

*Replied verbally
File. COMWEST.*

March 28, 1974

013976

Mr. C. K. O'Connor
Convest Exploration Company Limited
Tenth Floor
85 Richmond Street West
Toronto 1, Ontario

Dear Mr. O'Connor:

I wish to thank you for the information regarding Convest's Input data in the Glenlyon area. Your E-M data and results of Anvil's past field work in the area would form a base for planning additional exploration in this area.


As you may be aware, Anvil and Dynasty are in the process of amalgamating and we are having a small problem combining our exploration programs to be worked under the new company and obtaining budget decisions regarding various projects.

In my previous letter I expressed the indicated company preference to acquire data rather than go into joint program. Because we feel that this area has considerable exploration merit, we will continue to pursue this with our management. I will be back in touch with you once we get a firm decision on this.

Sincerely,

U. Jansons
Chief Exploration Geologist

UJ/mm



**CONWEST
EXPLORATION**
COMPANY LIMITED

TELEPHONE — (416) 362-6721
TELEX — 02-29119
CABLES — CONWEST TORONTO

TENTH FLOOR
85 RICHMOND ST. WEST.
TORONTO 1, ONTARIO

March 18, 1974.

File: P-738

Anvil Mining Corporation Limited,
P. O. Box 1000,
Faro, Yukon Territory.

Attention: Mr. V. Jansons,
Chief Exploration Geologist.

Dear Sirs:

Re: Glenlyon Area

This is to acknowledge your letter of March 5, 1974 regarding our Input data for the above area.

I took the liberty of calling Gordon Davis, who is an old acquaintance of mine from the rush days of 1966, to discuss this matter. He referred me back to you as he has apparently been out of touch with your recent activities in the area.

In any event, I happen to have a personal interest in this area and am wondering whether it might be possible to look at some type of joint venture.

In regard to the data, I am enclosing an outline of the area covered by our Input survey. Line spacing was 1/8 mile and the older Mark IV system was used. Mag correlation but not contouring is given. The survey cost us \$40,000. Lazenby of Questor, who was the geophysicist on the job at the time, says the older Mark IV system is about 50% as sensitive as the Mark VI currently in use. Looking at the data, however, it is apparent that discrimination rather than sensitivity is the problem in this area, with many formational graphitic conductors, any one of which might host or mask a sulphide deposit. My personal opinion is that the data would be useful only in conjunction with some fairly detailed stratigraphic mapping and qualified with follow-up soil sampling. Our old records make reference to insufficient drainage, especially in the northwest part, to eliminate the area by silts.

Undoubtedly you will have a better appreciation of the value of the stratigraphy than I, however there certainly appears to be remarkable consistency of the deposits and their relation to the phyllite formation.

Our ground follow-up was limited and did not include soil sampling. Sixteen conductors were located on the ground and six were drilled and explained. This data would be of some value also. However, as I mentioned first off, I believe the area has sufficient merit to warrant a better look.

In conclusion, provided Conwest receives some consideration for its data, we would like to consider a joint venture with Anvil on all or part of the area outlined. Conwest would be content to take a small contributing share in the order of 25%.

Alternatively, we would agree to the sale of our Input data and ground follow-up information, such as it is, for the sum of \$25,000.

Yours very truly,

CONWEST EXPLORATION COMPANY LIMITED,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kelly O'Connor".

C. K. O'Connor,
Geologist.

CKO/CP
Enc.



135°00'

