Consolidated Skeena

801538

February 1, 1968

Mr. John E. White,
c/o Consolidated Skeena Mines Ltd.,
Box 1179,
Merritt, B. C.

Dear John:

The following comments are based on the additional geochem. data recently received from Bondar Clegg, and plotted on my map set.

Firstly, note the enclosed letter from Barringer which I am passing along for your attention.

Next, many thanks for your informative letter, plus enclosed sample, of January 28th. The Highmont data were appreciated--the intrusive is obviously 'Skeena' quartz diorite, altered to varying degrees. The mineralization looks very nice, being much the same as fresh specimens of Stellako's bornite-chalcopyrite ore.

As you know, I am reviewing Lornex's work on Skeena's Divide claims; in this connection I would like to personally look over exposures at Lornex, Highmont, Alwin, Minex, and any other place we can get into without being shot at. So be prepared to divert from your current work for a couple of days, to go along with me on this tour.

I was glad to note that you staked the ten 'Boots'; lets hope nothing upsets the proposed February 8th recordings; however, we all concede that this is a necessary gamble.

Thanks for your notes re your soil-sample nomenclature; actually, I sorted these out after taking a longer look at them.

It's just as well that the Toe re-runs check out with originals; otherwise we would have large doubts about the earlier analyses. The 'holes' will have to be accepted; in any case it would be unlikely that we would get one continuous anomaly over this indicated gross areal extent. In spite of the holes, we still have several significant areas to test; any anomaly equal to, or larger than ½-claim in areal extent is worth following up.

Continued.....2

For comparison, note that the long dimension of the original Lornex north anomaly was only a bit over 1,200 feet. I would guess that we have three or four zones which appear to be 2X or 3X this in size (strength?).

Your C-zone profiles provide considerable further confirmation that the anomalies are related to bedrock mineralization; the distribution of the anomalous Hg's provided the initial evidence.

I think we have done all the soil sampling that is required for immediate purposes, or that can be done expeditiously this winter. This does not necessarily apply to the new 'Boot' claims; if you can fit this extra work in with your magnetometer program, attempt to cover these before we are ready to call in I. P., etc. crews.

The Mal-Chal ground likewise appears to be satisfactorily covered by the present extent of soil-sampling. Your most southerly anomaly is adequately delimited by the 48-S to 68-S grid lines, and is also satisfactorily covered by your additional staking. Your mag. survey may add some significant information but, from the past experience of others, I would not count on bringing out any startling mag. anomalies. My opinion is that the applicable geophysical methods here will be I. P. and, perhaps, ~~variable~~ (low + high) frequency E. M. However, I will be looking forward to getting your results, following your anticipated completion of the mag. work here by next week-end. Anyway, you now have three substantial exploration targets currently delineated in this block.

Turam

I think that the detailed suggestions for field work in my December 21st letter can stand as given; also, you can use your own judgment as to what local additions, extensions and, perhaps, deletions of any of the suggested field work is warranted.

Wonder when we can tell Gus that we are planning to tear up his ski hill!

Be seeing you one of these days, so save me a pair of 'size 9 snowshoes'!

Best regards,

W. M. SHARP, P.ENG.

WMS:mjr

c.c. Mr. F. A. McGonigle