1904.	1905.
Metalliferous	\$13,424,335	\$15,913,000
Non-metalliferous ..	5,553,024	5,290,000

Total production\$18,977,395 \$21,203,000

In calculating the values of the several minerals to obtain the totals shown in the foregoing table placer gold has been taken as worth \$20 per oz., lode gold at \$20.67 per oz., silver at 60 cents per oz. less 5 per cent; copper at 15 cents per lb.; lead at 4.6 cents per lb. less 10 per cent; zinc has been averaged at \$24 per ton; coal valued at \$3 and coke at \$5 per ton of 2,240 lb.

QUANTITIES OF MINERALS PRODUCED IN 1904 AND 1905

The quantities of minerals produced were as under:

	1904.	1905.
Gold, placer—oz.	55,765	55,500
Gold, lode—oz.	222,042	224,490
Total gold—oz.	277,807	279,990
Silver—oz.	3,222,481	3,587,719
Copper—lb.	35,710,128	36,200,000
Lead—lb.	36,646,244	57,200,000
Zinc—tons		13,330
Coal—tons of 2,240 lb.	1,253,628	1,110,000
Coke—tons of 2,240 lb.	238,426	242,000

It will be seen that, leaving out of account the small increase in placer gold which revised figures will probably show to have been under-estimated, the only mineral that did not exceed in quantity as well as value the production of 1904 was coal. As already stated the cause of this was a labour difficulty, which trouble led to the shutting down of the Western Fuel Co.'s colliery at Nanaimo, Vancouver Island, for six to seven months. Happily the matters at issue were adjusted and operations resumed before the year ended.

MINERAL PRODUCTION BY DISTRICTS

Coming now to production by districts, here again there is general cause for congratulation, the decreases having, with the single exception of the Coast district, been small, and all were due to causes that will in all likelihood be overcome in 1906. The comparatively big increase in East Kootenay was due chiefly to the enlarged output of lead from the St. Eugene