



offset (faulted) continuation of zone B, it having a similar grade and depth (4 mhos at 27m.). Overlaid on the Pacminex geology map, zone E coincides with a small portion of the Montezuma Fault; the low grades are consistent with such a source (and there is no related magnetic anomaly).

ZONE F: ten responses, grades 3, 2 (3), 1(2), X(4). This 1800m+ long zone describes a broad arc over a relatively linear Montezuma Fault. The zone can be 'straightened out' by relating K2, L1 and F10 and moving F9 further to the west (the precise position of this response is uncertain - see profiles). This possibility is shown in Figure 1. Anomaly F2 has the largest amplitudes in the survey (80; 88 & 96; 134ppm.) such responses are not uncommon over black shales, but they also occur over sulphides (see for example, Dighem's Westmead Park case history). And there is known mineralisation (Wallace's Prospect, a galena-sphalerite occurrence with associated stannite) within 50m. of F3 and F4.

ANOMALY 4: grade 4. The calculated conductance (21 mhos) for this anomaly may be in error, due to interference from adjacent anomalies; a lower, rather than higher, value seems likely. The anomaly is associated with a weak, broad magnetic response, also only recorded on one flight line.

The fact that a response was recorded on one line only suggests that it is not due to a formational feature and thus '4' is of potential interest.

ZONE G: two responses, grades 2, 1. This zone is 200 to 300m. outside of the E.L.'s eastern boundary and has not been evaluated.

ZONE H: three responses, grades 4, X(2). This zone is 200m to 300m outside of the E.L.'s western boundary and has not been evaluated.

ZONE I: two (plus) responses, grades 3, X, ?. This zone is, at its closest, within 50m of the E.L.'s western boundary. Since experience has shown that location errors of 100m+ are not uncommon, this zone is briefly described. I2 is a strong, well defined anomaly with an interpreted conductance of 16 mhos, at 9m depth. I1, a possible anomaly, is more poorly defined than most such responses; it was not picked automatically, but by the Dighem interpreters. The zone apparently continues further to the south west.

ZONE J: five responses, grades 3, 2, X(3). This zone sub-parallel 'F' and has a strike length of about 800m. The accuracy of the parameters for J5, the grade 3 response, is probably poor since it is not clearly resolved from an adjacent anomaly. But this (J5) anomaly indicates a definite conductor at the southern end of a (presumed) formational feature. There is no related magnetic response.

ZONE K: two responses, grade X(2). The two possible anomalies defining this zone are weak, but real (i.e. they should be identifiable on the ground). The exact location of the anomalies on the profiles is imprecise due to interference from stronger, adjacent responses, and as usual, flight path recovery is suspect in thick and mostly featureless forest areas. Thus it is possible that zone K is parallel to F and may be a northern extension of L. An alternative suggestion is mentioned below under zone L; namely that K2, L1 and F10 form one zone. Whichever is the case, this series of long parallel zones suggest formational features. If these 'features' are shear zones then the better responses may be due to mineralisation, but if due to graphitic shales, then they are likely to be due to higher concentrations of graphite. Zone K is of no particular interest.

ZONE L: two responses, grades 2, X. The comments made under zone K also apply here; this is a relatively weak zone although L1 is a definite, well-defined anomaly. A possible alteration in the zoning would enhance L, though the responses would still not be high. The proposed