

was the belief that a gentle but widespread unconformity existed between Unit I and Unit II. A closer study has shown this to be untenable.

What was formerly thought to be an unconformity between Mesozoic and Tertiary is now explained in terms of:

- 1) overlap in the flankal portions of the basin,
- 2) upward decrease of draping over localized basement highs,
- 3) upward decrease of flexing along lines of movement, and
- 4) lateral variations of lithology rather than divergencies of structural dip.

With regard to this last point, no comparable change in thickness of Unit I is observed where these divergencies appear. In other words, regardless of apparent divergence of dip, the bases of Units I and II remain somewhat parallel.

The other factors that now add weight to the belief that the lower unit is lower Tertiary rather than upper Mesozoic are:

- 1) the tie-in of the top of Unit II with the Oligocene of the Anglesea wall,
- 2) there is no evidence as far south as the Bass basin of the Mesozoic basin-forming movement characterized by block faulting and thick sediments in the Gippsland and Otway basins, and
- 4) since there is evidence of only one tectonic breakdown in Bass basin, it is most likely to coincide with the early Tertiary breakdown of the Gippsland and Otway areas.

Tertiary of Adjacent Areas - Fig. 1:

The marine Tertiary seen on Flinders Island (and other islands of the Furneaux Group) and King Island, could be the overlapping spread