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 writers accept full ownership of their contributions.

THE PDAC CONVENTION

I attended the PDAC convention this year with the knowledge we were to get some good news from the Ontario Government and the optimism that our industry seemed to be coming out of the doldrums.

The attendance seemed to be up. I was able to talk to and in some cases have a beer with people from around the world. One underlying trend was a focus back on Ontario. The display floor of the show seemed to be a buzz with diamond and gold property stories and the potential of a joint venture or option.

Well our good news came from the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Chair of Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (NOHFC). The OPA will be the recipient of $3.5 million dollars to assist in completing geoscience data collection in the area of the Nipigon Plate. Please see the press release in the adjoining pages. The OPA is very excited about this new role. The OPA hopes to be on the lead of many new projects in the future. We thank the NOHFC board for their confidence and support with this project.

Approximately 1 hour after this great news release your Board met with the Honourable Dan Newman to discuss, we thought, what was needed to keep Ontario the #1 place in the country if not the world to explore. The previous afternoon the rumours of Ontario Living Legacy decisions that didn’t bode well for us were all over the Convention Floor. The Minister started the meeting with telling us that a political decision preventing exploration within the 378 OLL sites had been made. Our feelings were, this is contrary to the promises we had received from former Minister Hodgson and our interpretation of the OLL strategy. I personally had been working behind the scenes to get OLL site boundaries moved to exclude some mining tenure. PSMP had been completed specifically with the idea of identifying areas to work within certain sites and explorers had been waiting patiently to gain access to certain areas.

One pen stroke and all our expectations were gone. We are back to reacting to adversity instead of being proactive. Some of our members have spent 2 years on the Living Legacy process and 2 years on de-
Deals made, boundaries moved, promises broken, this just about sums up our mineral industry experience with Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy (OLL).

We all now about the Forest Accord and the meetings at Fern. We all know about the shift in boundaries as some companies and some individuals through their lawyers and local members of Parliament had boundaries moved. But how many know of the recent promises broken by the Government.

It has been two years since the prospectors grant program was cancelled. It has been two years since our industry has been working with the Ministry of Northern Development of Mines to design a process of valuation of Provincially Significant Mineral Potential. One might think that these were delay tactics while the Government got up the nerve to announce that none of the 378 new parks and conservation areas designated by OLL will be valued for mineral potential. Let’s look at some of the promises made.

I could now go into the defence mode but today I haven’t got the energy. Please see the co-signed letter in the adjoining pages from Minister Newman and Minister Snobelen.

Call me and I should be able to give you some idea of where we are going next. We will continue to pursue the issues and expect to have some progress.

Tired from the show, late nights and disappointments,

GARRY

Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy - Three Years Later

Deals made, boundaries moved, promises broken, this just about sums up our mineral industry experience with Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy (OLL).

We all now about the Forest Accord and the meetings at Fern. We all know about the shift in boundaries as some companies and some individuals through their lawyers and local members of Parliament had boundaries moved. But how many know of the recent promises broken by the Government.

It has been two years since the prospectors grant program was cancelled. It has been two years since our industry has been working with the Ministry of Northern Development of Mines to design a process of valuation of Provincially Significant Mineral Potential. One might think that these were delay tactics while the Government got up the nerve to announce that none of the 378 new parks and conservation areas designated by OLL will be valued for mineral potential. Let’s look at some of the promises made.

Significant Mineral Potential in the 378 new parks and conservation reserves will not be applied. What a waste of time and money. It will be the North that will suffer from this decision.

MAP STAKING

The OPA has started a process of determining our members opinions of map staking in Ontario. We have not determined a direction to promote or support as of yet. The first questionnaires went out to 550 members via email. The questionnaire has now been mailed to the people without email addresses. The questionnaire is to be faxed or mailed in by April 4th.

Below is a selection of the comments to date. All the data will be reviewed, processed and presented in the April Explorationist.

Comments from Map Staking Questionnaire

Not In Favour

At a time when mineral exploration is at an all time low this step will not only take work away from the prospectors but will also hamper their ability to acquire lands based on increased fees for recording. Once its allowed in specific locations of Ontario it will be a matter of time before the practice is adopted for all of Ontario. Under no circumstances should it be allowed.

Not really in favour for north of 52 degrees. South of French River I am marginally favourable.

In a Prospecting Course a number of years ago it was stated by an Ont. Govt. geologist that 70% of operating mines in Canada were found by "prospectors" not the large companies. If that percentage is still valid then it would be foolhardy to discourage prospectors which I'm sure map staking would do.

If registration fees or assessment requirements are raised my answer to 1 & 2 would become No. Raising registration fees and/or assessment requirements does not deter large companies but is disastrous for individuals and smaller start-up companies.

Yes to the above questions, only if there is assurance that map staking for the remainder of Ontario will not be implemented at a later date.
Map staking has become an issue because of recent developments in a small area of the province from what I understand. It seems that there are problems with the staking of privately held land. Not all surveyed townships are privately held so there is no need to include them. Only include the private property where individuals have a permanent residence. A permanent residence would include both a year round residence or a summer cottage but not a hunting or fishing cabin. I would not consider any form of map staking of crown land anywhere.

I think map staking would eliminate too many jobs that many local prospectors depend on for cash to continue their own prospecting activities. The small prospector would be at a serious disadvantage when it came to staking within their own region. Land would be bought by the company there first with their cheque book, especially in area plays. It's a good concept for the larger companies and a serious disadvantage to individual prospector and Junior companies who may be strapped for cash.

This is a game that is played on the ground. There would be a loss of employment for those who stake. Higher fees would threaten small operators. Large tracts would certainly be swallowed by speculation even if fees were huge. Perhaps a two tier system? Same/ no fees for the old guys (less than X number of claims) and huge fees for the paper prospector. Some of the guys would find work doing improvements on the paper claims that for sure.

I believe with the advent of modern technology, on ground staking can be more accurate, effective and provide for the continuation of the entrepreneurial spirit, part of the exploration tradition, to flourish as never before.

No to all questions. Very difficult for prospector with suggested concept. Fees are costly enough now. I can see no reason why this province should go to map staking anywhere in the province either in southern Ont or above 52. I am definitely against map staking anywhere in the province mostly because it will put quite a few guys out of work and also because I think that claims lines marking the boundaries of a mining property are a necessity. The mining act clearly establishes how to stake in subdivided townships as well as how to handle staking in areas where the surface rights are alienated. There is no problem with the status quo and map staking would only benefit those who have big dollars and are too cheap to acquire the land via staking. I can only see the demise of the prospecting community if this goes forward.

Map staking favours the “big guys” who can then hold large tracts of land indefinitely. The ordinary person will once again be squeezed out in favour of "Corporate Interests". It is just one more instance where the Prov Conservatives view the ordinary citizens of this country as just “a pain in the ass”. How will the claim boundaries be identified "on the ground" if there are no claim lines???. There is nothing wrong with physically going out and staking a piece of ground. Only corporation execs want to sit in their plush offices and "map stake huge areas". This is sickening.

Map staking in Quebec is proving to be an absolute disaster - don't even think of doing it again in Ontario.

Given the lack of certainty regarding money saved in staking being used to do line cutting and other "on ground" work, the loss of revenue to prospectors will be a potentially crippling blow to the grassroots of the industry. This is particularly true in this time a greatly reduced access to venture capital for prospecting projects. The potential economic and business development opportunities for aboriginal people through the availability of work doing contract staking outweighs arguments that map staking will resolve some issues of potential conflict between prospectors and aboriginal people.

Foresee insurmountable problems trying to revamp the existing system in the populated and known mining districts.

This eliminates jobs.

Should be all one system, either all map for the entire province or no map staking anywhere.

Map staking should not be allowed, a lot of our members feel this way.

What are the reasons that this proposal was introduced? How do I get a copy of the proposal submitted to the Mining Act Advisory Committee?

The problem with increased costs hurts all companies; the large tract staking particularly in areas of elevated interest may be the single most important parameter against map staking; townships in the southern regions of Ontario may be best with map staking but certainly not for those areas to the north nor for the far north as I have properties in the latter and extensive work goes into the development of these acquisitions.

Map staking is an interesting concept but will cause
unfair advantages during competitive situations. Introduction of map staking in areas, such as the Larde r Lake Mining Division, will result in more "Land Barrons", people (not prospectors) will tie up more land on speculation and have no intention of even stepping on the ground. At least with present staking laws getting ground shows commitment, even if one hires someone to stake it.

Map staking should only be applicable in areas of subdivided townships or north of 52°.

**In Favour**

I am in favour of map staking for several reasons. The ministry no longer has the resources to inspect claims on an ongoing basis. This makes it easy to cheat on times if you are in competition for claims with other groups. The quality of claim staking has declined considerably from what I have seen in the last while. The perimeter blazing is barely visible after a year and those blazes are few and far between. I have also seen recently, claims that do not close, claims not where they are really on the maps, back dating of claims by cheaters etc. Why not map stake? At least you would get what you wanted and with GPS’s you can locate the boundaries fairly well. I have spent some time dealing with Latin American countries that all use map staking. It is first come as staking is supposed to be.

I don't understand why you would lump the two areas mentioned in #2 together as they have vastly different issues attached. Can you help me with this.

I am strongly in favour of map staking for all of the province, and furthermore, of changing the standard claim size to a permit which could be whatever size you want. Presumably you would pay a cost in proportion to the size. My thanks and congratulations for the association's initiative in bringing this matter up.

This has to be the way to go for the future.

I believe that it is the OPA's mandate to protect the individual prospector in Ontario; something that no other organization does. I think that map staking makes sense in areas of the province that have been subdivided for some time and where blazing and post erection may cause concerns with other land users. However, raising claim registration fees, or the amount of work required for assessment further burdens the individual prospector, and thus I would be against the proposition.

The days of the old fashion prospector are over. Changes to the mining act have already favoured large companies who carry out very little grass roots exploration anyway.

The modern day prospector has access to GPS's, etc so ground location of a claim is no longer an issue. The posting of open claims on the internet by the MNDM means there is no advantage to the little guy who may work a claim for many years before finding a showing. Therefore why not go all the way. There are ways to limit large land positions by large companies or individuals (US federal lands, for example, limit the number of acres within an NTS Sheet that can be held at any one time by any one company or "arms length" entity). It is inevitable so let's do it and move on.

Map staking is the only way to go today - it is practical, economic and reduces the need to cut down healthy trees so that they can be left as posts to rot. Most provinces in Canada are implementing this system and it is working very well I have used map staking in Nova Scotia and Quebec to my full satisfaction.

It is time to get on with it. We have to modernize I have been in this business for 45 years IT IS MORE TIMELY, EFFICIENT, CHEAPER, DEPENDABLE re TITLE for most exploration projects. Can get a bit hectic during a rush but there are ample precedents OF HOW TO DO IT from other provinces.

I think that Map staking would be of most benefit in the north, say north of 52, where staking requires significant funds due to the remoteness. In this case map staking could provide a less prohibitive way to stake claims, and may contribute to increased exploration spending in this region. I think that map staking should be considered for all of Ontario, but possibly with a phased in approach, as suggested.

Ten years ago I was not in favour of map staking, but times have changed and so has my opinion. It is time to put more prospector resources into prospecting and searching for minerals rather into acquiring ground. With the appropriate regulatory controls the wealth will not be able to stake the whole province. The issue of damage to the environment by staking will be eliminated. The dangers inherent with staking will be avoided. Staking disputes would be eliminated. I don't believe that there are a large number of prospectors that just make their living staking claims. We have the technology today in GPS systems to accurately locate ourselves on the planet. However, I think government should still do an impact and bene-
fit study to determine all the economic parameter of the immediate impact and the short and long term benefits.

Preferred would be map staking in the whole province, second would be map staking of permits and claims north of 52. With Permit areas much like Manitoba.

Q: How many showings have been found by prospectors out staking?

Post staking north of 52 is a waste because of the excessive costs of helicopter or other forms of access, particularly in the James Bay Lowlands where diamond exploration requires many small, isolated, highly dispersed claims. I am not so strongly against post staking south of 52 or at least where access is by road. From experience, many farmers and landowners in surveyed townships do not like having claim lines blazed through the bush which do not necessarily conform to their known blazed lot lines. We had complaints about this when I was working in Lanark County. Also I am against lawyers going around the bush with rulers measuring the size of blazes in order to have the validity of a claim refuted, although much of this was circumvented in the latest mining act. Map staking will stop this nonsense. The only reason to keep post staking is to keep the stakers employed. Unfortunately this is a fact of progress: many professions have disappeared over the past 100 years.

Map staking provides the opportunity of eliminating costly staking campaigns which often result in no claims or in staking disputes. Physical Staking should still be required when claims come open for staking for the first 30 days after a claim is cancelled, including new map staked claims. Physical Staking should be required in a perimeter around existing claims, for the first one year of existence of the new claims. Fees should be higher to stop larger companies from holding to much land. Physical staking should always be an optional way of staking at less cost if individuals would prefer that method.

That being said, the whole process will become more difficult to control. However, other jurisdictions, many a lot less sophisticated that Ontario, make it work OK. The Province has made great strides but still lag others (E.G NSW?).

Increase registration fees for map staking, limit the amount of contiguous ground that can be map staked and move ass't work requirements up to first year.

Map staking will take some jobs from stakers but will give everybody: big or small, regardless of resources, same opportunity.

Map staking is a definite advantage in virtually eliminating disputes based on poorly staked ground (which is the rule, in my experience, rather than the exception). With today's GPS systems, ownership is defined to within a few centimetres. However, unless the regs are properly formulated, large tracts of ground could easily be tied up for purely speculative purposes and not for real mineral exploration. Failure to submit exploration assessment work on "map-staked" ground should be dealt with severely by fines over and above the actual dollar assessment required and a revoking of the company's staking licence for a period of time.

SHAME ON MINISTER NEWMAN

TIMMINS, ONTARIO, March 13th 2002— The Porcupine Prospectors and Developers Association ("PPDA") vehemently disagrees with the decision by Hon. Dan Newman, Minister of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM) to reverse the Ministry stance and prohibit any mineral exploration on un-tenured land within Ontario Living Legacy ("OLL") Sites. Newman’s new position was revealed on March 12 at a closed door meeting at the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada Annual Convention in Toronto. Witnesses to this change in direction were invited representatives of various Ontario Prospector Associations, the Ontario Mining Association, and the Association of Mining Municipalities of Ontario.

“Newman’s new position is a betrayal of guarantees made by his predecessors, Hon Chris Hodgson and Tim Hudak.” said Andrew Tims, President of the Porcupine Prospectors and Developers Association.

“Basically Northern Ontario citizens have lost mineral exploration opportunities within 12% of the Province” said Tims. “The Fraser Institute recently listed Ontario along with Quebec, as the number one place in the world to explore for new mines. Newman’s reversal of government position will undoubtedly cost Northern Ontario communities jobs as we fall towards the position of British Columbia which was named by the Fraser Institute as the least desirable place to explore in the world!” added Tims.

The MNDM had spent a considerable amount of time and resources developing a scientifically based index to evaluate the mineral potential of the province in order to identify areas of the province having the “likelihood of containing an economic mineral resource” which “may add value to Ontario’s eco-
The Provincially Significant Mineral Potential or PSMP index system was intended to identify areas within OLL sites, or parts of OLL sites where light footprint exploration was guaranteed.

“What is shocking is that the PSMP process had been accepted as a scientific and informed method of also liberating some of the more prospective land from OLL alienation. This would have allowed prospectors and Junior Mining companies to work their mining claims outside of the protected sites superimposed on them” said Tims. “Newman’s actions indicate that he wishes to lead this government to disregard the best interests of Northern Ontario. It is no wonder that the recent Census Canada figures reveal that the population base in Northeastern Ontario is shrinking as resource companies close down operations” added Tims.

This decision is also extremely disappointing as it suggests Minister Newman is out of touch with his constituents including both the MNMD geoscientists and exploration community. Obviously Newman’s opinion is that Ontario residents are not as capable of light footprint exploration as are those of neighboring jurisdictions such as Quebec or New York. The Chadbourne mine operated until recently within the city limits of Rouyn-Noranda where children now play in the safety of a playground while in New York State a world class garnet mine has its operations within a State Park!

The PPDA believes that citizens of Ontario, and in particular those who live in Northern Ontario, are capable of light footprint exploration and that the people understand the environmental issues better than Hon Dan Newman and certain elements within his government.

The PPDA is a not for profit organization with the objective of representing and furthering the interests of the exploration community and the individual prospector in the Porcupine District of Northeastern Ontario. We concern ourselves with issues affecting our members and work to maintain a strong exploration community today, in order to ensure that new mines will be found tomorrow.

Porcupine Prospectors and Developers Association,
Andrew Tims,
President
(705) 268-8063
ppda@ntl.sympatico.ca

Ontario Prospectors Lied to by the Ontario Government
Bob Komarechka, SPDA past president
March 20, 2002

This letter is being written one week after the Minister of Northern Development and Mines (MNMD) made the unexpected announcement that there will be no mining in parks. This has been further collaborated recently with the issuance of a letter signed by Mr. Newman and his cohort John Sno-belen, Minister of Natural Resources

This rash announcement was a total reversal of previous policy and was a complete surprise to all. As we know, the government had previously stated in its Lands for Life and Living Legacy policy that mining would be allowed in some parks and Conservation Areas.

Last night a meeting of the Sudbury Prospectors and Developers (SPDA) was held. At that meeting our members were outraged; comments were stated that the government had lied to us, a motion was proposed to establish a political lobby group and demands for compensation raised. Even MNMD staff in attendance were surprised at this announcement. Significant amounts of the taxpayers dollars were allocated to MNMD in their studies to determine the mineral potential of these new parks so as to minimize the loss of mineral wealth to the province. This taxpayers money which could have been spent in more productive areas has now been wasted as well as the time of many qualified individuals. Additionally, the potential of saving the benefit of a major mine discovery within these areas has been lost.

Some of our SPDA members hold claims which were later declared as parts of conservation areas. In the past, when concern was expressed to the government and requests were made for movement of the conservation boundaries, our members were told that they should not be concerned that as long as the claims were in good standing it would be business as usual. Given this reassurance, some of these claims were optioned and expenditures have been made, or are being planned, by the optionee. Will the hapless prospectors now be sued because they had given false information to the optionee that these areas could be mined? Has the time, efforts and cash spent on these claims by the prospector and others to prove up these prospects been in vain? No doubt many other prospectors in this province face this same dilemma.

The current fickle policy of this government regarding the security of land tenure and availability of crown land to explore, does little to offer the comfort and stability required for serious investors to feel at ease investing in the mineral potential of this prov-
ince. Although Ontario has ranked #1 in the world as the best place to invest in mineral exploration, this one recent ill-thought act by our provincial government will certainly destroy this rating and the valiant effort of all those who helped to achieve this #1 position.

Recently, Mr. Newman expressed concern over the large numbers of people leaving the north to seek employment in Southern Ontario. Perhaps he believes once all the new parks are created, these people will return to obtain the high paying jobs offered by MNR in their park maintenance programs!

I understand that the Partnership for Public Lands (PPL) and Garry Clark, executive director of the Ontario Prospectors Association, have agreed to discuss possible boundary adjustments and suggestions for consideration of alternate park areas. At this time it is being proposed that the Ontario government be excluded from these discussions.

Hopefully some sanity will prevail in these discussions and recognition will be given for the delineation and extraction of the valuable mineral resource wealth of this province to the benefit of us all.

**Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy - Three Years Later**

Deals made, boundaries moved, promises broken, this just about sums up our mineral industry experience with Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy (OLL).

We all know about the Forest Accord and the meetings at Fern. We all know about the shift in boundaries as some companies and some individuals through their lawyers and local members of Parliament had boundaries moved. But how many know of the recent promises broken by the Government.

It has been two years since the prospectors grant program was cancelled. It has been two years since our industry has been working with the Ministry of Northern Development of Mines to design a process of valuation of Provincially Significant Mineral Potential. One might think that these were delay tactics while the Government got up the nerve to announce that none of the 378 new parks and conservation areas designated by OLL will be valuated for mineral potential. Let's look at some of the promises made.

These are direct quotations from the July 1999 Land Use Strategy.

"Mineral exploration may occur under controlled conditions in portions of new Provincial Parks that are identified through further analysis and consultation as having provincially-significant mineral potential. If part of a new park is to be developed for a mine, it would be deregulated as part of the park, and appropriate replacement lands would be placed into regulation."

"Prior to permitting exploration in portions of the new Conservation Reserves, procedures will be developed that will include:

- Criteria for designating areas of provincially significant mineral potential;
- Staking regulations for use in new protected areas;
- Guidelines for exploration activities which will consider the environmental sensitivity of the sites;
- Procedures for monitoring, inspecting and reporting;
- Procedures to be followed in taking a find to the advanced exploration stage;
- Procedures for replacing land that may be removed to permit development of a mine; and
- Conditions for restoring land to conservation reserve status when mining is finished."

Grudgingly we agreed to these promises.

After much consultation, a process to determine Provincially Significant Mineral Potential was about to be launched. So what happened that changed the mind of the Government to break the promises set out in the Land Use Strategy. I can assure you that it was not a Provincial Cabinet decision. A former Mines Ministry and cabinet minister knew nothing of the decision. Once again a deal was made and boundaries will move.

The Government with all their rhetoric really do not understand the value of mineral exploration to Ontario and society in general. I challenge everyone to think about the products related to mining that surround us. I say we take back all these products. The dry wall, the copper wire and piping, the galvanized rain gutters, the nails, the bricks and mortar, all metal products in the kitchen and bathroom. We would be left with wood products to burn to keep warm and a small pile of plastic, then nothing. We have given too much and we are not appreciated. This is demonstrated by the recent announcement that Provincially Significant Mineral Potential in the 378 new parks and conservation reserves will not be applied. What a waste of time and money. It will be the North that will suffer from this decision.
QUESTIONNAIRE
PROFESSIONALISM (?) IN PROSPECTING
Province or Territory where based __________________

1) Does your province / territory have any designation for prospectors showing the professional nature of the activity?
   Yes ________ No __________
If it does please describe:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2) Do you think that a national registration or certification program for prospectors, through the PDAC, which would demonstrate that the certified person is a “professional prospector”, would be worthwhile?
   Yes ________ No __________
Why?
________________________________________________________________________

3) How could such a program be established?
   Please describe briefly:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4) What would be the intent of such a program?
   (ie the right to file assessment reports or other recognition of professionalism)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Completed by: ___________________________      ______________________
Name                                                   Title
Contact info (tel/fax/email):
______________________________________________________
Number of Years Prospecting Experience: ___________                  Date: ______________

Please fax to (709) 739-0761 or email to pmd.krinor@nf.sympatico.ca
Thanks for your help.
Mr. Garry Clark  
Executive Director  
Ontario Prospectors Association  
1000 Alloy Drive  
Thunder Bay, Ontario P7B 6A5

Dear Mr. Clark:

The Ontario government has reviewed the current status of the implementation of Ontario's Living Legacy (OLL) and the outstanding issues relating to pre-existing mining lands and mineral exploration within new parks and conservation reserves.

As you are aware, we have worked together for about three years on implementing the OLL and we have encountered a number of difficulties. Recently, both mineral sector stakeholders and conservationists met to discuss their positions on the outstanding issues. We understand the general consensus among the stakeholders is that the concept of "half-parks" and the uncertainty about where and how mineral activity can take place is untenable. In view of the demonstrated difficulty of reconciling mineral exploration and mining in new parks and recognizing that certainty for mining land tenure is of paramount importance for a sustainable mining industry, we believe the status quo is unacceptable.

With this in mind, the government has concluded that there will be no new exploration on untenantured land within the OLL sites. All existing mining land tenure within OLL sites including mining claims, leases, licenses of occupation and patents remain protected under the Mining Act and will be treated as any others in the Province.

The government has made this difficult decision and is moving forward with a process to look at options to separate or address mineral tenure on or within the 378 OLL sites. We ask that the mineral sector, the Partnership for Public Lands and if needed, the forestry sector, work with the Ministry of Northern Development & Mines (MNDM) and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to review the OLL sites, in particular, those sites that overlap on existing mining land tenure. These stakeholders would also propose solutions or mitigation options to address the degree and nature of the overlap for the government's consideration. The government will consider all mitigation options and solutions, including boundary adjustments if jointly proposed by the OPA and PPL.
In order to avoid future conflicts, the Provincially Significant Mineral Potential (PSMP) manual will be adopted for all future land use planning initiatives, including the "Room to Grow" and "Northern Boreal Initiative". The PSMP will be posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry for public comment as soon as possible.

To commence this process, we ask that you confer with representatives from the Ontario Mining Association and the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada and then contact Hal Newsome, Senior Manager of the Ontario Geological Survey at the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (705-670-5955) for details regarding meeting logistics and next steps.

The government recognizes the importance of the mineral exploration sector and the mining industry. Over the past few years, Ontario has introduced focused flow-through share tax credits, Mining Tax cuts, mineral exploration research funding, mapping funding and improved Internet access to geoscience information. The Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation has provided $4 million to build the Ontario Prospectors Association, and has recently announced a $3.5 million contribution towards a geoscience mapping program and a Far North Assistance Program that includes funding available for mineral inventory programs.

Thank you for this opportunity to clarify the government’s position on mineral exploration and mineral tenure in OLL sites. We understand the challenging nature of this situation but we have every confidence that through the cooperation of all parties, an effective long-term solution can be reached that will benefit all Ontarians.

Dan Newman
Minister of Northern Development and Mines

John Snobelen
Minister of Natural Resources
PROVINCIAL INVESTMENT WILL BOOST ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN LAKE NIPIGON REGION

TORONTO – The Lake Nipigon region will generate new economic development opportunities thanks to a provincial investment of up to $3.5 million from the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (NOHFC), Northern Development and Mines Minister and NOHFC Chair Dan Newman announced today.

The funding will go toward a geoscience mapping project aimed at attracting mineral investment to the area. The Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA), in co-operation with its private sector partners, Lakehead University and communities in the Lake Nipigon area, will undertake the one-year $7-million study of the region.

“Our government understands that geological mapping and the collection of geological data are fundamental activities to sustaining a vibrant mineral exploration sector and prosperous resource-based communities,” said Newman. “This important initiative will generate significant private sector investment in exploration activities that could ultimately lead to new jobs and growth from long-term mining activity in the region.”

This project includes the geological mapping of bedrock, regional and orientation geophysics, and mineral deposit studies. The Ontario Geological Survey (OGS) will help acquire and will publish the results of the geological studies as maps, reports, and digital data sets. The information will then be available over the Internet through the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines' ERMES and CLAIMap systems. This valuable information will be used to globally market the resource potential and investment appeal of the Lake Nipigon region.

“The Ontario Prospectors Association is committed to working with its project partners to produce high quality geological data that will meet industry needs and help increase exploration activity in the Lake Nipigon region,” said OPA Executive Director Garry Clark. “We are very pleased that the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund is providing this generous contribution toward our initiative.”

Last year, the NOHFC announced a $4-million investment to help the OPA restructure into a modern, professionally staffed association to better serve the prospecting community. The funding will also allow the association to partner with industry to leverage more investments in promising, grassroots mineral exploration opportunities.
Assessment Work Expenditures
By Client Type
2001

Client Type
- Independent
- Junior
- Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mining Division</th>
<th>Total $ Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>$10,030,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcupine</td>
<td>$4,996,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>$4,326,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larder Lake</td>
<td>$2,207,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake</td>
<td>$1,831,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>$1,775,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>$1,157,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenora</td>
<td>$1,019,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ontario</td>
<td>$606,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,952,247</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>