Introduction

The Newton bulk tonnage gold deposit is situated on the Chilcotin Plateau, in south -central British Columbia. The project site is located approximately 110km southwest of Williams Lake (Figure 1). Significant mineralized intervals at Newton include, for example, 99 metres at 2.76 g/t Au and 126 metres at 1.24 g/t Au with elevated copper, silver and zinc. The unique mineralization style



at Newton can be classified Figure 1: Location map of the Newton bulk tonnage gold within the spectrum of porphyry property, the deposit lies within the Stikinia terrane. and epithermal deposits, however its genesis is poorly understood.

Geology and Mineralization

The main geological units at Newton are mafic flows, lithic wackes and conglomerates, intermediate to mafic volcaniclastics and a felsic volcanic sequence that consists of felsic flows and pyroclastic rocks. A geological cross section is shown in Figure 2a. Faulting has superimposed the stratigraphy locally. The polymetallic gold mineralization is hosted within the felsic volcanic sequence which has been dated as Late Cretaceous. Several porphyry units cross cut the felsic volcanic sequence and are weakly mineralized (Fig. 2b, 2c). The geometry and distribution of the mineralization appears to be controlled by the enhanced primary permeability of the felsic volcanic sequence. The mineralization is characterized by disseminated sulfides infilling and replacing primary volcanic features and is associated with a strong pervasive quartz-muscovite alteration with minor siderite. Two sulfide assemblages have been mapped in the mineralized zone a pyrite dominant (Fig. 2d) and a marcasite base-metal dominant (Fig. 2e, 2f). The marcasite assemblage comprises two base-metal end members: sphalerite (Fig. 2e) and chalcopyrite (Fig. 2f). Based on preliminary thin section studies the pyrite assemblage is older than the marcasite base-metal assemblage. Younger rare polymetallic veins consisting of pyrite, chalcopyrite, sphalerite, and arsenopyrite overprint both disseminated sulfide assemblages (Fig. 2g). Different sulfide assemblages have been mapped in the upper and lower felsic volcanic units located above and below the Newton fault shown in Figure 2a.

Research Goals

The aim of this research is to use sulfur isotope analyses to define a source of sulfur and to use oxygen and deuterium analyses to determine the origin of the fluids related to the gold mineralization. This research will assist to classify the Newton gold deposit within an appropriate deposit model.



Lindsay McClenaghan¹, Craig J. R. Hart¹, Melissa Gregory¹ and Mark Rebagliati² (1) Mineral Deposit Research Unit, University of British Columbia, Imcclenaghan@eos.ubc.ca (2) Amarc Resources Ltd.





Conclusions

Two sulfide assemblages are associated with the gold mineralization; pyrite dominant and marcasite base-metal sulfide dominant. The marcasite assemblage contains two end members; one that is chalcopyrite-rich and another that is sphalerite-rich. The chalcopyrite enrichment may represent a proximal zone and the sphalerite enrichment may represent a more distal zone in a cooling hydrothermal system. The sulfur isotope data indicates a mantle source of sulfur. The oxygen and deuterium isotope data indicates the mineralizing fluids related to both the pyrite and the marcasite assemblage had a primary magmatic water component. This data also indicates the mineralizing fluids related to the marcasite assemblage had a minor meteroic water component. The two sulfide assemblages could record changes in the physiochemical properties of the mineralizing fluid. Stable isotope results (S,O, & D) suggest mineralizing fluids are related to an intrusion. A porphyry model therefore best describes the characteristics of the Newton deposit.

References



Preliminary Oxygen and Deuterium Isotope Results • Muscovite separates were analyzed from samples with each sulfide

Isotopic composition was calculated for hydrothermal fluids in equilibrium

• δ^{18} O range from 2.7 to 6.8‰ and δ D range from -63 to -46.5‰ • Two distinct data clusters correspond with the two sulfide assemblages

• The $\delta^{18}O$ and δD range is consistent with magmatic fluids mixing with

• The porphyry intrusions at Newton may be the source of the mineralizing

Figure 4: Plot of δ¹⁸O versus δD, both δ¹⁸O and δD are reported relative to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW) and were calculated for hydrothermal muscovite fluids. Two outliers have been omitted from the data and have been sent for reanalysis. In order to calculate the δD and $\delta^{18}O$ values of the hydrothermal fluids in equilibrium with each sulfide assemblage a temperature of 235°C was used for the formation of marcasite (Murowchick, 1992) and a temperature of 335°C was used for the formation of pyrite, considering muscovite is an abundant alteration mineral. The error bars represent +/- 50°C difference for the each δ^{18} O fluid calculation. Primary magmatic water box from Taylor, 1974, Felsic magmatic water box from Taylor, 1992 and Volcanic vapour box from Giggenbach, 1992.