

COMMENTS ON A TRIASSIC AGE DETERMINATION
FOR CORE 18 FROM A.P.M. ROSEDALE No. 1
BORE

UR 1960/104



27th September, 1960.

Memorandum - Chief Government Geologist.

Comments on Records 1960/76, Bureau of Mineral
Resources, Geology and Geophysics "Plant Fossils
in Core 26, Rosedale No.1 Borehole, Victoria, by
Mary E. White"

Following an examination of samples from core 26 A.P.M. Rosedale
No.1 bore, Mrs. Mary E. White has determined as Yabeiella species
plant impressions generally previously classified as Taeniopteris
species.

I do not wish at this juncture to enter controversy regarding
the correctness of the determination, or to imply disagreement
with the determination, but to remark on the Middle - Upper
Triassic/Rhaetic age determination for core 26.


It would appear to me, that if based on the presence of
Yabeiella and Conifers alone, this age is not necessarily valid.

A large number of species from Victorian Mesozoic sediments
if taken individually would on the same reasoning indicate varying
ages for samples.

e.g. Neocalamites sp. (from Tasmanian and Queensland
Triassic) would indicate Triassic sediments,
Thinnfeldia pinnata Walkom (known elsewhere only from
N.S.W. Jurassic) would indicate Jurassic sediments.

Numerous other examples could be quoted to show that boreholes a
foot apart in one horizon could produce "evidence" to justify dating
over practically any portion of the Mesozoic.

I would suggest that thorough examination of plant fossil
assemblages is necessary before age determination can be authoritatively
essayed.


John Douglas

Geologist.