## I. INTRODUCTION



This report pertains to the combined airborne EM and magnetometer survey flown on behalf of Silver-Men Mines Limited over a group of claims in Geary and Mahaffy Townships, District of Cochrane, Ontario. The survey flying was accomplished May 13, 1965 by the Canadian Aero Mineral Surveys Limited geophysically equipped Otter aircraft, (registration CF-IGM), based at Timmins.

The flight lines were oriented $\mathrm{N} 15^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ and were spaced at $1 / 8$ mile intervals. The geophysical data acquired totalled 90 line miles. The mean terrain clearance of the aircraft during survey was 150 feet or 1ess. $\qquad$
Canadian Aero Mineral Surveys Limited personnel associated with the project were as follows:

| G. A. Curtis | - | Project Manager |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dale Smith | - | Pilot |
| D. J. Sarazin | - | Navigator |
| D. Graham | - | Operator |
| R. Sarsfield | - | Mechanic |
| G. Granger | - | Data Compiler |
| A. Martin | - | Draftsman |
| P. Tallyhoe | - | Data Chief |

The project was supervised by A. R. Rattew, P.Eng., author of this report.

The EM data are presented on a plan map at the scale of 1 inch equals $\frac{1}{4}$ mile. An uncontrolled airphoto mosaic served as the base for this map.

Appendix $I$ is a complete listing of all EM anomalies detected.

Appendix II describes the equipment, the records, the survey and map compilation procedures and the data presentation system.
II. GEOLOGY

According to the Ontario Department of Mines maps P. $139\left(1^{\prime \prime}=2\right.$ miles $)$ and $2046\left(1^{\prime \prime}=4\right.$ miles $)$ there is no mapping in Geary and Mahaffy Townships.

## III. GEOPHYSICAL RESULTS

Although some 17 EM anomalies have been plotted within this area, there are no good prospects for massive sulphide mineralization. In fact, there may be no bedrock conductors of any sort.

Anomalies 1A, 7A, 28A, 30A, 31A, 33A, 34A, 35A, 45A, and 47A are all weak out-of-phase features with little or no in-phase components, and no coincident magnetic anomalies. A low conductivity source is indicated for such anomalies and most of them probably derive from conducting swamps or clays. On the other hand, since
they are all relatively narrow anomalies they could derive from weak bedrock conductivity contrasts. But even if some of these anomalies do indicate bedrock conductors, massive sulphides are improbable.

Anomalies 10A, 11A, 15A, 23A, 31B, and 34B are all questionable features, (x-category) suspected of being spurious effects resulting from air turbulence or sharp aircraft manoeuvres. One of them, anomaly 34B coincides with a 350 gamma magnetic high.

Anomaly 25A is probably the best prospect for a bedrock conductor but it cannot conclusively be interpreted as such. If the in-phase response is authentic a bedrock source is indicated clearly, but there is a fair chance that the in-phase reaction may have been caused by air turbulence. There is no magnetic support.

## IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Since no good prospect for massive sulphide mineralization is indicated and since there may be no bedrock conductors of any sort in this area, ground followup of the EM indications is not recommended unless one or more of these features occurs in an especially favourable geological environment.

If the exploration philosophy of Silver-Men Mines
Limited dictates that some additional work should be done, we would recommend anomaly 25 A as the best prospect for a bedrock conductor.

Respectfully submitted,

OTTAWA, Ontario, June 28, 1965.

Respectfully submitted,

A. R. Rattew, P.Eng., Geophysicist.
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In-Phase

| Anomaly | Fiducials | In-Phase <br> Quad | Altitude | Magnetics | Rate | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 A | $8245 / 7$ | $20 ? / 40$ | 145 | N.side <br> $400 g$ | 3 | Weak, poss, sur- <br> face conductor |
| 7 A | $8699 / 8706$ | $-/ 80$ | 125 | nil | 3 | Probable sur- <br> face effect |
| 10 A | $8949 / 52$ | $60 /-$ | 165 | nil |  | x |




