

883334

From: GALAXY::TSCHROETER "TOM SCHROETER 660-2812" 9-JUL-1992 14:33:48.39
To: GALAXY::MRGATE::"A1::RSMYTH"
CC: TSCHROETER
Subj: RE: Skagit -Giant Copper

MI 92H SW 001 (NTS 92H(w))

Ron, Yes, I will organize something from Robert Bob, and myself. Tom.
Have a good holiday. From: GALAXY::MRGATE::"A1::RSMYTH" 9-JUL-1992 13:44:4
To: TSCHROETER, RPINSENT
CC:
Subj: Skagit -Giant Copper

From: NAME: Ron Smyth - Min. of EMPR
FUNC: Energy, Mines & Pet. Res. <RSMYTH AT A1 AT GALAXY>
TEL: 387-0687
To: TSCHROETER@VMSMAIL,
NAME: ROBERT PINSENT of EMPR at VMSMAI <RPINSENT AT VMSMAIL>

Can you look after this. I'm off on vacation. Let Vic know.

Ron

From: NAME: Graeme McLaren
FUNC: Energy, Mines & Pet. Res. <GMCLAREN AT A1 AT GALAXY>
TEL: 356-2289
Date: 09-Jul-1992
Posted-date: 09-Jul-1992
Precedence: 1
Subject: Skagit -Giant Copper
To: NAME: Ron Smyth - Min. of EMPR <RSMYTH AT A1 AT GALAXY>,
NAME: Vic Preto <VPRETO AT A1 AT GALAXY>

We are once again in negotiations over the future of the Skagit Rec Area. I have been asked to produce another cabinet submission on how to deal with the issue of rec area versus park and what to do with the "hole in the donut" (i.e. the piece of provincial forest surrounded by Manning/Skagit; Bethlehems claims, you may recall, lie half in the provincial forest and half in the Skagit Rec area).

An option I would like to develop strongly, is to create most of the Skagit rec area directly into a park, but to delete an area including the Bethlehem claims and some surrounding lands from park act status. This would effectively enlarge the hole in the donut and free up the claims from direct rec area status. The intent here is to remove that hurdle from Bethlehem so they might have an easier time of getting financing - right now they are stymied on getting financing because of the rec area issue. I recognize they will still have a hard time since they would effectively be surrounded by Park and are in the Skagit drainage anyway, hence an MDAP review may be a horror-show; however, this option needs to be fully developed.

Therefore, I would appreciate some brief paragraphs from GSB on the real mineral potential of the Giant Copper deposit. Any words about the potential for a viable mine and specifically any indications on what size of operation, based on a BC example, it might be ultimately be comparable to, would be of most value.

The intent would be to draw comparisons with that operation in terms of

socio-economic assessments. I recognize there are certain leaps of faith and discomfort on making these projections, but we have to make them and qualify them accurately. Hence, your qualifications on the statements made are essential as well.

Can GSB supply any VERY BRIEF sentences/paragraphs on this?? I am supposed to supply something by July 20, but due to my travel requirements this means I have to finish a draft by next Wednesday. Can you supply anything on Monday or early Tuesday next week???

Your expert assistance, as always, is much appreciated!!
If you are able to supply info, I would appreciate a note indicating when you anticipate it may be forthcoming.

thanks,
graeme

From: GALAXY::TSCHROETER "TOM SCHROETER 660-2812" 9-JUL-1992 14:36:20.71
To: VPRETO
CC: GMCLAREN,TSCHROETER
Subj: Skagit-Giant Copper

Rec'd request for action from Ron, including note from Graeme. Will get something together (Schroeter,Pinsent,Lane) by next Mon. pm at latest. Tom.