

News views and opinions on the mineral exploration scene in Ontario

May 2002 Issue

Date: May 2002

THE EXPLORATIONIST

The Newsletter of the Ontario Prospectors Association

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.

PROSPECTOR VERSUS THE SYSTEM

The Ontario Prospectors Association would like to congratulate DOUG ROBINSON of Kirkland Lake. Doug has won a ruling in Small Claims Court that verifies that the Living Legacy / Lands for Life process had negatively affected the value of his claims. These claims are located within and beside blobbed areas. The full ruling has been placed on the Ontario Prospectors Association website.

Deputy Judge Pierre D. Brunelle stated in his judgement "In light of this finding, I have no choice but to find the Plaintiff's two mining claims are now worthless and he is entitled to compensation for this portion of his claim."

This statement has been held to by the OPA since February 1998 when the first Gap sites were placed on the landscape. This statement and ruling holds up the fact compensation is needed for the effected claimholders. This ruling was only to replace the costs of acquisition since there was no exploration work completed on the claims.

The OPA contends that an evaluation of effected claims should be completed and a dollar value placed on the claim. This would be similar to the system in place in British Columbia. We are presently introducing this the idea to the Government. We hope to get some basic principles adopted so as to prevent the need for multiple lawsuits. The costs of lawsuits for both the taxpayer and the claimholders should be avoided.

We have completed an analysis of the claims affected by the March 1999 blobs placed on the claim maps. The total units affected total over 15,000. Using the findings of the Robinson case the costs without taking into any exploration completed or minerals found would be \$15 million dollars. To minimize this total effect we have been working with the Partnership for Public Lands to move some boundaries of the protected areas and to disentangle some mining lands.

Please contact me with ideas or concerns that are arising from the Ontario Living Legacy.

THE END OF THE LABOUR PROBLEMS

I think explorationists are happy the Ministry is back from there strike. I personally think the volume of materials sent into the Sudbury office must have almost filled the Recorder Office. Ron Gashinski's staff seems to be coming back to speed quickly. The fact we have a June 1st opening is credited to his staff working full out after the strike. This dedication seems to be continuing with the sorting out of Claim maps, cancelled/posted claims and the assessment system. Please see the back cover for where we are with the issues and how they plan to get back up to normal.

The Prospecting Fund was held up by the strike but also seems to be back on track with about a 1-month delay. Please watch our website for breaking news within the next 2 weeks.



[We're easy to get a hold of](#)

Contact the Executive Director: Garry Clark

By e-mail: gclark@ontarioprospectors.com

Phone: 807-622-3284 Fax: 807-622-4156

The Lake Nipigon Geoscience Initiative is progressing forward with only a slight delay by the strike. A Program Director is to be appointed within the next 3 weeks. Once the position is filled the details and schedule of the project will be released for comments.

RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AGREEMENTS

Resource Stewardship Agreements (RSA) are a result of the Living Legacy process that are between the Remote Tourist Operator (RTO) and the Forestry company who possess the Sustainable Forestry Licence. These agreements are setup to help protect the value of the RTO sites. The agreement is placed within the Forest Management Plan and can control timing, access and methods of forest harvest.

Resource Stewardship In Need of Reforms

Access to crown lands via newly constructed logging roads in North Western Ontario is becoming progressively restrictive for the area residents due to recent Provincial Government policies to protect resource based tourism. Most of the recent restrictive crown land logging road access policy flows from Ontario's Living Legacy, the new foundation for Ontario's land use policy. The various restrictive measures such as the Resource Based Tourism policy, the Remote Access policy, the Enhanced Management Area policy and the exclusive tourist operators and forest industry RSAs (Resource Stewardship Agreements) clearly protects the resource based (fishing and hunting) tourism industry, while the residents are deprived of using many of the new roads. Ontario's Living Legacy 7.3.3 states as follows, "New roads will be restricted from public use" the public may still use these areas by traditional means, i.e. walk or canoe in.

The vast majority of North Western Ontario residents realizes the importance of the forest and tourism industries and agrees that some road access controls must be implemented in order to properly manage our commonly owned wildlife resources. This decision cannot be trusted to the forestry and tourism alone. The area private sector, the non-commercial group must be included at the negotiating table to ensure the long-term sustainability of our resources.

Tourism operators, with the support of tourist outfitter associations and the Ministry of Tourism Culture and Recreation, are an extremely powerful group that demand vast areas set aside where road

access and timber harvesting will be prohibited. This will result in loss of timber revenue and in time the timber will become over mature and decadent, blow down and will not be properly regenerated for future use. The aesthetic loss will also be tremendous.

The Ontario Tourism Culture and Recreation ministry has announced that they are providing the tourist industry with \$480,000. According to the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters association, this money will be used to develop Resources Stewardship Agreements between resource based tourism and forest companies on large areas of crown lands. Obviously the tourist industry feels this issue is extremely important and warrants proper representation, in order to get a good deal. It is also stated that NOTO (Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters) will work in partnership with MTCR (Ministry of Tourism Culture and Recreation) and hire a coordinator to help negotiate these agreements, which will include as many as 2000 tourism business areas on crown lands and waters effected by forest management. (Wood harvesting, transportation and regeneration). Where does this leave the local resident and other crown land users that also have a vested interest in the area? Unfortunately, the Guide to Resources Stewardship Agreements has been designed by the Ontario Government exclusively for the tourism/forestry stewardship agreements on crown lands without any meaningful provision for the involvement by a well established stakeholder, the Ontario resident.

In the current escalating globalization, tourist establishments and forest companies could be foreign owned, as any other business, with increasingly frequent changes in ownership and corporate policy, with practically no opportunity for our local citizens to participate in the management of our crown lands and its resources.

Resource based tourism and the forest industry are a vital part of the Northern Ontario economy, however both are profit oriented enterprises with their own business objectives. In many instances in the past, both sectors have acted with adverse long-term effects on our natural resources. Many local residents feel it is detrimental to the general public for two business sectors with the Governments assistance to attempt to manage and use our common natural resources without the resident sector participation and involvement from the very beginning of these nego-

(Continued on page 3)

tiations. To have public participation to Resource Stewardship Agreements through the public open house, Forest Management planning process or through the Local Citizens Committee, is very inadequate and ineffective. The public sector must be as equally funded as the tourist industry (\$480,000) to hire professional negotiators to understand the agreements and act on our behalf. Also the resident sector must be well represented in all access issues on crown land. It goes without saying that whoever controls the road access also controls to a large degree the availability of our fish and wildlife resources. Should we be complacent and let our natural resources be miss managed, the resource based business sector will fade or move to greener pastures and the area resident will suffer job losses, etc. and be left with the rehabilitation problems.

The Dryden District Conservation Club, an affiliate of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, recently passed two resolutions requesting that the O.F.A.H. lobby the Ontario Government for meaningful and equal representation at RSA and at any future similar committees or negotiations involving the management of our natural resources on crown lands. The second resolution addressed equal funding to negotiate the private sectors interests in the RSA process and other similar agreements. The two resolutions passed easily at the O.F.A.H. Zone - a quarterly meeting on March 23rd. Both resolutions have now been forwarded to O.F.A.H. head office in Peterborough, Ontario for approval and action by the board of directors representing all affiliated clubs across Ontario. The above mentioned policies regarding access restrictions are quite new and most of us have not realized their full impact, nor have we seen the last of it. It must be understood that this issue affects all Ontarians, as these restrictions will affect everyone's recreational possibilities. It is hoped that the Ontario Government will realize the value of the non-commercial involvement in balancing the current "Business to Business" RSA and decide favourably towards a more democratic method of dealing with our natural resources in our own back yard.

Hopefully a favourable outcome in our resource management policies will stimulate renewed interest in our communities and create a better environment for growth in the north.

I.J. Riives
Box 5, Site 132
17 Keith Avenue
Dryden, Ontario P8NB 2Y4
Ph. (807) 223-5465 Fax (807) 223-5545

Dear Mr. Riives and Mr. Greaves :

Thank you for sharing your plight and concerns with us regarding the shared use of Crown land. We know you both as respectable Sportsmen and Conservationists. At the same time we wonder about your desire and ability to 'get along'. Both of you enjoy positions on Crown land use planning committees and play an important role regarding problem solving as a result of that process.

With all due respect I would suggest that you are doing none of us any favour or good by sniping at each other. The BEST interests of all crown land use stakeholders can only be achieved through mutual respect and 'collaboration'.

Might I also suggest that the two of you get together over a jug of suds or a bucket of minnows and start sharing your concerns and IDEAS with each other one on one. Put out an extra glass and we might even join you.

Dave Christianson, Director Emeritus,
Northwestern Ontario Prospectors Association.
807-767-4670

PS: " Riives and Greaves" it even rhymes if you say it right.

TEMAGAMI: Here we go again?

Dear ONAS,

Here we go again. Just when we thought that an agreement was imminent, the MNR has to stick their nose into the process and try to ram another park down our throats. The Temagami area has enough parks already - we went through that exercise a few years ago. Now the never-ending parks agenda rears its ugly head again in total disregard to previous negotiations that took years to complete and were generally accepted by most stakeholders. This reminds me of the OLL process that was based on province wide consultations and ended up being shanghaied by the MNR. This is the never-ending story of the bully Ministry trying to run everything according to their own agenda with little regard for other stakeholders. How did they ever talk you into backing this idea? The mining industry fought long and hard to prove we could explore in sensitive areas such as the skyline reserve and get along with other

stakeholders. Now that we have several years of experience in Temagami with no problems, the MNR wants to deny us access anyway. There is already a logging ban in the area (Sky-line Reserve) and no proposed hydro developments so the creation of a park is aimed squarely at the mining industry without just cause. Maybe ONAS should take another look at the MNR motives for this initiative and see whether it is in the best interest of the negotiations and the stakeholders before jumping on the big green bandwagon. The area already has plenty of protection and if you need an example of the economic benefits and impact of a mine near the lake, look at Temagami Island and the impact that Teck Corporation had on the quality of the lake and the economy of the area. Northern communities are shrinking at an alarming rate and stifling the possibility of major employment opportunities seems to be the wrong thing to do at this time. We need all the breaks we can get, not another sterilization of prime geology on top of the OLL debacle.

Yours truly, Michael Leahy

Sudbury Prospectors and Developers Association

May 10, 2002
Mr. Doug Carr, Chief Negotiator, Temagami
Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat
4th floor, 720 Bay St.
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2K1

Dear Sir:

Re: The right to explore and mine in all new parks created in Ontario.

This letter is in response to the proposals by The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to create a new park covering Lake Temagami and the new reserve areas in Temagami, Ontario. This was brought to my attention by Gord Yule from the Ministry of Development and Mines (MNDM) in Timmins.

To my knowledge, the mining industry and related exploration - prospector groups have not been given any notice whatsoever concerning the creation of this new park by MNR. This is probably in response to Mines Minister Dan Newman's betrayal to the exploration industry. Minister Newman (MNDM) has signed an agreement with Minister Snobelen (MNR) which states that no exploration

will be allowed in any new parks in Ontario. This would most certainly also include no mining in any parks in Ontario.

Your proposals as outlined on your Web site includes the right to generate money from the natural resources on the reserve or private lands to be owned by the Temagami Aboriginal Community. Your area contains high potential for mineral resources such as Nickel, Copper, Platinum and Diamonds; to name a few. If MNR create any park whatsoever on the Aboriginal lands or on Lake Temagami, you can be assured that there will not be any exploration or mining allowed on or near the lands affected by the park. In addition to this, all old mining patent lands are supposed to be business as usual but mining companies are not investing time nor money in any lands hindered by parks. The Sudbury Prospectors Association suggest that you do not allow MNR to create any parks as part of the agreements you are now negotiating. Creating a new park will prevent any money being made by mining and hinder your ability to generate funds.

I would like to know if there will be any regulations or restrictions to prospectors doing exploration work in the area you chose as your traditional land use base (last map on your Web site)?

Roger Poulin, President SPDA

ONTARIO PROSPECTORS ASSOCIATION

May 15, 2002

Doug Carr, doug.carr@jus.gov.on.ca
Director & Chief Negotiator – Temagami
Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat
4th Floor
720 Bay St.
Toronto, ON
M5G 2K1

RE: Temagami Settlement Model

Dear Mr. Carr,

The Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA) has been involved in the establishment of the special exploration methods employed for the Skyline Reserve of Lake Temagami. The determination of a settlement by ONAS should recognize that these methods exist and that their continuation is desired by the exploration community.

Establishing shoreline parks on Lake Temagami is not required nor is it an economically sound method of resolving the settlement issue. The area of Lake Temagami has high mineral potential as shown by the past producing Teck deposit. This deposit produced without polluting the lake, benefiting the local and provincial economies. The potential of the geology of the area could provide economic stimulus for the First Nation and surrounding communities.

The last thing that the Ontario Prospectors Association would want is added constraints in the area brought on by the establishment of additional parks.

The Ontario Prospectors Association is always available to discuss land use issues affecting exploration and mining.

Thank you,
Garry Clark
Executive Director
Ontario Prospectors Association

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for your e-mailed comments of May 15, 2002. Please be assured that your views will be considered along with those of other groups and individuals who have provided their comments, as the negotiators for the parties work to shape a final settlement agreement.

With regard to your comments about creation of a waterway park around the shoreline of Lake Temagami, I would like to clarify that this was not proposed by MNR, but rather arose last year as a result of discussions with stakeholder groups in the Temagami community.

At the time the waterway park notion was first discussed, and through the development of the Settlement Model, our understanding was that mining could be a permitted use for that class of park, as per the OLL rules that were being developed. The intention was to maintain existing permitted uses, including mining exploration, in accordance with the special regulations that were developed under the Public Lands Act and the Mining Act for specific areas affected by the Temagami Land Use Plan.

The recent policy decision by MNR and MNMDM about mineral exploration in newly created protected areas was made with no reference to the work we are doing on the land claim settlement. That decision was made after the joint Settlement Model had been mailed out to the public.

Creation of a park is one of several possibilities being considered by the parties to the land claim negotiations as they look to federal and provincial regulations and policies to address the needs of all affected interests with regard to the shoreline of Lake Temagami in the context of a land claim settlement. The overall objective of the parties is to ensure that development is controlled and impacts are minimized, much as they are under the existing Temagami Land Use Plan.

Thanks again for your comments.
Sincerely,
Doug Carr
Director
Negotiations Branch

DO YOU JUST BELONG?

Are you an active member?

*The kind who would be missed
Or are you contented.*

That your name is on the list.

*Do you attend meetings
And mingle with the flock?
Or do you stay at home
And criticize and knock*

*Do you take an active part
To help the world along?
Or are you satisfied to be the
Kind who just belongs?*

*Do you work on a committee
To see there is no trick
Or leave the work to just a few
And talk about a clique?*

*Do you come to meetings often
And help with hand and head?
Don't just be a member
Take an active part instead!*

*Think this over, and remember
Do you know how to ring the gong?
Are you an active member
Or do you just belong?*

THE 21 DAY CAMPING RULE AND EXPLORATIONISTS

The MNR has revised its FREE USE POLICY (21 day camping rules) and have dated the policy Feb 22, 2002. The excerpt that exempts explorationists states:

" Mining Activities

- Buildings constructed/placed on an unpatented mining claim used by the holder of the claim (as allowed under Mining Act, subsection 50(2)). Land use occupational authority is required for buildings constructed within shoreline reserves (i.e. maximum 400 feet) of a unpatented mining claim where the surface rights have been reserved to the Crown.
- Camping on Crown land within an unpatented mining claim while undertaking exploration activities as allowed under subsection 50(2) of the Mining Act
- Camping on Crown land outside of an unpatented mining claim while undertaking mineral exploration activities. Camping is limited to 21 days per year or as otherwise posted in areas extensively used by the transient public (e.g. public access points). Approval may be obtained to camp beyond 21 days at such location. Refer to section 3.4.3 of this policy."

This does not preclude any other permitting required such as **work permits**. Please note this was completed by the MNR in consultation with our Regional Land Use Geologists. It was expressed to me that MNR were concerned about commercial workers occupying some of the access points or points of frequent tourist use for long periods of time. They want the general public to get use for recreational activities when possible.

ASK YOUR REGIONAL MNR FOR A COPY OF THE POLICY

IN NAME ONLY By Andrew Tims, PPDA

Welcome Minister Wilson to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. This portfolio will test your ability to institute practical and reasonable policies while weathering inter-ministry politics and other influences outside of your control. Some of

your predecessors have been successful in this balancing act while others are not worth mentioning at all.

The title of your new ministry is the main source of conflict with current government policy. "Northern Development" suggests the goal of your portfolio is to encourage the economic prosperity of northern communities. The latest census data reveals that government policy to date is lacking in this endeavour as most northern communities have seen a 3-14% decrease in population. The second half of your ministry's title uses the term "Mines" to cover a wide range of responsibilities from administering the Mining Act to the activities of the Ontario Geological Survey. Regardless of the attempts by local governments to diversify their northern economies these communities still rely the resources-based industries as their major employers and revenue sources.

The future economic health of most northern communities is being threatened by the continual erosion of the technical expertise of the provincial geological survey, the elimination of all mineral exploration incentives and the expropriation and alienation of crown land. In simple terms the Ontario Treasure Hunt funding the Ontario Geological Survey has been utilizing over the last three years should be the normal operational funding level and not the exception. The surveys carried out through OTH funding have succeeded in initiating staking rushes and have encouraged the return of junior mining companies to Ontario. What is the rationale in reducing the OGS staffing levels to that of housekeeping duties?

The foundation of any exploration program involves prospecting. This grassroots work is generally unrewarding and a costly venture but lays down the basics required to discover a new mine. Ontario is the only province, other than Prince Edward Island, that does not provide an incentive to the prospecting community as a means to keep a healthy mining industry. The lack of an incentive infers the government does not desire the new wealth generated by the mining industry in Ontario. Finally land access is the lifeblood of northern resources-based communities. The imposition of 378 Ontario Living Legacy sites expropriating 12% of the land mass has affected a large number of mining claims holders. The parked claims holders are now unable to promote their properties and the value the investments in the property has been lost.

The Porcupine Mining Camp is being threatened by this policy of unilateral land expropriation. On one front an Ontario Living Legacy river park threatens the Montcalm Nickel project operated by Falconbridge Limited. The potential \$600 million injection into the Timmins economy over a 7-yr period is in peril due to a 200 m wide park about the Groundhog River – a river which meets the Ministry of the Environment requirements for the discharge of treated waters from Montcalm Project site.

All of the gold mines in Timmins occur within six kilometres of an ancient fault – the Destor Porcupine Fault Zone. This 6 kilometre wide corridor from west of Timmins to the Quebec border produced over 70 million ounces of gold from numerous mines over the last 95 years. Again it is obvious that the economy of the north is of little importance to previous policy makers as there are two large Ontario Living Legacy sites within this six-kilometre corridor immediately west of Timmins. The largest of these two sites, the Tatachikapika River Plain Conservation Reserve (Denton and Thorneloe Twps), were the site of a major gold rush with exploration work injecting a minimum 6 to 10 million dollars into the local economy. The work that was completed on those parked claims is now valueless as a recent policy change by the previous Minister of MNDM has deemed that high potential area untouchable.

So, Minister Wilson you enter into a portfolio where the goals of your ministry are at odds with the past actions of the government. We wish you all the luck and support in your tricky balancing act.

**HALTON ASSOCIATION OF
GEOSCIENTISTS
(HAGS)**

April 19, 2002

Honorable Jim Wilson,

Dear Minister,

RE: MINERAL EXPLORATION IN PROVINCIAL PARKS

The Halton Association of Geoscientists (HAGS) is an ad-hoc group of more than 30 geoscientists, most of who have more than 20 years of experience in the mining industry both in Canada and throughout the world. Although primarily residents of the Peel-Halton region, many members reside elsewhere in the Toronto area. The group has been in existence for over 8 years and meets regularly to discuss matters that affect the mining industry.

We have seen with interest your recent appointment as Minister of Northern Development and Mines, and congratulate you on this new responsibility. We look forward to continuing to work constructively with your Ministry on the many issues that confront the Ontario mining industry.

HAGS recently prepared a letter in response to an announcement made by your ministerial predecessor Mr. Dan Newman during the world's premier mining conference, the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada's convention, in March. As you are probably aware, this announcement stated that the Harris Government was no longer prepared to consider mineral potential in the selection of lands for the formation of already designated new parks and tourist playgrounds.

Unfortunately, the recent changes in government prevented us from forwarding this message to Mr. Newman himself. We would therefore like to provide you with our concerns in light of the apparent change in government policy towards keeping mining a viable industry in Ontario.

HAGS has been active in promoting improvements to National Instrument 43-101, Best Practice Guidelines and other legislative and regulatory changes over the last few years. Members of the group have also been active in the development of policy for the implementation of Ontario's Living Legacy (OLL), essentially since its inception. We are very concerned about the continued alienation of lands available for mineral exploration in the Province. Much of the alienation includes lands of high mineral prospectivity.

When the Harris Government made a policy decision to create the 378 Provincial Parks at the last election, in defiance of the Lands for Life process, specific undertakings were given to the exploration and mining industries that exploration would be allowed to continue in areas of high mineral potential. Now the MNDM has seen fit to join in with other Government Ministries to abrogate these undertakings.

This decision is completely biased towards the Partnership for Public Lands (PPL) lobby. The science-based Provincially Significant Mineral Potential (PSMP) process would likely have identified some OLL sites that have significant mineral potential, and many that have low mineral potential. In the latter case, it would be entirely logical to exclude the OLL site from future mineral activities.

In the former case, controlled exploration would result in minimal short-term environmental

disturbance, and if mining proved feasible then boundaries could readily be adjusted to account for the prospective areas, or substitute sites conscripted. Given PPL's avowed intent of raising the percentage of protected area land in Ontario to the 20-25% range, and the *Room to Grow* initiative, it would appear that such substitute lands could readily be identified.

Applying PSMP to the OLL sites would have been a fair, scientific and even-handed approach – a democratic, Canadian type of solution. Instead, the complete capitulation of the relevant Ministries to PPL leaves us in the minerals industry wondering how secure any of our mining land is, and whether investors will have any confidence to support our programs.

This betrayal of trust is damaging to all aspects of the exploration and mining industry in Ontario, and will lead to a reduction in expenditures in favour of more hospitable jurisdictions. It will be interesting to read next year's report by the Fraser Institute, ranking Provinces by their relative attractiveness for mining investment, because it appears that this action has now made most of them more attractive than Ontario.

Your predecessor failed to provide the leadership for a Ministry that should be dedicated to the protection of lands for mineral exploration, preferring to keep the peace by caving in to vocal, agenda-pushing "environmental" groups. This is not the first time that our industry has been used in this way, and it begs the question of whether any undertakings by your Ministry should be accepted as anything other than an expedient stratagem to restrain the exploration and mining industries until it caves in once again.

The continued alienation of mining lands in all jurisdictions, and more specifically throughout the Province of Ontario, is a major concern to our group. This alienation, essentially in perpetuity, has short, medium and long-term implications. In the short term, it demonstrates that Ontario is not open for business and that the Harris Government would always surrender to emotional whining by groups with little interest in the future prosperity of our Province. In the medium term, jobs (and companies) will be lost in areas of the Province that can least afford them, specifically anywhere north of cottage country. Unfortunately, although these areas cover over 85% of Ontario, they represent few voters, so apparently had little impact upon the government's actions.

In the longer term, the Province is becoming progressively more sterilized for new exploration concepts and the work that would result from these. Neither you nor your predecessor are any more able

than we are to divine the future requirements of metals, some of which may not be in short supply now, or for which the current demand is low. We need only refer to tantalum, palladium and diamonds which only 10 short years ago were not considered to be potential targets for exploration. However, your predecessor did not seem to be concerned with the future of the Province in this regard, since he appeared to be abandoning those benefits that would accrue to its citizens through an active, environmentally responsible and sustainable exploration and mining industry.

MNDM staff has worked hard to produce a PSMP ranking system, based upon sound scientific principles, which your predecessor acknowledged will be used in future planning exercises. If this system is good enough for future use, then it is good enough for application to the 378 newly created Living Legacy sites, for which it was primarily designed. We believe that PSMP should be applied now to the 378 Living Legacy sites, thereby meeting the commitment made by MNR and MNDM in *Ontario's Living Legacy Land Use Strategy* of July 1999.

In summary, we believe that the actions of your predecessor and his Ministry and Government were a stab in the back to one of the major industries in this Province, which is a disgraceful, and ultimately very damaging, state of affairs. He, and his government, should be ashamed to call themselves public servants.

The Harris Government, commendably, supported the creation of the Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario (APGO). One prerequisite for membership in APGO is adherence to a quite rigorous Code of Ethics. By breaking their commitment to apply PSMP to OLL sites, the Harris Government treated with contempt the standards it demands of its citizens.

In your new position as Minister, you now have an excellent opportunity to review, reconsider and remediate the actions of your predecessor and the Harris Government. We would hope that this issue, one which affects a large proportion of the land area of the Province, would be one of the first to benefit from a re-examination, and that you will recognize the damage already inflicted upon our industry by these irresponsible actions. We would be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss these matters in more detail if you felt that this would be beneficial to your understanding of the issues

Yours sincerely,
Philip Burt

The Status of Mining In Present Day Ontario

Historically, mining exploration has been a driving force in the development of Ontario's economy. The search for and development of mineral commodities has created numerous communities and the infrastructures that support them. The wealth derived from mining exploration and development has contributed enormously to the high standard of living that we have achieved.

Unfortunately, it appears that the status of mining exploration is in decline. This is evident when all of the other stakeholders with interests in our province's natural resources have precedence over mining interests and in some cases the decision makers do not even consult our industry when important land issues are being resolved.

For example, forest management planning is an important process in Ontario. It determines how our forests are to be best harvested while considering sustainability and ecological rational. Since the people of Ontario own the Crown forests, MNR has developed a process for public consultation. Local Citizens Committees are set up to advise the MNR District Manager on forest management issues such as where the roads and bridges are going and when they will be closed after the forest has been harvested.

LCC terms of reference call for anglers, hunters, tourist operators, naturalists, municipalities, loggers, native groups and "others" to be part of the planning process. Mining explorationists are not mentioned in this list where in fact they should be among the first. It is on record that there have been instances where prospectors have been excluded from LCCs because mining is not included in the terms of reference.

The importance of having a prospector on an LCC must not be underestimated. A brand new road into a freshly cut and then scarified forest, presents enormous possibilities for a prospector to discover a new mineral occurrence. When the plan is being made he or she can describe where the areas of highest mineral potential are and why the roads and bridges must remain intact until the area has been thoroughly explored. Mines are extremely rare phenomena and when an opportunity such as this arises it must be exploited for the good of our society as a whole.

The Northwest Regional Advisory Committee's terms of reference states "Each regional director of the Ministry shall appoint, as members to the Regional Advisory Committee for the region, a regional representative of:" and it goes on to list 14 different stakeholders including (viii) Ontario Camp-

ers Association. Presumably mining exploration is included in (xv), Other Interest Groups.

OPA is very proactive regarding these issues and will work diligently to ensure that our interests are represented whenever decisions are being made that affect our industry.

Yours truly,

John Halet OPA and NWOPA, Director

RE: Smart Growth Panels

Dear Minister Hodgson,

The Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA) commends you and your government on developing your Smart Growth Panel approach to developing the economic potential of the various individual regions of the Province. But the compositions of the Northwest and Northeast panels are greatly flawed when representing the stakeholders of the regions. Our Association represents a key economic driver of the North and we are poorly to not represented on the Panels. Yes I agree large committees are somewhat unwieldy and therefore unproductive but unbalanced committees can be as unproductive missing whole issues of the stakeholder groups.

Having reviewed the makeup of your panels I note the Partnership for Public Lands and Forestry groups have representatives. These stakeholder groups continue to have our most interactive relations as can be witnessed by the OLL conflicts we are still trying to sort out. The membership sees the inclusion of those groups and our exclusion as another example of their greater influence with government.

I listened to your assistant's reasoning and as I have said I understand the problems with representation and committee size. I would suggest that the regional stakeholders groups such as Northern Ontario Municipal Association, Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities and Association of Mining Municipalities of Ontario could have represented the areas better than a select group of mayors/reeves. That would have created a smaller panel with room for groups like the OPA and possibly other stakeholder groups of the north that enhance the economy.

I understand these are one-year appointments and hopefully a better balance will occur in the future. The OPA is available at anytime to provide input or members for the Panels.

Yours truly,

Garry Clark

Executive Director

Ontario Prospectors Association

MINING LANDS SECTION
INFORMATION & STATUS UPDATE

1) MINING CLAIMS INFORMATION (MCI):

During the OPSEU strike 267 reports of work were received. The MLS is striving to complete by **mid-June** the data entry of these reports (87% presently processed). All other documents, such as extensions of time, Commissioner's orders, and pending proceedings, have been processed. The 76 work reports received after May 06, 2002 are now being processed.

New updates on the abstracts will be available for viewing in **MCI on Saturday, May 25, 2002.**

Please note that some of the new mining claims may not appear in the MCI system, because they have not been completely processed and many claims will have a work report pending status.

2) MINING CLAIM MAPS:

During the OPSEU strike, a total of 423 applications to record, which include 10,754 claim units (172,064 hectares) was received.

The MLS is pleased to advise that most of these new recordings have been plotted on the claim maps. Some Applications to Record because of errors requiring client amendments have not been plotted yet. Staff is presently working on new applications received after May 6, 2002.

Also, please note that you may not be able to click on all the new claims for MCI details as data entry has not been completed.

***** There cannot be any removal of cancelled claims off the claim maps until all documents affecting the due date of a mining claim has been completely processed.*****

3) POSTING OF MINING CLAIMS:

Our best estimate for posting of mining claims for staking will commence in **mid - June**.

A notice will be posted on the MLS's web site commencing approximately **10 days** before the posting starts with frequent updates. The posting process for the backlog will be outlined at that time. There is no intention of posting all the claims at the same time.

MINING LANDS DISPOSITION OFFICE:

The Dispositions Office has produced **the list of lands open to staking on June 1st**, which has been published in the **Saturday, May 18th, edition of the Ontario Gazette.**

Mining leases due to expire at the end of June or July 2002, have their application for renewal deadlines **extended to August 31, 2002.**

Invoicing of annual rents and taxes, for licenses of occupation, leases and mining patents will also be delayed. The invoices are expected to be mailed by the end of summer.

MLS – May 24, 2002