

During four weeks ended December 27 the production of coal at the collieries of the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company totalled 84,282 tons (2,000 lb.). As there were in that period but 23 days on which coal was mined this gave an average production of 3,665 tons per day. The total production in 1907 was nearly 982,000 short tons gross. Reduced to tons of 2,240 lb. this gives an output for the year of 876,757 tons as compared with 720,449 tons in 1906. The 1907 production was disposed of as under, figures being approximate:

	Tons of 2,240 lb.
Manufactured into coke .....	322,000
Exported to United States .....	290,000
Sold in Canada .....	220,000
Used under collieries' boilers.....	44,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>876,000</b>

The coke manufactured totalled about 206,500 long tons, as against 189,385 tons in 1906.

Members of the Canadian Mining Institute will shortly elect officers for the ensuing year and members of the council for stated periods. Once again some Ontario members are endeavouring to carry out plans which many members resident in other provinces fear will, if these Ontario members gain their present ends, eventually lead to the disruption of the institute as a national, in contradistinction to a provincial, institution. So seriously is the present position regarded that the president now in office and four past presidents have jointly signed a circular letter to members submitting that "members, in voting for candidates for vacant offices, should see to it that the industries of the Dominion are adequately represented rather than that preponderance be given to any one industry or any one Province." Further, it is pointed out that a particular canvas "has been directed against two faithful and efficient officers of the institute, viz., the secretary, Mr. H. Mortimer Lamb, and the treasurer, Mr. J. Stevenson Brown." The *Mining Record* does not hold a brief for any candidate for office, but it is heartily in accord with the views of the gentlemen whose signatures are appended to the letter here referred to, that the best interests of the institute will be far more effectually conserved by re-electing the two executive officials named than in thrusting them aside in order to satisfy the ambitions of other men who may possibly be not so well suited for the particular offices these two have well and worthily filled. It would seem as if the western members of the institute have an important duty to perform—to assist the eastern members to preserve the national character of the institute, and this we think they can at the present juncture most effectively do by supporting only those candidates for offices and council who may be depended upon to continue the good work of the institute along similar lines to those heretofore successfully followed.

There were several incorrect statements included in Mr. H. Mortimer Lamb's article on "Mining in British Columbia," contributed to *Mines and Minerals*, of Scranton, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., and reprinted in last month's *Mining Record*, reference to which we purposely deferred until after we had verified information then in our possession, so that we might be the more positive in our expression of non-agreement with Mr. Lamb on these particular points. First, Mr. Lamb excepted the Slocan from those districts in which he said there were "signs of material activity and progress everywhere apparent." This did not do the Slocan justice by any means. Those who are familiar with the Slocan, which Mr. Lamb evidently is not, well know that in 1907 it made more material progress than in any other of several recent years. We need only mention here the Montezuma, Whitewater, Rambler-Cariboo, Ruth, Richmond-Eureka, Standard, Vancouver group, Hewitt, Lorna Doone, Arlington, and other mines that were active the greater part of the year, while there were literally scores of small properties upon which some work was done and many of which produced ore, some on a small scale and others in appreciably large quantity. Next, Mr. Lamb was duped into giving publicity to one or two of the well known fabrications of enemies of the Le Roi Mining Company. What authority had Mr. Lamb, we ask, for the assertion that "in order to keep the furnaces running the Le Roi ships (to its smelter at Northport) a great quantity of nearly valueless rock." If he can give any dependable evidence in support of this serious charge he should not hesitate to do so; if not he should publicly retract what we believe to be one of the falsehoods that certain persons, with set purpose of discrediting the Le Roi management and the Northport smelter from time to time circulate. One more statement we take strong exception to, viz., that the Le Roi No. 2 is in the West "the one notable exception in the long list of mismanaged British-owned properties." Did Mr. Lamb never hear of the Tye Copper Company? Did he ever when editing the *Mining Record* give that management unstinted praise? Did it not then and does it not still deserve all the credit ever given to it in the West, and more too, for its enterprise, its persistence despite occasional discouragement in carrying on a thoroughly legitimate mining and smelting business, and making it a financial success? We agree that the management of the Le Roi No. 2 has been, and is, good, but there are others, and Mr. Lamb should know better than to assert there are not. If Mr. Lamb should again feel impelled to write on British Columbia mining matters we shall hope for the exercise of more care on his part. There are more than enough unreliable "penny-a-line" writers contributing to newspapers rubbish supposed to be British Columbia mining news, without his doing similarly, even in a small measure, to influential mining journals.