drill press chuck and the bit, and enables water to flow down through the inside of the bit and wash out the cuttings (Fig. 2). The operation is similar to that used in a large diamond drill, of the type used for evaluating ore deposits. Excellent core sections can be obtained using the water swivel. Experience shows the water flow should be gentle, and can be supplied from a gravity-feed bottle or from a water main with the tap barely open.

Care must be taken to ensure that the bit and swivel are accurately centred in the axis of rotation of the chuck, and the sample must be clamped securely to minimize vibration. Mounting the rock or mineral in polylite cold plastic is recommended if a large number of cores are required from one specimen. Pressure should be gentle during drilling and with a little experience the "feel" of the cutting edge can be used to adjust the downward pressure for a high core recovery. The core may be left in the hole and taken out with tweezers, but it is probably easier to "dry-block," by cutting off the water supply momentarily. A pad of cuttings then forms at the base of the bit and the core can be lifted out.

Advantages of this technique over the dentist's or non-coring drill often used in geological laboratories are: (*i*) speed of operation; (*ii*) contamination is reduced to a minimum as the cuttings and bit particles are rapidly washed away; (*iii*) the sample obtained is in a form more suitable for microscopic examination prior to *x*-ray or chemical analysis; (*iv*) closer control of the sampling is maintained, and a larger volume of sample is obtained.

The results suggest a smaller diameter bit could be used if necessary. The technique was also tried on samples of feldspar, quartz, and beryl with good results. The cost of the apparatus, excluding the drill press, was less than $100.

Manuscript received January 16, 1962

CUPROSKLODOWSKITE, KASOLITE AND SCHOEPITE FROM GREAT BEAR LAKE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES, CANADA

L. I. COWAN

Earth Sciences Division, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Ontario

Cuprosklodowskite, kasolite, and schoepite are identified on pitchblende from Great Bear Lake, Northwest Territories, Canada, by *x*-ray diffraction powder patterns. All of the specimens studied were collected during the first few years after the original discovery.

Cuprosklodowskite occurs as thin dark green coatings and minute, mammillary crusts and as thin blue-grey earthy crusts on pitchblende (R.O.M. No. M 21593) from Great Bear Lake. Fourmarierite is found widely on the same specimen. The *x*-ray powder pattern is identical with that of cuprosklodowskite from Jachymov, Czechoslovakia, and with the cuprosklodowskite pattern in the reference set of the Department of Geological Sciences, University of Toronto. The alteration products on the Great Bear Lake uranium ores have been observed frequently, but this species has not been identified among them previously.

Kasolite is found on a single large specimen of pitchblende (R.O.M. No. 10600) from Labine Point, Great Bear Lake. It coats almost every surface of the specimen and fills numerous minute cracks with a dull, sulphur-yellow crust. The powder pattern is identical with that of kasolite crystals from Kasola, Katanga, Congo.

Minute honey-coloured schoepite crystals form a drusy coat on pitchblende (R.O.M. No. M 18403) from Great Bear Lake. The powder pattern is identical with that of schoepite crystals from Kasola, Katanga, Congo.

NEW MINERALS AND MINERAL NAMES

At its meeting in Copenhagen in 1960, the Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names of the International Mineralogical Association voted that there should be an annual review of new mineral names and suggested changes of nomenclature, with indications of approval or disapproval. Such lists for 1959 and 1960 have been voted on and the votes are recorded below. It should be noted that in some cases the votes are on the basis of incomplete preliminary reports (the Commission is strongly opposed to the publication of new names without complete descriptions); when the full account is published, the Commission will reconsider the status of such names.

First Report on New Mineral Names
List for 1959 (prepared March 15, 1961)

Number voting—6 (representatives of Bulgaria, Canada, France, Great Britain, Japan, United States)
The number given is the number who *disapprove* the name.
Fifteen of the 51 names were disapproved by four or more.

Alvanite	0	Canasite	0	Fenghuanglite	4
Angelellite	1	Cobalt pentlandite	0	Gowerite	0
Baotite	1	Cornubite	0	Haiweeite	0
Batisite	1	Dalhayelite	0	Hellyerite	0
Bergenite	3	Delrioite	0	Honessite	2
Cafetite	1	Dixeyite	5	Hormites (group name)	6
Calciotalc	3	Fenaksite	2	Hydroamesite	5