

No other direct magnetic correlation with an E.M. conductor exists within the Joint Venture area. This contrasts with the best anomaly detected by this survey, a grade 5 response approximately 800m outside the northwestern boundary of E.L. 15/76 in Renison's E.L. 42/71. This E.M. has both a sharp 100 ohm-m resistivity low and a direct magnetic correlation of 100%.

4.2.2. Mitre Geophysics' Assessment of Dighem II (Refer Appendix 2: Mitre Geophysics Report EZ/MG82/11 (J.R. Bishop) Nov., 1982 and Figure 2: Anomalies plan)

The Mitre Geophysics report was received at the close of the reporting period and has not yet been fully evaluated. The report has established a systematic order of priority for follow-up of the E.M. conductors with consideration of the effect of terrain clearance on the sensitivity of the Dighem II results.

The first priority E.M. anomalies are A2 and A1, 4, J5, F2, F1 and F3, D2 and D1, C2. However all these anomalies compare poorly with the above-mentioned (section 4.2.1.) grade 5 response outside the E.L.

Dr. Bishop states that the Montezuma E.M. responses are typical of those over graphitic shales, but that their NNE trend (a known prominent fault direction) suggests that most responses are due to faults or shears. The better conductors (listed above) within these linear zones may be due to non-magnetic massive sulphide within the interpreted faults. No pyrrhotite-hosted cassiterite body is indicated although pyrite-hosted cassiterite mineralisation is a possibility.