

005

THE ULTRABASIC BELTS CONTD.

It should be noted, however, that the nature of this E.M. response is far from uniform even within one belt. For example, in the vicinity of Sheet 10 PPs 74 and 75, there is a paucity of E.M. response over a wide exposure of ultrabasics and a corresponding concentration of magnetic peaks to a percentage of the total areal exposure.

An interesting addition to possible conductive causes is that suggested in Geological Report G.73 page 15, (d), viz. schlieren with a matrix of steatite, limonite and clay contained between two well defined walls.

(j) It is believed that ground checking is now essential in order to achieve much further progress in the near future, otherwise discussion becomes too conjectural.

E.M. anomalies of the ultrabasic belt have been reviewed with regard to the now most desirable sequence.

Bearing in mind what are now considered to be the most favourable factors, conclusions reached are:-

(i) 14/5 and similar anomalies should be lowered on priority lists.

The reason for the original selection of 14/5 was that it was considered the best of this type of anomaly and hence the first of this type which should be checked. Now it is still believed that 14/5 is valid and should be checked but is rather less important at this stage. 14/5 becomes Third Order Priority whilst Third Order Priority anomalies of this type become Fourth Order Priority.

(ii) Most of the marginal and terminal anomalies do not appear favourable on chart. Somewhat of an exception is:

10/10 situated on Line 653, Frame 3290 in a small magnetic disturbance.

When considered as a response above background, its small broad L.F. value is greater than H.F. It is selected as a suitable anomaly of this type for checking.

(iii) The conclusions of Hawkes (1951) bear out the need for ground checks to provide correlation of rock types, within an ultramafic mass, with magnetic responses, before direct or indirect detection of chromite can be thoroughly attempted. The high specific gravity of chromite, ranging from 3.7 to 5.0, favours the use of gravity methods for ground follow-up surveys.