



010128

WHEN REPLYING PLEASE REFER TO

FILE NO.

0355

MINERAL RESOURCES BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND PETROLEUM RESOURCES

101 - 2985 Airport Drive
Kamloops, B. C.

January 20, 1975

DEPT. OF MINES AND PETROLEUM RESOURCES		
Rec'd JAN 23 1975		
AVB		
NCC		

Dr. N. C. Carter, P.Eng.
Senior Geologist
Mineral Resources Branch
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B. C.

Dear Nick:

Re: Bethlehem Mine

We (I) received a most instructive tour from talented Dave Miller to this mine on Friday, January 17, 1975.

My version from a one day trip of the geology would be an insult to Bill M. et al so suffice to say that the visit was considered to be of great help to me geologically.

A few things surprised me such as the shapes of the ore bodies and the degree of coincidence of the orebodies with the Bethlehem/Guichon contacts. My previous impression was that contacts were secondary to core collapse.

A number of rock specimens were gathered for the Kamloops office.

The J.A. zone, 300×10^6 T, 0.6 Cu, is considered sub economic with average 600 feet of overburden.

The Huestis is 30×10^6 T, 0.55 Cu.; the Iona is now 20×10^6 T, 0.5 Cu. Another very surprising thing was the Bethlehem/Valley Copper interrelation in any future mining of the VC body. Bethlehem drilled a 730 M. hole and had 0.6 Cu.

Page 2

on the east VC body and a great deal of Bethlehem's future reserves of total 220×10^6 T would be from this VC zone.

During the visit, a statement was made from production personnel that with 54¢ Cu., the mine loses money.

Present life of the present mine exclusive of the VC is estimated to be ten years.

Best wishes,

Gordon

Gordon P.E. White, P.Eng.
District Geologist

lc