

Exam Project Assays

Some problems seem to exist in the assays for hole #1. There are serious differences between the positions of logged mineralized sections and the actual assay results as follows:

a) 130' - 150'

poor mineralization is noted from 129' - 142'. Below 142' mineralization is noted to be slightly better and mostly concentrated in the interval from 144' - 149'. In contrast 130-140 assay result is much higher than 140-150.

b) 210' - 230'

There is no pronounced mineralization noted in this interval to correspond with the high assays. Most striking is the interval from 210 to 220 which is included in two rock units both noted to be poorly mineralized.

c) 370 - 400

370-380 is noted to contain 1' of good mineralization, 380-390 to contain 3½' of good mineralization, and 390-400 to contain 2½' of good mineralization + lesser fracture bound low grade mineralization. In contrast the assays have the section 370-380 as the highest value and 380-390 as the lowest.

These sections have one thing in common - that is that they all contain unusual calc-silicate rocks that are strongly fractured and sheared and have a dark green serpentine like mineral.

on the shear surfaces. Only two other sections of the hole have this rock, one from 450-460' also contains sphalerite but has not been assayed yet. The other is near 80' which is not fully mineralized but is near good sphalerite and it is not associated with a spurious looking assay. These serpentine bearing rocks are commonly calcite rich but numerous other calcite rich sections (some strongly so) occur in the hole where the assays are not spurious. These rocks are dark colored and it may be that some sphalerite was overlooked but the typically coarse sphalerite in the core is quite easy to pick out on a split surface and although most of these rocks were looked at somewhat harder than others because of their unusual mineralogy no subtle mineralization was ~~seen~~ seen. Even if there were some unknown factor that increases Zn assays in these rocks it does not explain the strikingly low assay from 380-390' which contains $\frac{3}{4}$ ' of calc silicate rock with good sphalerite mineralization.

The other possibilities are that the assays are unreliable or that the numbers of the samples have been somehow switched around either by the core splitter or in the sample preparation.

The fact that the other two holes are apparently all right immediately suggests the core splitting is in error since the first hole was done by Ed and the last two by Ryan. I very carefully explained to Ed that the core splitting was very important and showed him in detail how to read the core boxes and to find footages in the boxes. I instructed him to keep only one bag open at any one time so that it would be impossible to get the wrong tag in a bag and as far as I remember I never saw two bags open at once. I also told Ed that if he was uncertain of what he was doing then he should do nothing until he could ask

me about it, thus I don't think that the mistake was in the core splitting.

The one other thing these samples have in common is that they were all part of the same shipment of samples; the second shipment which is the one you took into Faro the day you were in to look at the results of the first hole. It may be that who ever prepared these samples had a particularly bad day and got the numbers mixed up. If so there is not much hope of ever sorting this problem out without a great deal of work or ~~or~~ quarantining the core.

I would suggest that these assays be redone to confirm the numbers and cross the next ledge if its still there.

The rest of the assays look all-right but the fact that the three high leads in hole 2 are all 2.60 both by me and B. I think these should be checked.

In comparing the assays not done and the logs it appears that some moderately good assays are yet to come on hole 1 and 2. Particularly 450-460, 550-560 and 570-580 in hole 1 and 551-566, 525-535, 474-486 and 217-227 in hole 2 with probably 80-80 assays from 390'-430' in hole 2 as well.



Certificate of Analysis

TO Cyprus Anvil Expl. Mr. G. Jilson
P.O. Box 1000
Faro, Yukon

REPORT NO. A-45-18
DATE July 4, 1975

I hereby certify that the following are the results of analyses made by us upon the herein described CQIE samples

MARKED	%	%	%	width	Assay/lb width				
	Cu	Pb	Zn		Zn				
9	9477	140 1/2 - 149 1/2	0.06	0.01	2.12	9.0	19.08		
10 3/4	9479	164 - 174 3/4	0.03	0.02	0.59				
3 3/4	9480	174 3/4 - 178 1/2	0.15	0.03	5.48	x 3.75	18.55		
3 3/4	9481	178 1/2 - 182 1/4	0.03	0.01	0.35	x 3.75	1.32		
10 1/2	9482	182 1/4 - 192 3/4	0.14	0.02	4.32	x 10.5	45.36		
8 1/4	9483	192 3/4 - 201	0.14	0.03	3.10	x 8.25	25.58		
		174 3/4 - 201	~ 0.12		3.80	26.25	100.81		

BONDAR-CLEGG & COMPANY LTD.

NOTE:

Rejects retained two weeks
Pulps retained three months
unless otherwise arranged.

[Handwritten Signature]



Certificate of Analysis

TO Cyprus Anvil Mining

REPORT NO. A-45-32

DATE July 30, 1975

I hereby certify that the following are the results of analyses made by us upon the herein described COFE samples

MARKED	%	%	%						
	Cu	Pb	Zn						
9507	0.05	0.04	1.60						
9508	0.05	0.05	1.12						
9511	0.05	0.04	0.98						
9512	0.04	0.01	1.05						

BONDAR-CLEGG & COMPANY LTD.

NOTE:

Rejects retained two weeks
Pulps retained three months
unless otherwise arranged.



Certificate of Analysis

TO Cyprus Anvil

REPORT NO. A-45-51

DATE August 19, 1975

I hereby certify that the following are the results of analyses made by us upon the herein described rock samples

MARKED	%	%	%						
	Cu	Pb	Zn						
N-138	0.14	6.56	6.40						
Au Ag to follow									

BONDAR-CLEGG & COMPANY LTD.

NOTE:
Rejects retained two weeks
Pulps retained three months
unless otherwise arranged.