

cluding the contributions to it from all the leading mining sections of the Province, that British Columbia is likely to make will be small in comparison to those of the big mining states of the Republic, yet this fact need not, nor should it, debar our mining districts from doing their utmost to make a creditable showing. In gold, silver, copper and lead, the annual production of British Columbia is greater than that of all other provinces in the Dominion combined, so it would seem to be the duty of this Province to make a special effort in the direction of making as large and representative an exhibition as it is practicable. In view, too, of the repeatedly published statements that smelting costs are exceptionally low in the Boundary, it would be well if the metallurgical establishments of that district were worthily represented at St. Louis. But whatever is to be done, whether by mines, smelters, branches of the Provincial Mining Association, or private individuals, must be done soon, otherwise the space at present at disposal for Canadian mineral exhibits will likely be apportioned for other purposes.

The Prospectors' Association of Nelson, to which reference was made last month in these columns, has had another meeting at which, according to the published report of the proceedings, "it was decided that representations should be made to the department at an early date by the Association for the appointment of an Inspector of Claims, whose duty it should be to inspect all assessment work done, and in the event of the same not having been carried out according to the affidavit filed when recording the same, to report the fact to the department." The report further stated that it was felt by all the members present that this was the only way by which the present falsifying could be stopped. The intention of the association in passing this resolution is praiseworthy enough, but the remedy it recommends does not appear to be an effective one. If "all assessment work done," in the Province is to be inspected, then not only one inspector only, but a score or two would be required to do this work thoroughly. Even should these be appointed there would still be difficulties in the way of the desired result being attained. Leaving out of present consideration the question of whether or not it would be desirable to prosecute for perjury where it could be shown that a false affidavit has been made, the importance of preventing the issue of a certificate of work in cases where a claim owner is not entitled to it should be kept well in view. As the law now stands once a certificate of work has been issued it is unchallengeable, notwithstanding that it might be shown that the work had not been done as sworn to. The intention of the law to secure the due performance of work

on mineral claims is in such a case thus defeated. Besides an insistence upon the making of a fully detailed statement, giving measurements, days and dates worked, and rate per day worked, suggested last month, it would be well to require that every application for a certificate of work shall be posted for a month in a conspicuous place in the office of the Mining Recorder for the mining division in which the claim concerned is situate, before the applicant shall be entitled to obtain such certificate. Further, let each Mining Recorder be appointed chief inspector for his own mining division, with power in any and every instance in which he may have good reason to doubt the truth of the affidavit presented to him on application for a certificate of work or of improvements, to appoint some suitable person to visit the claim to ascertain whether or not the work has been done as sworn to. In the event of its not having been done as alleged, the cost of inspection to be recoverable from the person making the false affidavit, and the certificate to be withheld. If it should happen that owing to the non-performance of the assessment work required by law the claim, during the time intervening between the making of the application for the certificate and the inspection on behalf of the mining recorder, shall have run out, then let it revert to the Crown and be open for re-location by any one other than the person making the false affidavit, but, on the other hand, in all cases where no inspection shall have shown that the work has been done as stated, then let the certificate be issued, whether the year for which the assessment was recorded shall at the end of the month have expired or not, provided, of course, the application for the certificate shall have been made within the year for which the work shall have been done. Given the requirement, without exception, of full particulars, of the work done, as above recommended, and the knowledge that the mining recorder is empowered to have an inspection made if he deem it necessary, it would appear probable that evasions of the law, such as are admittedly frequent under existing lax methods, would then be few and far between.

The last issue of the *Engineering Magazine* contains a very interesting and comprehensive account of the Alaskan auriferous areas with special reference to the Klondike gravel deposits. The author of this paper, Mr. J. D. McGillivray, is not only a clever journalist, having been at one time editor of the *Mining and Scientific Press*, of San Francisco, and subsequently a member of the staff of the *New York Herald*; but he is also an experienced and practical miner and consequently his treatment of the subject