

## CORPORATION FALCONBRIDGE COPPER

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 14, 1984  
 TO: A. J. Davidson  
 COPIES TO: D. H. Watkins, H. Gibson, D. Lefebure  
 FROM: I. D. Pirie  
 SUBJECT: CDN ASSAYS

---

During July and August, chip samples from trenches on the Rea Gold property were assayed at CDN and then a selection were checked at Chemex with the following results:

Au g/tonne		Ag g/tonne		As %		Ba %	
CDN	CHEMEX	CDN	CHEMEX	CDN	CHEMEX	CDN	CHEMEX
7.30	11.45	34	34	.14	.16	1.22	2.37
40.0	40.3	218	193	4.45	8.33	7.34	33.98
17.0	16.93	172	154	2.75	2.73	6.10	49.91
2.60	2.88	112	97	.13	.05	4.74	56.41
3.90	4.32	184	157	.11	.07	5.78	44.45
6.50	6.58	51	55	.48	.32	1.06	0.97
14.7	15.01	109	121	3.95	3.85	0.60	0.09
17.8	15.43	64	62	11.20	10.7	0.13	0.01
41.9	44.2	248	214	16.2	15.8	0.11	0.01
6.30	6.44	43	43	2.0	2.21	0.38	0.11
67.8	57.0	179	163	.29	10.3	0.40	0.10
45.2	53.0	301	276	7.9	7.2	0.44	0.14
23.50	22.7	99	125	12.6	10.7	0.14	0.05
11.30	10.90	73	69	11.8	11.8	0.26	0.10
12.60	5.42	196	35	7.0	6.8	0.66	0.13
13.80	13.70	1420	1238	5.05	5.1	1.82	5.0

Variations in Au results may all be put down to nuggeting. The higher Ag analyses at CDN are consistent with what we already know about Chemex - their numbers are low, due to them losing Ag during fire assaying.

Arsenic analyses were by wet chemical method at CDN and by NAA at Chemex. The only sample to show a startling difference was of a gossan in which the As mineral was scorodite. It obviously did not dissolve for CDN!

As for Barium, I would recommend the random number generator on the PDP before using CDN. The numbers have a better chance of being right!

Consequently I feel that CDN are still OK for general Au, Ag work, but would recommend not using them for more important work such as drillhole intersections. If you've had any Ba numbers from them - have them checked!

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized initials 'IDP' followed by a horizontal line.

I. D. Pirie

IDP/ik