Quesne1 Lake Area, B.C.
The Eureka property is located seventy kilometers east of Williams Lake, B.C., between Crooked Lake and McKay River ( $52^{\circ} 18^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ latitude and $120^{\circ} 38^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ longitude).

The Eureka peak prospect has been known for some time as a porphyry property, having been investigated by Helicon Explorations (1965-66), H. Travis (1969), AMAX (1970), Rio Tinto (1972) and Noranda (1974).

The property lies on the Eastern Flank of the Quesnel Trough near its contact with the Omineca Belt. The Quesnel Trough contains eugeosynclinal series of basic volcanics and clastic sediments. Intermediate to basic intrusive complexes of Cretaceous age cut the sediments and volcanics. Ultrabasic intrusive are spatially closely related to the mineralized structures.

The mineralization occurs within both the Triassic or Jurassic sediments and volcanics as well as within the porphyry intrusives.

In 1980 UMEX carried out a property examination of the then remaining claims, and found that significant gold values were commonly associated with the system. These claims were optioned and additional ground covering the remainder of the structure were acquired by staking in 1981.

UMEX holds 34 claims covering 177 units, of these 25 claims covering 25 units were optioned from prospectors for the consideration of a sum of $\$ 100,000.00$ to be paid over a period of four years and a $3 \%$ net profit royalty (Table l, Figure 1).

In 1981 a rock sampling program was carried out to define the structures of greatest potential. A total of 491 rock samples were taken over the ten kilometers length of structure. Multi-element analyses, both by AA and by ICP ( 26 element) as well as gold determination (FA-AA) made on these samples to determine the metal associations.

The 1981 rock sampling program defined two major gold bearing trends that are transverse to the overall copper trend.

In 1982 a limited amount of rock sampling (71 samples), was carried out, and, these further defined the structures.

In these rock sampling programs it was found that a large proportion of the samples were significantly anomalous in gold, with values ranging from 50 ppb to 7.8 ppm Au . The copper content of these samples was always very high. The rocks that were anomalous in gold had an average copper content of about $0.4 \%$.

Since the rock samples were taken from the surface, and these were heavily oxidized, the metal values found in the unweathered rocks can be assured to be higher.

The Eureka property has a potential for higher grade copper-gold mineralization. UMEX is looking for a partner to further evaluate the property with the above potential in mind. Such a partner is expected to match UMEX's previous expenditures on the property to acquire a fifty percent interest.

## $\underline{T} \underline{A} \underline{\mathrm{~L}} \mathrm{E} \quad \underline{1}$

| Claim | Record No. | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EN 1 | 30398 | 1 |
| EN 2 | 30399 | 1 |
| EN 3 | 30400 | 1 |
| EN 4 | 30401 | 1 |
| EN 5 | 30402 | 1 |
| EN 6 | 30403 | 1 |
| EN 14 | 30477 | 1 |
| EN 28 | 30646 | 1 |
| EN 29 | 30647 | 1 |
| EN 104 | 30618 | 1 |
| EN 105 | 30619 | 1 |
| EN 106 | 30620 | 1 |
| EN 107 | 30621 | 1 |
| EN 109 | 30623 | 1 |
| EN 129 | 30611 | 1 |
| EM 11 | 65079 | 2 |
| EM 12 | 65080 | $\underline{2}$ |
| Total Units ....... 19 |  |  |
| Group II - EM-2 |  |  |
| SF 1 | 1688 | 1 |
| SF 2 | 1689 | 1 |
| SF 3 | 1690 | 1 |
| SF 4 | 1691 | 1 |
| EM 2 | 57929 | 20 |
| EM 3 | 57930 | 20 |
| EM 4 | 57931 | 12 |
|  |  | Total Units ....... 56 |
| Group III - EM-6 |  |  |
| NS 1 | 3373 | 1 |
| NS 2 | 3374 | 1 |
| CS 55 | 48017 | 1 |
| CS 56 | 48018 | 1 |
| EM 1 | 57928 | 16 |
| EM 5 | 57932 | 18 |
| EM 6 | 16956 | 16 |
|  |  | Total Units ....... 54 |
| Group IV - EM-7 |  |  |
| EM 7 | 24293 | 8 |
| EM 8 | 24294 | 20 |
| EM 9 | 24295 | $\underline{20}$ |
| Total Units ....... 48 |  |  |

