The Explorationist Newsletter is brought to you as a ‘member service’ of the Ontario Prospectors Association. It’s purpose is to share news and information amongst it’s members and also to act as the association’s ‘Political Voice’.

The views and opinions expressed in this newsletter are not necessarily those of the Ontario Prospectors Association, including all of it’s members and Directors. The writer’s accept full ownership of their contributions.

Editorial comments/contents:

Many thanks for the comments/advice re the last (first) Issue. Suggestions for additional content etc. are always welcome.

In future we should be able to look for an Issue to come out during the last week of each month. Everyone who wishes to (or is expected to) write articles will get a friendly ‘drop dead due date’ reminder (maybe twice because they’re all getting old).

Who gets the Newsletter and how will you get it? When you filled out an application for membership in the OPA you should have indicated your preference whether you wanted the electronic or printed version of the newsletter. If you checked off the e-mail box (and gave us a good address (that we could read), you will be put on the list for notification that a current Issue is available for viewing/downloading from the OPA website and you’ll be given instructions for doing that.

If you chose to receive the printed version it will be sent to you (black and white) by snail mail to the address you provided.

Anyone wishing to change over to the electronic version is encouraged to do so because it saves the OPA big bucks in printing and mailing costs.

In this Issue you’ll find some interesting reading we’re sure: The articles by both Bob Komarechka and Frank Tagliamonte are examples of the kinds of highly researched and fact based information that we love to include.

My apologies to Bob K. if he notices any formatting or other types of screw ups in his article……he’s a pretty complicated guy and so understandably, is his computer. I had a helluva time working with the ‘files from Mars’ as my computer guru put it. (we’ll get better Bob)

Also included are some comments on the PSMP process, a report from NWOPA on the NW symposium, etc., thoughts on participating in the FMP process, an interesting article with a slightly different slant by Dale Alexander, information about the High Water Canoe Run by ‘Evil Kanoe (Mike) Leahy), more on the View from the South from Fred Swanson, The continuing saga of Native Issues by Garry Clark, a short summary of the AGM and NE Symposium, a poem entitled The Prospector submitted by new director Wally Rayner, and another reason for being an OPA member in the form of a product review/recommendation and DISCOUNT price re Bear Spray cartridges.

All in all I think we’re making great progress towards finding a real balance of information and communication in OUR newsletter. Thanks to those who submitted articles for this one and a challenge to others to keep the ball bouncing.....!
In the past several years the Ontario government has implemented a major change in its policies for its provincial crown land through the Lands for Life Process. This process has, in addition to creating more parks, also created a whole myriad of land designations which can limit or prohibit mineral exploration over significant areas in this province.

The map above indicates the various planning areas in the Lands for Life process. You will note that neither the predominantly native inhabited north nor the heavily populated part of southern Ontario was considered in this exercise. It is not known whether this was a political decision, but what is of concern here is the percentage of remaining general use (or as indicated `unrestricted’) crown land available in each of these areas. The percentage of land indicated on this map shows the amount of crown land where conventional prospecting, exploration, staking and development has been done in the past, is still allowed. While there are other categories of land as defined in the Lands for Life (now Living Legacy) documentation where mineral exploration may occur, these areas may have access and development restrictions, some of which have not yet been determined. It is this uncertainty for the last two years that has discouraged exploration investment in these areas. It is an issue that needs resolution.

The list of tables below (supplied from the Ministry of Natural Resources in Peterborough) clarify how each of the planning areas have been affected as well as the whole area of study. It should be noted that the data in these tables relate to the time near the completion of the Lands for Life process, March 23, 1999, from which time only minor changes have been made.
Assumptions in Development – Applicable to all tables following:

1. Areas were tabulated from 1:600,000 digital databases. These may change when mapped or surveyed at a larger scale.
2. The land base includes all land and water area, excluding the Great Lakes.
3. The area figures are derived from the Provincial Land Use Coverage, which is created by merging all base layers and resolving any erroneous overlaps with the following priority sequence (in order of priority): unregulated CRs, provincial parks, national parks, private/federal land. Proposed designations are then merged and restricted to areas lacking any existing uses.

Points of Clarification

* includes 1 provincial park partially in Boreal East
** includes 9 unregulated conservation reserves in the Temagami Comprehensive Land Use Planning Area.

It should be noted, in the table above, that while the Algonquin recreation/utilization zones (5.7%) has been removed from the total existing protected areas, no mineral development is allowed in this area.

As can be seen from the previous table, the Great Lakes Planning area has been hit the hardest with the Lands for Life Process with reduction in General Use Lands from 54.8% prior to Lands for Life to 38.5% after. This represents a 30% reduction in available General Use lands for the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence Planning Area as a result of the Lands for Life Process.
### Points of Clarification

* includes 1 provincial park partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence in the Ontario’s Living Legacy option. Existing park area reflects the proposed partial deregulation of Abitibi De Troyes provincial park.

** includes 1 unregulated conservation reserve in the Temagami Comprehensive Land Use Planning Area.

*** includes 5 proposed provincial parks partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence.

**** includes 2 proposed conservation reserves partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and 1 partially in Boreal West.

---

### Boreal East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>O.L.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>213,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Protected Areas</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>403,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>237,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>513,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Protected Areas</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>750,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,139,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – natural heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – remote access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – Great Lakes Coastal Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – fish and wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – intensive forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Management Areas – TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>12,994,134</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crown Land</td>
<td>13,397,270</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>1,445,764</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,843,004</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen above some areas have suffered more than others in this exercise which continues through Living Legacy. It can only be hoped that the reduction of the available crown land for mineral exploration will not mean a comparable reduction in new mineral discoveries.

Fortunately the government of Ontario has recognized the significance of the exploration industry on these new land designations and has established positions of Regional Land Use Geologists or RLUGs. These individuals will study this matter and deal with problems with existing mineral tenure in these areas and consider what measures can be undertaken in those areas of high (Provicially significant) mineral potential that have been excluded from exploration by this process. It is rather unfortunate however that the administrative areas of the individual RLUGs do not conform to any Land Use Study Area, Mining District or Resident Geologists Area. Additional costs, new maps and new databases will now have to be established regarding these new RLUG areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boreal West</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>O.L.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,939,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,941,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>321,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>764,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,085,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,941,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – natural heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – remote access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – Great Lakes Coastal Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – fish and wildlife</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>208,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – intensive forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Management Areas – TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>427,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>16,733,296</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crown Land</td>
<td>18,674,688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>1,152,244</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19,826,932</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous 3 tables have been summarized in this last table which covers the complete study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lands for Life Planning Area</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>O.L.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,352,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin recreation/Utilization zones</td>
<td></td>
<td>-591,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3,011,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2,409,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3,011,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – natural heritage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – remote access</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>619,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – Great Lakes Coastal Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – fish and wildlife</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>208,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – recreation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>677,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA – intensive forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Management Areas – TOTAL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,609,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>35,461,078</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Crown Land</strong></td>
<td>39,064,032</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>6,060,825</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45,124,857</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points of Clarification**

* In the Ontario’s Living Legacy option, existing park area reflects the proposed partial deregulation of Abitibi De Troyes provincial park in Boreal East

** includes 10 unregulated conservation reserve in the Temagami Comprehensive Land Use Planning Area.

The Lands for Life Process has been completed and is now replaced by Living Legacy. However this is not the end of the land reallocation process as the provincial government has also announced in November 2000, another 100 million to expand Ontario’s Living Legacy, some of which is slated for more parks and protected areas. Let’s hope the Ontario government uses these funds wisely to investigate alternatives and not rush to restrict use and access of lands with high mineral potential.

The potential exists for this process to go beyond just mineral exploration, the constraints on accessibility can ultimately lead to onerous user fees for our outdoor recreational activities as well. We must be vigilant on this issue.
THE LEGACY OF A LEGACY - A HILARIOUS JOKE OR BITTER REALITY

It was an interesting evening. Informative, frightening at times as well as somewhat amusing. Maybe even at bit of comic opera. The bungling antics of some Ontario government ministries, primarily the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) was an awesome revelation and an ominous indication of more goofs and wider ranging, tighter landscape regulations to come, especially in Northern Ontario.

The speaker was admirably capable, well informed, knowledgeable and presented his perhaps controversial subject material dispassionately and with cool, unruffled professionalism.

The foregoing refers to the Ontario Living Legacy (OLL) update talk presented by geologist Dave Rowell of the MNDM to the Sudbury Prospectors and Developers Association on the evening of 20 March 2001 in the auditorium of the Willett Green Miller Centre.

A brief abstract of some of the subject material covered and some reflective comments follow:

$ Commitments to claimholders whose claims were surrounded by new protected areas$

The defensive platitudes about tenure and access to mining claims suggested that it would be business as usual. The reality is, who would choose to get involved in an area where the extension of mineralized zones is constrained and permission to expand the boundaries of a successful mineral prospect are in the hands of those who are uninformed about, or who care less about mineral exploration or mine development - namely the MNR and the International and Domestic Environmental Lobby (IDEL)?

One prospector commented that one of his claims (one claim unit or 40 acres) was bisected by a Park (Regulated and Restricted Area - RRA) boundary. He reported that the super dominant Ministry MNR refused requests to move the RRA boundary to eliminate encumbrance on that one claim.

This conjures up a recollection of an incident related to me by a prospector friend in Val d'or. He had mineral showings on claims in Labrador, the proposed site for a new Park. He was able to meet with the Minister responsible to present his case. The solution was instant and practical, we will move the Park said the Minister. End of problem. This type of solution is much too realistic and much too practical for Ontario regulators to fathom.

$ The status of the Provincially Significant Mineral Potential (PSMP) assessment process$

The MNDM propose to complete PSMP assessment coverage of all affected (diseased !) areas of the province destined for exclusion from prospecting and mining prior to the finalization of the RRA process.

This sounds very much like a re-invention or terminology manipulation of the scientifically dubious Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) charade.

In most instances, OGS data and geological maps are adequate to determine the prospective nature of most of the landscape. Recent success in diamond exploration is an example, among many, to confirm that virtually the whole landscape is prospective. As a
rank amateur, I say it is ALL prospective. The whole landscape is prospective to search for mineral wealth.

The process of regulating the new protected areas

This is in fact an MNR and IDEL lobby driven process. The rules and regulations are nevertheless in evolution we are told. No need to elaborate. Where the MNR and the IDEL are involved the hoops will reach up to the clouds and beyond. The disincentives are likely to be enormous. Nevertheless it will be a great creator of employment: supervisors, inspectors, permit issuers, paper makers etc. .... ....

Planning for controlled exploration in parts of new protected areas

Again, this will be a process loaded with regulatory machinations. It will be an interesting exercise to observe how many explorationists will be ready to saddle themselves with mountains of additional regulation and how many investors will be willing to invest speculative dollars in projects located within areas encumbered by tenuous tenure regulations.

One prospector posed the question: If controlled exploration is being contemplated in some L4L and OLL RRA sites, why not in some existing Parks? A Well, why not? Eventually an enlightened public may be posing the same question with vigour and disdain. Hope springs eternal. The slumbering giant (The Ontario Public) may one day awaken to the constraints being surreptitiously imposed.

Opportunities for continuing input from the mineral sector into OLL planning

The mining industry was both ignored and excluded from portions of the L4L and OLL processes. Hopefully the call to participate in the OLL exercise is genuine and provides for convincing assurances that contributions made will be incorporated into inclusive rather than exclusive solutions. Caution is in order however. Once burned, twice shy. Fortunately the mining industry is resilient, innovative and eternally optimistic. Perhaps it is worth another try. Eventually common sense and sound scientific presentations will prevail to convince the one eyed skeptics that mining is an integral part of the social fabric and is capable of operating responsibly and beneficially. Modern mining practises are evolving at a rapid rate, constantly diminishing the disturbance to the landscape or the ecosystems that inhabit it. Virtually all mining companies now have environmental departments staffed by capable engineers and technicians. They are ahead of the curve in innovation, compliance and restoration but trailing the curve in pressure group and general public recognition - for the moment.

Nevertheless, some grim realities have to be confronted. What has here to fore been meekly alluded to, but is now more openly acknowledged, is that the MNR and their collaborators have the clout to bulldoze their agenda into creating irreversible and expanding RRA's. The MNDA by contrast, appears to be a subservient participant in spite of trying to uphold the interests of the mining industry. The MNDA is nevertheless supported by sound science, gifted geoscientists and hopefully, in the immediate future, will be supported by a strong, influential, relentless, compelling mining industry presence at all OLL site review or approval meetings.

In spite of the foregoing, it must be realistically acknowledged that the blobbing and encumbering of staked mineral claims is an assault on tenure. Not only mining claim tenure but all tenure. It was a colossal goof. It was thoughtless and spiteful and is a menace, not only the mining industry, but to all of Ontario's citizens.

MNR manipulation processes that are evolving to seemingly try to right wrongs resulting
from the blobbing of mineral claims and prospective mineral lands may be likened to the adage which proclaims: *If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it* but MNR mandarins and their cabal supporters have a new adaptation to this age old adage. It is: *If it ain’t broke, break it, then we may try to fix it*. This is precisely where we are at. It may never be the same but more importantly, it should never have been broken. Not one single mineral claim should have been compromised by an MNR, RRA site.

There were numerous very pointed, critical, and contemptuous comments made during question period after the MNRM presentation in Sudbury. These were not targeted at the messenger but at the creators and regulators who conceived the policy of compromising mining claim tenure and who are now in the process of implementing these reckless encumbrances.

It may be interesting to reflect on this whole exclusion zone process. Ontario now has a two tier system of RRA. One is the traditional Park system that most folks have grown to accept and enjoy. The other is the Lands for Life (L4L) and the Ontario Living Legacy (OLL) process which is a defacto massive land grab deviously engineered by the MNR and mandated by the (IDEL). The bar has now been raised to include tenured properties in RRA sites, a frightening departure from traditional practices that tended to respect land tenure and property rights. This new policy departure threatens the whole fabric of landscape tenure. The ultimate fall-out from such draconian policies, once recognized by entrepreneurs and the general population, will be that mineral exploration capital will exit the province and citizen resentment will escalate because property rights are being clandestinely compromised.

**And now for the kicker. Remember 12%? That was one of those nebulous goals and the interim rallying target call by the IDEL. That nebulous and indefinable 12% was as though inscribed on an endlessly inflating balloon. The long and the short of all this is, that those vast expanses of free space in far Northern Ontario are destined to be pock marked by a new generation of green blobs once OLL exclusion sites have been sledgehammered into place elsewhere on the Ontario landscape.**

Ontario’s citizens will ultimately be trapped in a MNR governed maze of RRA from which there will be no escape or recourse. The green blobbing of Ontario’s landscape is an ongoing contagion which respects neither resource development or land tenure.

**And it is written: The MNR shall have exclusive dominion over ever expanding expanses of Ontario’s landscape. It shall be widely proclaimed as the exclusion solution.**

Frank P. Tagliamonte
31 March 2001
The process of defining (tracts of) land that have 'Provincially Significant Mineral Potential' continues........

BY: Dave Christianson PSMP Committee Member.....

This process is a direct result of Lands for Life and is supposed to result in those tracts of (PSMP) lands that are located in (some of the 378) new Parks, being 'open' to some sort of 'sensitive' exploration/mining.

The action started over a year ago with a panel of experts that included OGS senior staff (geologists/managers), exploration and mining reps, a rep. from Parks Ontario (MNR) and a rep. from the Partnership for Public Lands (PPL).

PPL and Parks people 'sat in' on a sporadic basis, probably just to keep the process 'honest'. The fact that they have not participated (observed) at each and every meeting takes from the credibility of the purpose for their being involved, and that can be taken from either side. My personal feeling is that from the time that they did spend at our meetings they witnessed 'science in motion' by a very diligent and determined group (will they admit that?).

The working group understands full well the importance and need for the process to be 'science-based' and totally defensible in the real world. They also understand the importance of the meaning of the word 'potential' to the mineral development industry and the province. Finding out that those who committed us to this process (government) have failed to provide sufficient funding to enable it to happen in a reasonable time period, and it is in fact robbing dearly from an already gutted Resident Geologist's (field) program, is disconcerting to say the least. How much of our efforts will be lost due to the fact that we are forced to work with 'hand-bombed' maps showing areas of PSMP when the PPL folks have state-of-the-art GIS capability that surpasses that of MNR even? It's not nice or fair to be put into a sink or swim situation but that's where we're at really!

At the same time we can't help but wonder what the outcome will be?! The fact that this PSMP thing was part of Mike Harris' commitment to resource industries in that they would have more 'security' etc. after LfL, will be believed 'when it is seen'.

OLL has effectively set aside 12% of crown land for the protection of one designated 'value' or another. We have been advised (warned) by the PPL folks that there is another 3 to 8% 'on the block' as this is being written, in order to 'complete' a system of protected lands. We have also been advised that any type of 'development in these areas is verboten and will not be accepted. Where does all of this leave us with PSMP? Will this intense effort that we are undertaking be all for naught? Or (worse yet) will the results of our efforts be halved or quartered by the 'suits' when our work is done? Sometime in the next few months we'll have a better idea of the actual area of land that will be affected by PSMP. If it's small, we'll have a smaller fight on our hands than if it turns out to be large, but fight we will have regardless. One thing's for sure, when our job is done we'll have an opportunity to see exactly what big Mike had in mind re his 'commitment' to us! If he does good, he should get a biscuit....if he does bad........?!
People Scene: One of our very own Board members is a star in more than the exploration game……check this out!

I wondered why Don always drives around with a canoe on top of his truck….I thought it was a decoration because it was always there. Well I guess he must put it in the water more than 'the odd time' in order to qualify for this. Good Luck Don !!!!!!!!!!!!!! Bring us home a medal.

Symposium 2001 was a big success (AGAIN !) ………………

It was another class-act attended by well over 400 guests!
Total 'registration' was in the neighborhood of 360 with many more 'visitors' complimenting that number. This year saw a much larger number of 'interested' people (public) come and take a look at who we are and what we do.

NWOPA recognizes the need to keep the public informed about who we are and what we do and has grappled with the task of more formally addressing that during the annual Symposium; however, we have yet to come up with a special 'program'. This year's post-mortem will surely include the recommendation that this be formalized for next time. Once again, the Board has received a multitude of positive comments, "It's truly a prospectors show" being the most prevalent. The comments concerning a need for ONE registration/application form for everything and the ability to pay by 'plastic', will definitely be dealt with in time for the next one.

One new aspect of the NW symposium that was exceptionally well received was the ‘Awards Ceremony’. The brand new NWOPA awards Committee, Mark Smyk (Chair), Ken Fenwick and Ian Campbell made some fine choices. This is another one that NWOPA struggled with over the years and thanks to Mark we now have a formal 'selection' process established. Nominations for next years awards are now open, please contact Mark, Ken or Ian with nominees.

From L to R: Moe Lavigne, Developer of the year, Keith Minty co-winner, Developer of the year, Bill Moorehouse accepting for Scotty Grey, Lifetime achievement award, Mick Stares, Discovery of the year award, Bob Fair service, Lifetime achievement award, Steve Stares, Discovery of the year award and Dan Calvert, Discovery of the year award. [photo credit: Lloyd Koskitalo]

A more detailed report with appropriate ‘thank you’s’ etc will be included in the April issue of the B&B coming soon……………….
Entering the world of ‘Taboos’ is risky at the best of times but I’m gonna chance it. We all know that it’s strictly ‘taboo’ to make excuses for politicians but what the hell... New Guy Newman missed his spot to address the troops at the NW symposium but it wasn’t from lack of trying that caused it.

Fact is, his handlers even chartered a flight to try to get him here in time after another important meeting in Toronto. He missed the predetermined spot at our event by about 20 minutes but not to worry, Poppa had a contingency plan. I’ve been around long enough to know that even the politician’s ‘roads to hell’ are sometimes paved with good intentions!

The fact that he did make it is important to note. Arriving a bit late (I think John Snobelen was trying to fly the King Air again and that’s why it was late. He thought T.Bay was in northern Ontario over by Huntsville), we managed to reassemble the NWOPA awards group and get some good shots. We then had chance to guide him around the event and meet a whole bunch of important ‘prospectors’.

I was particularly impressed with the way our people treated him. It was clearly evident that he was ‘welcome’ at our show and we went out of our way to show him how important we are.

Also in true NWOPA style, we sent him home with some ‘trinkets’. He had asked earlier for someone to make him a claim post for his T.O. office and he was presented with one of Larry Mealey’s ‘perfect’ posts. Inscribed on the brass plaque were the words “This ‘real’ claim post made by a ‘real’ prospector, Larry Mealey is presented to Dan Newman, Minister, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines by NWOPA, Pres. Dave Christianson April 2001”.

We've got a bit more work to do to get this guy totally up to speed but both sides are workin at it.

Congrats to the ‘winners’ at NWOPA’s annual general mtg.......Those elected to the 2001 Board of directors are as follows:

President: Dan Calvert, Vice President: Tom Trelinski
Secretary: Cyndee Komar, Treasurer: Paul Nielsen
Past Pres/Director: Dave Christianson, Directors: Chris Bever, Susan Warren, Dave Hunt, Doug Parker, John Halet.

(contact information will be provided in next issue.)

A meeting to appoint NWOPA’s OPA rep’s will take place soon.

A burglar broke into a house one night. He shined his flashlight around, looking for valuables, and when he picked up a CD player to place in his sack, a strange, disembodied voice echoed from the dark saying, “Jesus is watching you.” He nearly jumped out of his skin, clicked his flashlight out, and froze. When he heard nothing more after a bit, he shook his head, promised himself a vacation after the next big score, then clicked the light on and began searching for more valuables.

Just as he pulled the stereo out so he could disconnect the wires, clear as a bell he heard, “Jesus is watching you.” Freaked out, he shined his light around frantically, looking for the source of the voice. Finally, in the corner of the room, his flashlight beam came to rest on a parrot. “Did you say that?” He hissed at the parrot.

“Yes,” the parrot confessed, then squawked, “I’m just trying to warn you.” The burglar relaxed. “What are you doing here?” The burglar laughed. “What kind of people would name a bird Moses?” “The kind of people that would name their rottweiler Jesus.”

“Xtreme sports”
(just like politics?)
The following article is reprinted with the permission of 'The Angler & Hunter Hotline'. It was originally printed in the April issue of Ontario Outdoors magazine and is an excellent summary of how Prospectors too can/should be involved in the FMP process.

**Get involved in process**

**Let's keep surprises to minimum**

Our annual conference this year was a great success with many issues being discussed.

One of the most important issues expressed by many of our members at the conference was access.

When our members travel north on their annual fishing or hunting trips they often are surprised to find road closures that have taken place.

One of the reasons may be that it was part of the Forest Management Planning process.

We all know, and we all use, roads that were created for timber extraction. If we ask how many use roads and how they are designed for access, it becomes clear that the process works and how you as an angler and hunter can get involved in the Forest Management planning process.

I am not an expert, however, I have been actively involved in the process and a Local Citizen Committee (L.C.C.) member for many years. As part of the process, all Forest Management Plans must have input from an L.C.C.

The committee is comprised of representatives from angling, hunting, mining, environmentalists, and tourist outfitters, to mention a few, and is appointed by the M.N.R. District Manager of the area.

So how can you get involved in a plan that is being developed perhaps hundreds of kilometers away from you?

First, you should look at the process. There are five stages, the first being an invitation to participate, the second and third are presentations of information at Information Centers, the fourth is a Draft Plan Review and the final stage is the inspection of the approved plan.

During the first stage, invitations go out to known interested parties such as anglers and hunters and tourist outfitters.

Prior to the first stage, you should contact the M.N.R. District office to determine when the next plan is coming up for review and get yourself on the mailing list.

In this way, you can find out who the angler and hunter representatives are and contact them directly with your concerns.

Plans can take up to two years to develop, so it is a long process.

During the second and third stages, the plan can be viewed at the M.N.R. District office and often at the office of the Sustainable License Holder (S.F.L.).

After the third stage, the plan can be viewed at M.N.R. District and Regional offices along with the M.N.R. Info Center at Queens Park in Toronto.

A plan review can be extensive, however, if we stay on topic of access, we can reduce the level of work. Obviously you should be asking questions about access restrictions and conservation of the resource.

In general, we should be asking for road access on primary and secondary roads during their lifespan.

It is the tertiary roads - the short haul roads - that often cause conflict among resource users. This is why a carefully planned road network is essential to reduce conflicts.

One additional part of the process often overlooked is the Annual Work Schedule. Once a plan is developed and implemented the S.F.L. holders create a schedule of work each year. This schedule shows what work will be undertaken each year and where.

This is also valuable information to hunters and anglers. Too often I hear complaints from those that were not aware that an area would be harvested.

A simple enquiry to your local M.N.R. office is sometimes all it takes to remove the surprises when you visit your favorite spot each year.

Let's all get involved in the process and ensure there are no surprises next time you visit your favorite area.
Musings on a Muddy Landscape
By: Dale Alexander, President, Northern Prospectors Association

Each time I put pen to paper for the Explorationist I ponder the objective of the publication - to be issue oriented. I blanch that I have no magic solutions.

I know how we feel about the snowmobile legislation but I also know that the trails have huge maintenance costs in the north due to greater distances and longer seasonal usage. How to be constructive toward such issues without being petty, how to treat the problem and not the symptom, how to reduce the problem to a single issue and look at alternatives, how to clean up the details of consensus without damaging the structure - that is my dilemma.

Two other monster issues are Access and Inter-ministerial Communication. One very small aspect of Access is the environment. Some thirty years ago when the mining industry first encountered the environmental movement, the conclusion was that mining needed 100% access to land 100% of the time. Environmentalists characterized that response as intractable and subsequently didn't waste time trying to include, let alone negotiate with, the mining sector. The die was cast; the players were polarized. We became the enemy, if not the target. I am not convinced that we have totally recovered from that era, even though there are opportunities today to work in sensitive areas under special circumstances. We may even have access to new areas currently withdrawn once what is 'provincially significant' is determined. And so we talk. We speak of 'light footprints' and closure plans, and, how advanced exploration differs from prospecting or mining. We look to educate a sceptical audience from a podium that all too often looks divided.

Part of our current problems also relate to the number of ministries involved in our day-to-day affairs. MNDM, MNR, MOE, Ministry of Labour, Municipal Affairs (from ever amalgamating towns) and on it goes. Perhaps there should be Inter-ministerial Head's-Up teleconferences to keep them apprised of broadly-based, competing issues.

To get out of this quandary of no panacea, I find it often helps to ponder some of the positive things around. One of our truly under-rated successes has been the website. While an NPA site has been around for some time, the connection was not made until a Think Tank in August 1999 that an easily recognizable site could be a valuable asset for information, education and marketing. Since November 1999, there have been some 7000 visitors to the NPA site and most of the regional groups as well as the OPA are now online. Prospectors are more connected and hopefully more empowered than ever before. There are also a lot more possibilities in this venture. Kudos to Dave Larocque. He got us this far, and, continues to work tirelessly.

Editors Comment: Immediately upon receiving this, I thanked Dale for his contribution. It is the mission of the Explorationist to include a balance of articles and information and this article surely helps meet that goal. Thanks again Dale.
HIGH WATER RUN 2000
By: Mike Leahy, NPA

It was a dark and stormy night. All through the north, anxious canoeists worried about the morning weather. Would it continue to pour, would the record be broken, would the race be a wash-out? Those with the true faith fretted not, they knew that the Sesekinika Sun Dance would once again succeed in bringing fair weather by race time. By eleven a.m. the clouds started to break – and by race time the sun shone upon the start line at the Last Resort. Twenty seven canoes lined up on the beach, anxious to test their mettle against the competition. The long-standing championship team of Thorpe-Tuovinen was temporarily sidelined (for health reasons) and the men’s title was up for grabs. For the first time, mixed and ladies classes were recognized as the event grew in size and popularity. The horn sounded on the stroke of one, sending the ladies off with mixed teams and the men’s division following at ten minute intervals. The race was on!

This was the tenth annual High Water Run sponsored by the Northern Prospectors Association. The event was thought up as a fun way to get the canoe out and start the year off with a good paddle. The old motorboat would have to wait until the long weekend when fishing season opened. Too many of us have been spoiled by the comfort of large boats, forgetting the importance of exercise, quiet and the fun of paddling. The race started off small but over the years, thanks in part to John Tuovinen and Bill Thorpe (legends in their own time), it has become an integral part of the local outdoor culture. The course has varied over the years due to late ice on the lake but the Blanche River has remained a fun and challenging run. After the first few km of relatively open water from Sesekinika Lake to the south end of Rainbow Lake, the course turns into a maze of twists and turns, sometimes narrowing to only a few metres wide. The Equalizer. The course runs downstream but the odd dead-end meander or feeder creek can lead the unwary into a time losing turnabout. There are also a number of short portages through the alders where the river turns back 180 degrees and almost meets itself, saving the alert paddlers up to 200m of paddling. These hop-overs are not marked with park-type portage signs but with flagging ribbon – northern style. The Kirkey team was a bit intimidated by this part of the course, choosing to follow the leaders until they could hear the noise at the finish line before bolting ahead for a win in the mixed division. Unorthodox, perhaps, but the idea is to have a bit of fun along with the pure physical workout. Anybody can paddle in a straight line but it takes a little more skill to handle this course where navigating and sharp turns keep the mind working along with the muscles.

The top teams all finished the course in about two hours and by 4:30 we were all back at the resort for a prime rib dinner, all included in the $25 entry fee. Medals were given out to the winners and a bit of cash went out to the best poker hand. Both the serious racers and those that entered just for the fun of paddling had a great time as usual. Next year the sun will shine again on the High Water Run – see you there, if you dare.
Last fall I attended a public forum in Peterborough where members of the public were given a venue to express their concerns, criticisms, appreciation or just general opinion regarding the newly identified Kawartha Highlands Signature Site. This site is considered to be one of the “crown jewels” of the Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy. The site covering an area of approximately 35,000 hectares of Crown Land is located within the contiguous townships of Cavendish, Anstruther, Burleigh, and Harvey, lying to the northeast of Peterborough.

I remember the event quite clearly, as not being what you would call a prolific public speaker I was of course rather nervous. None the less with speaking notes in hand, off I went to the Market Hall located in Peterborough’s downtown to voice SOPA’s concerns.

For a Saturday afternoon there was a fair crowd on hand and a full schedule of pre-registered speakers. The surprising message that I gleaned from the various speakers was that they in general, claimed they were pleased that this area of “pristine wilderness” had now been “saved” by its inclusion in the Ontario Living Legacy. However, that’s about where the consensus of opinion ended. One by one the numerous speakers gave their opinions about the activities the park should allow. No mining, no logging, no trapping where the most commonly voiced. Then as the list of proposed banned activities got closer to the types of activities that many of these speakers enjoyed (hunting, ATV’s, snowmobiling, motorised boats, RV’s, etc. etc., the threads started to bare. The back and forth continued until one gentleman pointed out to the audience that it seems everyone wants their own personal wilderness –a park that’s there for the activities they personally enjoy. However, any activities they don’t enjoy, well that bothers them and therefore these activities shouldn’t be allowed.

The key thought that I took home from this experience is that this “untouched wilderness” that these people have been using and enjoying for years without any official park status, has over the last two hundred years been prospected, quarried, logged - numerous times over, trapped, hunted, snowmobiled, etc, etc. The fact that this area has for the most part been maintained in a condition that is worthy of the descriptions that were so praisingly put forth by proponents of the park, certainly say’s something.

I wonder though, if this will continue to be the case. Only time will tell if the creation of the Kawartha Highlands Signature Site and its promotion as a tourism destination will forever change the way the people who currently use the area feel about it.” Will the inundation by large numbers of tourists significantly impact this area in ways that many years of logging, prospecting, trapping, hunting, fishing and unrestricted public access didn’t do?

PS...the cartoons are compliments of the editor, not Fred (wouldn’t want to get Fred into trouble!)

Favorite Bumper Stickers
The issue of access to the areas defined as First Nation Communities traditional lands continues to be the prime concern of the OPA. The OPA has been trying to figure out the protocol of who and when we need to notify when we are planning work in the areas of traditional lands.

Letters to MNDM have come back with the generic response that:

1/ The Mining Act gives us access to any Crown lands.

2/ The MNMD recommend we contact the First Nation Community in the area of the planned exploration (though there is no legal requirement to do so).

The industry understands that it is good corporate policy to talk with the people in the area that may be effected by our work. The biggest problem we have is that who do we talk to and at what point in the exploration cycle?

There is the problem that has been plaguing us as long as I have been working in the industry. For the same length of time we have been looking to MNMD for the solution.

On Monday April 9th, 2001, I attended a meeting that was the potential first step towards better understandings of the First Nations concerns and expectations. Three First Nation Community representatives, one tribal council representative, Federal and Provincial representatives, various company (Junior to Major) officials and the OPA met to speak openly and to listen.

The meeting ran all day and focused on Memorandum of Understandings between the explorers and the First Nation. The lack of a map of traditional lands and values was discussed at length. Both sides recognized and acknowledge the problem with no simple solution being put forward. The minutes of the meeting, I believe hold the potential of a great starting point for a protocol for consultation with First Nation communities. The way things are going to move forward is by continued direct dialogue of the exploration industry and the First Nation Communities.

When the minutes are available I will post them on our website.

On another level the OPA has been contacted by some First Nation groups in regard to education items and video tapes. The intent is to put some data in the schools and on the local TV to help familiarize the community to the exploration and development cycle. If you can recommend any data please contact me via the OPA website (www.ontarioprospectors.com).

For those of you who are eagerly awaiting more news about the “Prospecting Fund”, please stay tuned to the OPA website.

It is still the intent to have it up and running this field season.
The OPA had its first Annual General Meeting since the incorporation as a not-for-profit corporation. The meeting was held in Sudbury April 17, 2001 at the Northeast Symposium.

Approximately 50 members attended with over sixty proxy votes being represented. These figures represent ~ 15% of the total membership. The representation was impressive for a fledgling organization.

The meeting was Chaired by Roger Dufresne, who kept the meeting orderly and timely. We had point of order meetings from the floor that will help the Association operate in a more effective manner.

The New Board of Directors and Vice President were elected and appointed for the next year.

ASSOCIATION DIRECTORS

Sudbury Prospectors and Developers Association  
Roger Poulin  
Bob Komarechka

Northern Prospectors Association  
Roger Dufresne  
Garfield Pinkerton

Porcupine Prospectors and Developers Association  
Andrew Tims  
Mike Tremblay

Sault Ste Marie Prospectors Association  
Vivienne Cote  
Ted Shellhorne

Southern Ontario Prospectors Association  
Fred Swanson  
Andrea Rae

Northwestern Ontario Prospectors Association  
Garry Clark  
Dave Christianson

Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada  
Andrew Chater

Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario  
Neil Westoll

Ontario Mining Association  
Patrick Reid

At-Large Directors  
Michael Bourassa  
Tor Jensen  
Wally Rayner

Vice President: (to become President next year)  
Vivienne Cote
The two day Mines and Minerals Symposium in Sudbury was a great success. This is the first year the event has been held in Sudbury and ~ 500 people attended the event. Numerous comments were made about the high quality of posters, booths, talks and organization. The organizing committee from the Sudbury Prospectors and Developers Association executed a great show and completed it with few if any problems.

The posters and booths comprised prospectors, service groups, junior and major companies and the various provincial and federal support agencies. A continuous stream of viewers was present throughout the event.

The Minister of Mines, Dan Newman gave a keynote address at the luncheon. He stressed the need for Ontario to continue to be the #1 place in the country to explore and develop new mines. He stated the government understood the need for a healthy exploration and mining community to help support all of Ontario.

The speaker presentations were well attended with topics such as recent diamond and PGE exploration and OGS activities.

The evening reception was a great place to interface with all facets of the industry within the poster and booth display area. Various presentations were made at the reception including recognition of longtime service to the Exploration community to Mike Leahy by the OPA. The one thing the event didn’t lack was food. The sponsors of the food portion of the event made sure we were all well fed.

The support of the participants, various sponsors, partners (Industry Canada, FedNor and MNDM) and the numerous volunteers succeeded in completing a successful event. The OPA and SPDA would like to thank everyone for the support and wish all a successful field season.

---

THE PROSPECTOR
Submitted by: Wally Rayner OPA Dir

There's a swish of brush on his old canoe
As he tramps the portage trail,
Where the Pegwa flows to the Albany
As the lights of evening fail.
There are rapids and rifles and sweepers bad
In the path of his old canoe, ---
There is gold on the rim of that ancient shield
There is gold, and he'll find it too.
From the rugged hills of Couer d'Alene
And the far off Kootenay
To the golden sands of the Cariboo,
He has hunted the hills for pay.
His head is bowed to the tumpline's toll,
On his face the weather's scar,
On his feet the dust of the desert grey
And mud from the glacier's bar.

---

His tent shows white on the timberline
And the ash of his campfire cold
Is stirred by the breeze of the Yellowknife
On his endless search for gold.
He has wandered far on his lonely quest
He has sought and found the prize--
It is felt in the grasp of his eager hand
And seen in his smiling eyes; --
The gold of the golden autumn hills
As they rise o'er the shimmering lake,
The gold of the dawn on snowcapped peaks
When myriad birds awake,
The gold of a gorgeous sunset grand
At the close of a desert day --
The gold in the hearts of his fellowman
--There never was better pay…

Paddy Carroll
Finally, it's here!

Superior Safety Inc. is pleased to announce that after a long waited period, the Guard Alaska has finally arrived to our warehouses. Guard Alaska bear repellent has been subject to a barrage of laboratory and efficacy tests in Canada and the United States. The registrations prove Guard Alaska is a safe and effective bear repellent (on all North American species.) This all-natural formula uses an exclusive form of capsaicin and does not contain bear attracting properties found in other registered products. Instead of conventional carriers used, this product contains a carrier/base that removes the protective oils from the skin and mucous membranes, and actually opens the pores of the skin allowing the active ingredient - capsaicin to penetrate. The carrier has a greater density than water, which is a desirable trait for use when the animal is wet from rain or other causes. Guard Alaska bear repellent is available in 255g cannisters, it carries a distance of 5-6 meters (15-20 feet) and exhausts in 9 seconds. This compares to 4 and 7 second rates from most other registered products. Guard Alaska’s special formula will not freeze and has no shelf life (most registered products carry a two year shelf life.)

All members of the Ontario Prospectors Association are offered special pricing for the 255g Guard Alaska bear repellent of $51.75 ea. (List price $69.00 less 25%) available at any Superior Safety Inc. branch location. Please present your membership card for discount.

Be prepared! Further information can be obtained by contacting your closest Superior Safety Inc. location.

Superior Safety Inc.

Branch Locations:

Thunder Bay (807) 344-3473  
Dryden (807) 223-4548  
Kenora (807) 468-6555  
Marathon (807) 229-1853  
Timmins (705) 268-5962  
Sudbury (705) 674-6055

Editor’s Note: Anyone with any kind of respiratory ailment should exercise extreme caution while using any ‘Bear Spray’ product including ‘Guard Alaska’ Read Instructions prior to using !!!!