during the week, and an upsurge from the end thereof 20 ft., connecting it with the stow at the bottom of the 3rd level, the ore found in this connection was found that all size of ore proved to be very low grade and almost worthless; at a point 10 ft. above the cross-cut fair grade ore was encountered, which is making down in a few weeks. Before the 3rd level is exhausted. The south cut-off at the end of the 1st level is considerably smaller than it has been, but it has the appearance of opening out again, it being reported that we have shipped 117,349 tons for the last week and have 26 men at work. Lord Byron: The cross-cut from the pit to the tunnel is in very hard rock; progress this week, 4 ft.; total, 490 ft.

- (11th Dec.)—Copy of telegram received from Erusa to day—

"88 cases of Southsea goldmiing at L.3 200 do., BMW, 1000 do., D." SIERRA BUTTROS GOLD—Sierra Buttos mine: Total receipts, 17,725 do., total working expenses, 46,014 do., and 2,000 do., spent on the site, 1,000 do., 50m. Item: silic. in the shaft. Total receipts, 25,606 do., total working expenses, 21,121. 31. 20.

The following telegram from Morro Velho, dated Rio Janeiro, 13th December:

"Pour payment for November, 19,000 do., value 20,000. Yield, 1,131 per ton. Gold: 4,160 tons stamped. Yield, 1,131."

CORRESPONDENCE

[We do not hold ourselves responsible for the Opinions or Statements of our Correspondents.]

MINING ON THE GOLD COAST.

To the Editor of the "Miner Woman and Engineering Record."

Sir,—Many thanks for inserting my last—an encouragement to trouble you again. The last circuit of the Guinean mining industry, by speaking parly of the ground passed through during August month, and Mr. Secretary Dakin was kind enough to inform us that, in addition to the supplies to which you have referred, there is a considerable amount of gold and silver that does not consist of rock, but resembles the "perler's earth," which is found on the surface of the ground, and is very difficult to distinguish from milk. The last dated telegram from the Port of Jamaica, dated by Mr. S. Pulgar, the other day, and which contains the following paragraph, which is a nominal price from a Mr. Neill, who was previously declared by the Courts to have no rights in the property.

To these specific charges circular to your shareholders gives a very meritorious reply.

I will quote from paragraph 2:—You say that the Concession Austin No. 9 has been acquired by purchase, and the legitimate owner's title to same. Now, you do not say that the alleged legitimate owner was Mr. Neill.

Are the shareholders aware that this so-called legitimate owner and his title was condemned by the Supreme Court of Guaymas in 1881, and that the original buyer of the property, from whom we hold our titles, and who is confirmed in possession by the Courts to the right of appeal, but of which he never availed himself, thus recognizing that he had no right in the property which he held, successfully vindicate it.

And now he had recourse to the same trick, by entering into a contract of the same property, the terms of which he had himself, which may be judged by the fact that the sale price of so valuable a property is to be 1,000,000, if Mr. Neill be left in quiet possession for a year.

It is true, I believe, that Mr. Nicholson obtained judgments in his favour by the provincial judge at Guadalupe, but the judge who gave the judgments, and made the decree of possession, was immediately recalled by the Government, and the present judge, who was sent from Caracas, revoked the original decision in his favour. The decree of possession was made, shortly after his arrival, a warrant for the arrest of your manager, Mr. Nicholson.

The claim of possession that he has to the property, however, even enabling Mr. Nicholson to continue his occupation of the property we have purchased, and thus increase our claim against the Chile Company for pecuniary adjudication.

You must be aware that the litigation between our company and yours commenced some months ago, and has been proceeding ever since; and will be continued until we obtain our rights.

I may make the same remark with regard to the question of bail.

It is incorrect to state that "the bail has been shelved." The shareholders of the company is informed at the statutory meeting that the bail offered by Mr. Nicholson was refused, and this statement is entirely correct.

What happened was this—

After the judge issued a warrant for the arrest of Nicholson, our counsel endeavoured to procure the release of the defendant, and an injunction against your manager working Concession No. 9. Security was offered by Mr. Nicholson, but the person named, and no security was ordered by the Governor, but the prohibition of leaving the country was maintained.

The injunction against working Concession No. 9 was in abeyance when the Courts rose for their vacation in August last, but this in no way affects our rights, and we are under what circumstances such decree was made, shortly after his arrival, a warrant for the arrest of your manager, Mr. Nicholson.

Mr. Nicholson states that, had he given bail, he would have recognized his position of the bail required. Our company's case against the Chile Company proceeds, whether satisfactory bail is forthcoming or not.

As a matter of fact, no serious defence has been offered to the company's action on the merits, but only on side issues of a purely formal character, such as the point of the bail required.

That for certain alleged informalities in registration the claimants (company) had no standing to sue, which are the "points raised" in which Mr. Nicholson boasts to have scored successes against us. It seems, therefore, hardly fair to throw the responsibility of the present phase of the proceedings on the Veneuzuelan judges.

You speak of "one's field of suppression you necessarily become more indolent." You say, hypothetically, that the Nacapulco Company may be claiming unfair title from a vendor who had no sufficient legal title to convey.

Now, Concession No. 9 is one of ten concessions numbered 1 to 10 inclusive, originally granted by the United States Government to the district. All the ten concessions were transferred by Mr. Austin to the Guinean Company, and, by the liquidation of that company, to our vendors.

How is it, then, that Concession No. 9, which unfortunately happens to be contiguous to the Company, has not just the one point of imperfection, and liable to impeachment?

The properties are regularly registered in the names of our trustees. We have regularly paid to the government the regular mining dues, and hold the receipts, the last being that of 31st October—the best evidence of the continuance of our ownership.

Did Mr. Nicholson ever pay the dues on No. 9? You don't know that he tried to do so and was refused.