

News views and opinions on the
mineral exploration scene in Ontario

September 2002 Issue

Date: September 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.

THE ONTARIO FRONTIER

There is a large portion of the Province that lies under-explored and is easily accessed by plane or helicopter. A portion of this area is scheduled for forestry development over the next 21 years.

I know some will say "Here he goes again on the under utilized area of north that Manitoba and Quebec are taking advantage of". Yes that is partially where I'm headed.

We have been looking toward the north for years, Musselwhite has been developed and it looked like the Attawapiskat diamond play was moving forward. This is where the problems develop!

The Provincial government has been trying to progress in the north with various initiatives but the First Nations always come back to Federal issues. Sooner then later, we need the Federal and Provincial governments to come together and solve the problems of accessing the north.

Uncertainty brought forth by First Nation and exploration company conflicts leave Ontario in the background when comparing the best places to explore. The quality of the rocks, Provincial Surveys and land tenure don't stand up to access conflicts. Our Government needs to understand that "Fraser Institute" ratings mean nothing if no one can explore because they can't get to the land!

We have a Federal Minister from northern Ontario who is pushing change. This may be the best chance to get some resolution. The Provincial Government needs to put aside party politics and grasp this opportunity.

When the PDAC comes along in March we will be looking at core from gold and diamond projects in Northern

Quebec and maps and drill ideas from Northern Ontario because we couldn't get there to do the work!

ACCESS AND ACTION

I met the Minister of Northern Development and Mines at the Timmins Symposium in the spring. I was impressed that he could make the event on short notice after his appointment. He sat with us and talked about championing issues that were affecting us.

That was the last time I saw and talked to him. I've attempted to talk to him and set-up meetings without success.

I just read the latest Ontario Out of Doors Magazine from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters with their Presidents message stating how inaccessible the Minister of Natural Resources is and felt another strong semblance to our situation. Have the Conservatives gone into a heads down no one will notice game where they only show up to give out good news and then retreat to their offices?

Our issues haven't retreated or gone dormant. Minister could we move forward on some issues?

THE EXPLOSIVES ACT CHANGES

The new explosives act is expected to become legislation this fall. The act is part of Bill C-55, the Public Safety Act (2002), which was introduced in the House of Commons this spring after the withdrawal of Bill C-42 earlier in the spring.



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

Contact the Executive Director: **Garry Clark**

By e-mail: gjclark@ontarioprospectors.com

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

The devil as they say “resides in the detail” and we will not see regulation detail until after the bill is passed and they start to formulate regulations. The PDAC suggestion of requiring a blaster’s permit approach similar to the handgun permit was rejected. However, prospectors will apparently be required along with everyone else in the manufacture, transport and use of explosives to hold a Quebec style license, which has a term of five years. The PQ license is not expensive but requires a rigorous background check. I gather Quebec prospectors tolerate it – but grudgingly.

The real concern is storage. A type 6 magazine will be required as a minimum, but what constitutes a type 6 magazine is changing too, and not likely to be getting any cheaper. Anyone living in a rural area should be able to have a type 6 magazine on his or her property in a secure and safe place. The weekly (?) reporting requirements of the contents of magazines are going to be onerous, even for lowly type 6s. If I had to guess, the reporting is going to prove most difficult issue for prospectors – but I am only speculating.

To continue with the speculation I see a possible roll for local associations, perhaps even provincial associations in supplying type 6 magazines. There will definitely be an opportunity for someone with a type 6 magazine to charge to store explosives for other license holders and charge for his/her weekly inventory reporting.

The fact that prospectors have along history of leaving unused explosives in the bush is going to catch up with them. I know why this happens, but great effort is going to go into ensuring that this practice is over.

NRCan is aware of the importance of not letting pressure from the US effectively eliminate the ability of prospectors to use explosives, but prospectors better understand the pressure from Washington is intense. The world changed on September

11 last.

The problem of buying explosives seems to be isolated to Thunder Bay, but it just may be that Dave Christianson yells more effectively than most. The TB problem appears related to the change in ownership of an explosives seller from a small local dealer to a large chain. Contributing factors appear to be the new (overcautious?) owner/manager figures small buyers are not worth the hassle/risk, personalities?

Publishing a list of where to buy explosives would appear to be useful service for members but may backfire? Authorities are not likely to want outlets advertised?

I saw bits of a TVO presentation the other night and found it interesting that the Direct Action (?) group of domestic terrorists who blew off the front of the Lytton Industry building in the GTA 20 (?) years ago stole over 500 lbs of dynamite from BC Dept. of Highway’s magazines! I understand that much of the dynamite used by biker gangs comes from mines of construction company magazines.

The OPA would like to thank David Comba of the PDAC and Dave Christianson of NWOPA for all their effort on the Explosives Issues

Mellon Lake mine: Fight isn't over...

Ontario didn't issue permit because of a technicality
The Kingston Whig-Standard
Sat 10 Aug 2002
Page: 1 / Front
Section: Community
Byline: Ian Elliot
Source: The Kingston Whig-Standard
The battle over Mellon Lake is anything but
(Continued on page 3)

over, the two sides agree.

While environmentalists and opponents of the proposed granite quarry in the protected area northeast of Belleville are cheering this week's decision by the government not to issue a mining permit, it is not the final word on the mine.

Proponent Joe Palu had until this past Tuesday to consent to conditions attached to a mining permit offered by the Ministry of Natural Resources. He did not, so the ministry withdrew the permit offer.

The conditions limited the area that could be quarried to 29 per cent of the site, set strict limits on the periods at which blasting and quarrying could be carried out and limited the firm to removing granite or gravel, but not both.

However, the firm can reapply for another permit, as it has done before, or take legal action to recover the money it has sunk into the project.

"I don't think it's totally finished yet," said Paul Leadbitter, the

Federation of Ontario Naturalists' manager of parks and protected areas.

"I think this could move into another phase with him reapplying, or he can sue, or apply for reimbursement of his costs to date.

"It's definitely not over."

Palu did not respond to an interview request yesterday, but Garry Clark, the executive director of the Ontario Prospectors Association and the person who took up Palu's case with the provincial government, said Palu had a lawyer and was weighing his options.

"Our opinion is this guy went in with his head up, expecting everything to be business as usual," Clark said.

"He expected everything to be fine and the government dropped a park on him."

The mining claim predated the government declaring Mellon Lake a protected area, although that designation does not prohibit mining claims already

existing on the site being exercised.

That exception rankles environmentalists, and the industry isn't thrilled with it either. Clark believes if it had not been for the designation, the quarry would not have been as contentious as it proved to be.

"If this hadn't been a Living Legacy site, there wouldn't have been the outcry that there was," he said.

"People would have looked at it, evaluated the risks, but I don't think there would have been the reaction that there was."

Melissa Tkachyk, a wilderness campaigner with environmental group Earthroots, was pleased with the decision but said it seemed to be based more on economics than on a desire to spare wilderness.

"It is unfortunate that the permit was denied on a technicality," she said.

"It all comes down to money because it wasn't economically feasible for the company to go in and do this work."

Granite in the quarry was relatively low-value, but if the area contained diamonds or palladium, a mine might still have been viable.

"The natural ecosystem is worth more than gold or diamonds," she said.

But Dave Comba, director of issues management for the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada, a mining industry group that represents the mineral exploration and development industry, said Ontario's decision is evidence the environmental lobby has too much influence.

He called their opposition to many mining claims "overly simplistic."

The opposition to the mine was in part over the possible loss of habitat for prickly pears, which were not located on the site to be quarried and not believed to be native to the area, and over a type of skink that is not endangered in Ontario, he said.

The loss of the quarry will also hurt the area economically, he said.

It would also have provided Canadian manu-

facturers a source of domestic granite whose quality is as good as that now being imported, he said, adding that the type of mining would not have resulted in environmental degradation such as acid runoff.

"People somewhere else will be glad for these jobs," said Comba, a Queen's graduate who has a cottage north of the city. But Joan Kuyek, national co-ordinator of the Ottawa-based Mining Watch, said mining is not the economic engine that it once was.

"There are now fewer than 30,000 miners in Canada," she said.

"When I moved to Sudbury in 1970, there were 30,000 miners just in that city. ... Mining has always been treated as though it was the best use of land, but wilderness and water are important in themselves."

She called the Mellon Lake decision a victory for the grassroots environmentalists who turned the proposed quarry into an international cause through Web sites and publicity. Local efforts to rally support turned into a flood of more than 1,000 letters to the natural resources ministry by people around the world after the cause was taken up and publicized by environmental groups and individuals.

However, the government did not turn down the Palu application on environmental grounds, Kuyek pointed out.

"The mining lobby in Ontario is incredibly strong and [the government] didn't want to set a precedent on environmental grounds." There will be more conflicts in the future as mining companies are able to pull minerals out of the ground using new technologies that allow them to work sites previously considered unviable, Kuyek predicted.

That will set up more conflicts with landowners and environmentalists similar to that of Mellon Lake.

But prospectors and environmental groups say there is a glimmer of hope.

Environmentalists and the Ontario Prospectors

Association have already held meetings to discuss the conflicts and have sent a joint letter to the Ontario government asking the government to consult them before laying down any new parks or protected areas.

Clark said if the two groups can agree on what the boundaries of future parks should be, the prospectors would not see mineral-rich land being put within the confines of a park and environmentalists would not see parks targeted for resource extraction.

Leadbitter said another proposal is to pay off claims in protected areas that had been staked prior to the Living Legacy program, thus clearing the land of possible future mines.

"It might be unrealistic in all cases, but we're pushing to eliminate all the claims," he said.

"There might be some sites in some parks where we might be able to negotiate an agreement."

Stewardship of Crown Land Source of Concern Chronicle -Journal Letters 31 August 2002

Ever since the Ontario government developed several new restrictive road travel policies, including the Remote Tourism Policy, many northern residents are beginning to feel the restrictive effects of it.

According to many of the speakers at a meeting held in Thunder Bay on July 6, many of the bush roads on Crown land have been gated and several more are scheduled in to be gated to provide near exclusive remoteness for commercial fishing and hunting camps.

The meeting was arranged by a mix of concerned resident stakeholders, mainly members of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and the Ontario Prospectors Association, coming from across Northern Ontario from Ear Falls to Elk Lake. Also invited were delegates from the MNR, MTR and NOTO to hear concerns and help correct the injustices.

One of the main sore points of discussion was the Resource Stewardship Agreements (RSA) developed by the MNR, and exclusive business to business formal agreement between the timber companies and the tourist operators with interests on common Crown lands.

The vast majority of residents attending the meeting objected very strongly to the current RSA process where all other stakeholders have been virtually eliminated from any meaningful participation in Crown land access issues and resource management decisions. Many believe that the RSA process in its present state is only a thinly disguised privatization of Crown lands for remote tourism, and has no resemblance to the multi-partner stewardship agreements widely used in southern parts of Ontario.

The value of direct revenue that will be collected by the Ontario government for the large blocks of land that are being proposed as remote tourism areas were also being questioned. Is the public getting a fair return for what they are giving up? The loss of timber revenue from the unharvested and unmanaged mature timber that goes to waste and becomes a fire hazard around the "protected" tourism areas and the regeneration of undesirable forest cover was also pointed out.

A clear message was given to the invited guests that representatives from the various communities throughout the North must be included as equal partners in the RSA process and any other decision making bodies involving Crown land access and resource management from the beginning of any negotiations.

The next meeting is scheduled for October in Thunder Bay.

Signed

I.J. RIIVES

August 19, 2002

The Honourable Jim Wilson,
Minister of Northern Development and
Mines,
99 Wellesley Street West,
Room 5630 Whitney Block,
Toronto, ON.
M7A 1W3.

Re: Application of Provincially Significant Mineral Potential (PSMP) Criteria to Ontario's Living Legacy (OLL) Sites.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Thank you for your letter of May 22, responding to my April 16 letter regarding your Government's decision to withdraw the application of the PSMP process to newly created Conservation Reserves and Parks.

I had hoped for a more reflective response than the Party Line you gave me. Your response completely fails to give me confidence that a balanced approach to mineral exploration will be taken in the future.

In your own words, "The mineral sector's attempts to work within these protected sites would continually and constantly be challenged other key stakeholders and the public. A decision was therefore made that no new exploration will be allowed within those parts of new parks and conservation reserves that do not have pre-existing mining land holdings."

Does your Government think that the mineral sector's attempts to work anywhere will not be challenged by other stakeholders? On the basis of what you have written to me, the Government's position in such a situation will be to disallow exploration and mining because of the likelihood of continual and constant challenges by other stakeholders.

You rightly identify the "...difficulty of reconciling mineral exploration and mining in new parks..." Many new parks protect values that are abundant and widespread elsewhere, so it may be pre-

sumed that coming to terms with mineral exploration and mining in general will be difficult. It is also difficult to reconcile the construction of a car plant with existing rural values, or a new subdivision with agricultural land, but that hasn't stopped officials and politicians from authorizing and endorsing such developments.

I understand that you consider it "vital... [to] focus on moving forward..." because that would effectively imply the mineral industry's acquiescence to your Government's about-face. It is difficult to believe that similar reversals will not occur in the future, without some clear policy statement to the public at large that mineral exploration and mining are acceptable and essential components of land use in this province, and that both activities will be supported by the Government. Regulations are in place to ensure that these activities are conducted in an environmentally sound manner.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Marmont.

Member, PSMP Advisory Committee, Industrial Minerals.

DO NOT FORGET OUR WEBSITE HAS A PROPERTY EXCHANGE FOR MEMBERS TO ADVERTISE THEIR PROPERTIES FOR OPTION. WE HAVE HAD SUCCESSFUL ADVERTISERS.

**Third International Conference on
Large Meteorite Impacts**

Nördlingen, Germany - August 5 - 7, 2003

Sponsors

Lunar and Planetary Institute
Stadt Nördlingen
Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany
University of Münster, Germany
Märker Zementwerke AG, Harburg, Ries
Meteoritical Society

Purpose of Conference

The conference, (formerly "Large Meteorite Impact and Planetary Evolution") will bring together researchers working on a wide range of aspects of impact cratering with emphasis on large terrestrial and planetary impact structures and how they influenced planet formation and evolution. Of special, but not only, interest are new observations and interpretations obtained from studies of the three very large terrestrial structures – Chicxulub, Sudbury and Vredefort. More specifically, contributions dealing with the following aspects are invited:

Impacts and Earth evolution

Impact structures and climate change

The role of target volatiles

Formation of melt sheets, melt breccias, and impact glasses in crystalline and sedimentary targets - Melt sheets and melt breccias within the impactite sequence

Mass-movement of subsurface materials as revealed by macroscopic and microscopic observations from crater floors, mega-block zones, central uplifts, peak rings, and collar rocks.

Impacts in marine environments

Impacts on other planets

Material response to hypervelocity impact – shock metamorphism

Geophysical signatures of planetary impacts

Economic significance of impacts

Experimental and numerical studies

Proceedings Volume

A proceedings volume presenting the results of the conference will be produced as a GSA Special Paper or similar.

Travel Assistance

Moderate funds will be made available to students and recent graduates and PhDs who present results dealing with the topic of the conference. Students from developing countries are specifically encouraged to apply.

Schedule

December 15, 2002: Indication of interest forms due to Lunar and Planetary Institute

January 31, 2003: Second announcement, call for abstracts and preregistration available on LPI Web site. Information on hotel accommodation, travel to Nördlingen, etc.

March 1, 2003: Application for travel assistance including preliminary abstract of grant applicants

May 1, 2003: Deadline for electronic submission of abstracts

May 31, 2003: Final announcement, preliminary program and abstracts available on LPI Web site.

June 15, 2003: Preregistration deadline

August 3-4, 2003: Pre-conference field trip to Ries impact crater (in conjunction with Meteoritical Society field trip)

August 5-7, 2003: Conference in Nördlingen

August 8-9, 2002: Post-conference field trip, Ries and Steinheim impact crater

Guest Program:

Mediaeval Nördlingen is a beautiful city offering guided and self-guided walking tours to the city wall, churches and other interesting buildings. Day tours by bus to several, other mediaeval towns nearby will be offered depending on demand.

Contacts:

Burkhard Dressler or Thomas Kenkmann
e-mail: burkhard_dressler@attcanada.net
thomas.kenkmann@rz.hu-berlin.de

after October 1, 2002:

dressler@lpi.usra.edu

Michael Schieber

rieskratermuseum@noerdlingen.de

LOOKING FOR ASSISTANCE

I'm gathering some background on my grandfather John C Adamson.

Wondered if you might be able to tell me whether or not he was a member of your organization. He was President of Lakeshore Mine in Kirkland Lake and also had done some prospecting work in the Sioux Lookout area in the late 1920's.

Any help would be appreciated.

John C, Adamson, CFP
Manager - Wealth Management Services
St. Willibrord Community Credit Union
167 Central Ave, 2nd Floor
London, ON
N6A 1M6

Phone: 519-672-0130 Ext.410
Fax: 519-672-8040

NEWS RELEASE

NORTHERN PROSPECTORS ASSOCIATION
SEPTEMBER 6,
2002

PROSPECTORS SUE MNR FOR 3 MILLION

Three Thunder Bay prospectors have filed a statement of claim in Superior court claiming 3 million dollars damages as a result of the Ontario Living Legacy/Lands for Life process. The prospectors held a group of mining claims in the Nipigon area that were designated as parkland in the biggest park creation exercise ever to take place in Ontario. Subsequent to the designation, the exploration company that held an option on the property abandoned the claims.

This latest development is part of an ongoing battle between the exploration industry and the Ontario government over the effects of the Living Legacy park creation process. Prospectors have contended that the creation of new parks over their pre-existing mining claims has created an encumbrance that has seriously affected their ability to option the claims or to maintain existing options. Once a group of claims has been "parked", they say, future development proposals will be fraught with objections by environmentalists who oppose mining. Such opposition could be costly to fight and might result in the defeat of the proposal. Mining companies are reluctant to spend exploration money on such properties due to the unpredictable and possibly catastrophic risk attached to development in these areas.

The Ontario Government, however, contin-

ues to wallow in denial. They contend that everything is "business as usual" on "parked" claims. The government has refused to admit that they have caused any damages to the exploration community because they are unwilling to pay compensation. The Living Legacy process has been a nightmare for the exploration community since its inception. Instead of creating certainty as claimed by the MNR, it has been a long story of flip-flops and broken promises. The exploration community has tried to participate in good faith but appear to have reached the end of their patience.

Twelve other parties have filed notices of intent to sue the MNR and MNDM over the Living Legacy fiasco. These new lawsuits could amount to several million dollars over and above the 3 million dollar suit filed last week in Thunder Bay. In the recent similar Robinson case, Judge Pierre D.Brunelle stated:" ...I have no choice but to find the Plaintiff's (Robinson's) two mining claims are now worthless and he is entitled to compensation for his portion of the claim."

Mike Leahy, Director of the NPA, says that all this would go away if the government would admit it has caused damages and enter into negotiations that would result in a fair compensation package for the affected parties.

Contact Mike Leahy at 705-642-1982 for further information

August 21, 2002

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The Ontario Prospectors Association is pleased to announce that Wally Rayner has been contracted to the position of Program Director for the Lake Nipigon

Region Geoscience Initiative.

The Lake Nipigon Region Geoscience Initiative is a \$ 7.0 million dollar project aimed at attracting mineral investment to the area of Lake Nipigon. The Ontario Prospectors Association portion of the project is funded by through an agreement with the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund. The Ontario Prospectors Association is partnering with the Ontario Geological Survey, private sector partners, Lakehead University and communities in the Lake Nipigon area. The project will develop a comprehensive geoscience data base that will assist mineral explorers in their search for Copper, Nickel, Platinum Group Metals and Copper–Gold rich mineral deposits.

The Initiative will commence immediately with community and industry consultations to help define the perimeters of the project. A thorough compilation of previous exploration and geoscience data will provide a baseline for the project and identify potential gaps in the geological database.

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.

For Further information please contact:

Wally Rayner
Program Director
Lake Nipigon Initiative
(807) 622-3284

**ONTARIO EXPLORATION & GEO-
SCIENCE SYMPOSIUM**

**“ONTARIO: AN INFINITE EXPLORATION TARGET”
DECEMBER 2, 3, 4, 2002
Macdonald Block,
900 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario, Canada**

The Ontario Exploration and Geoscience Symposium (OEGS) will be held in Toronto on December 2, 3, 4, 2002. The Ontario Prospectors Association is planning a series of workshops, speakers, booths and posters designed to draw the Ontario exploration community together and share in the latest knowledge and exploration successes.

This year we will highlight the most recent exploration and OGS results from around the province. Some of the highlights will include the resurgence of Gold exploration in Red Lake and Timmins and the recently released Operation Treasure Hunt results.

We welcome you to attend and to participate. Space for displays, speaker and sponsorship opportunities are available for you or your organization to present your findings. The OPA looks for your support and your participation.

If you have any suggestions for workshops that you would like presented, please email or call the OPA office (807-622-3284) with your idea(s) and we will consider your submission(s).

**INFORMATION ON BOOTHS,
SPEAKERS, POSTERS AND
SPONSORSHIP OPPORTUNITIES
ARE AVAILABLE AT**

<http://www.ontarioprospectors.com> or
oegs@ontarioprospectors.com

Ontario Prospector's Association
Explosives Supplier Survey
Companies found in the yellow
pages under Explosives

Questions:

- 1) Do you sell explosives to prospectors/ mineral explorationists?
- 2) Do you sell small quantities (less than 2 boxes)?
- 3) Do you sell magna pak or equivalent?
- 4) Do you use 90- day purchase and possession permits?
- 5) What requirements do you need from a prospector?
 - A background check and or letter from the O.P.P?
 - A Transportation Of Dangerous Goods Certificate?
 - A magazine license?

Dyno-Nobel Ltd 705-693-2752
1000 O'Neil Dr. W,
Garcon, ON
P3L 1L5

- Yes, they do sell some explosives to prospectors.
- Yes, they do sell in small quantities.
- They sell an equivalent to Magna Frac.
- They do issue 90-day purchase and possession permits after the background check is performed by the O. P.P.
- They require the following from a prospector:
 - Letter of clearance from the O.P.P. (the standard form).
 - A Transportation of Dangerous Goods Certificate is not required when purchasing

quantities of 25kg or less. If purchasing more than 25kg, a certificate is required.

- A magazine license is not required if purchasing one days supply of explosives. If purchasing more than one days supply a magazine license may be required.

ETI Canada Inc 705-472-1300
350 Dupont Rd.
North Bay, ON
P1B 8K2

- No, they do not sell explosives to prospectors.

Edwards CJ & Son Limited
807-468-9891 Contact: Wendy
Lakeside Beach,
Kenora, ON
P1B 8K2

- Yes, they do sell explosives to prospectors.
- Yes, they sell small quantities. They sell explosives by the stick (12x16 and 1x8) and they sell powder.
- No they do not carry Magna Pak or an equivalent.
- Yes, they use 90-day purchase and possession permits.
- They require from a prospector:
 - A letter from the O.P.P
 - One days notice (in order to get the order ready).
 - A Transportation of Dangerous Goods Certificate would help as she has

forms to fill out.

- A prospector's ticket.
- A magazine license is not required right now- but the laws are changing.

ETI Canada Inc.
807-229-8599
17 Godfrey Dr.,
Marathon, ON
P0T 2E0

- No answer. Left a message on the answering machine. They have not returned the call yet.

McCracken RC Explosives Co Ltd 705-652-3404 Contact: Rick Wilford
15 Clementi
Lakefield, ON
K0L 2H0

- Yes, they do sell to prospectors.
- Yes, they do sell small quantities.
- No, they do not sell Magna Pak or an equivalent.
- Yes, they do use 90-day permits.
- The following is required from a prospector:
 - A background check performed by their local O.P.P.
 - Identification.
 - A Transportation of Dangerous Goods Certificate is not required when purchasing 25kg or less of explosives. If purchasing more than 25kg, a certificate is required.
 - A magazine license is not required when purchasing 25kg or less of explosives. If purchasing more than 25kg, a magazine license is required.

Nordex Explosives Ltd
705-264-1255 Contact: Joe
BOX 790
Kirkland Lake, ON
P2N 3K4

- Yes, they do sell explosives to prospectors.
- Yes, they do sell in quantities of two boxes or less.
- They do not carry Magna Pak; but they do carry an equivalent- Magna Frac (colon pak????).
- They have not used 90-day permits.
- They require from a prospector:
 - A prospector's license.
 - Identification.
 - A background check with the O.P.P.
 - A Transportation Of Dangerous Goods Certificate.
 - A magazine license.

Orica Canada Inc.
705-264-1255 Contact: Nancy
6 First Ave
Timmins, ON
P4N 1E2
Contact: Stephan Marineau (manager)
705-365-8956

- Yes, they do sell explosives to prospectors.
- Yes, they do sell explosives in quantities of two boxes or less.
- No, they do not carry Magna Pak or an equivalent.
- Yes, they do use 90-day purchase and possession permits.
- They require the following from a prospector:
 - To set up an account prior to the purchase, which can take between one and two weeks.
 - A background check with the O.P.P.

THE OPA DIRECTORS

President – Vivienne Coté
Vice President – Roger Poulin
Secretary – Wally Rayner
Co-Treasurers: Dave Hunt & John Halet
Executive Director: Garry Clark

Committee Appointments:

- *Audit Committee:* Roger Dufresne, Dave Hunt (John Halet Alternate), Bob Komarechka, Ted Shellhorne
- *Membership Committee:* Garry Clark, Garfield Pinkerton, Tor Jensen
- *Symposium Committee:* Roger Poulin, Andrew Tims, Susan Warren, Bill McGuinty, Ray Zalnieriunas
- *Education Committee:* Fred Swanson, Roger Dufresne, Vivienne Coté,
- *Land Use/Access Committee:* Vivienne Coté, Wally Rayner, Bob Komarechka, John Halet
- *Issue Resolution:* Vivienne Coté, Andy Chater (Tor Jensen), Neil Westoll
- *Communications Committee:* Roger Dufresne, Vivienne Coté, Neil Westoll, Garry Clark
- *Finance Committee:* Dave Hunt, John Halet, Garry Clark, Roger Dufresne, Ted Shellhorne

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Group</u> | <u>City</u> | <u>Telephone</u> | <u>Fax</u> | <u>Email</u> |
|--------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| Andy Chater | PDAC | Toronto | 416-360-1974 | 416-360-7193 | teddybear@on.aibn.com |
| Vivienne Coté | SDPA | Sault Ste. Marie | 705-253-3900 | 705-256-8120 | vvivi3@shaw.ca |
| Roger Dufresne | NPA | Kirkland Lake | 705-567-3725 | 705-567-9751 | rdoodoo@ntl.sympatico.ca |
| John Halet | NWOPA | Thunder Bay | 807-475-4142 | | jhalet@tbaytel.net |
| David Hunt | NWOPA | Thunder Bay | 807-345-3171 | 807-345-9546 | dhunt@tbaytel.net |
| Tor Jensen | AT LARGE | Toronto | 416-943-6430 | 416-943-6498 | tjensen@sprott.ca |
| Bob Komarechka | SPDA | Sudbury | 705-673-0873 | 705-673-0873 | bkomar@sympatico.ca |
| Garfield Pinkerton | NPA | Elk Lake | 705-678-2165 | 705-678-2288 | jkate@ntl.sympatico.ca |
| Roger Poulin | SPDA | Val Caron | 705-897-6216 | | rmineral@isys.ca |
| Andrea Rae | SOPA | Brighton | 613-475-5641 | 613-475-4542 | raebrighton@iontranet.ca |
| Wally Rayner | AT LARGE | Toronto | 416-486-9514 | 416-486-0542 | norman.rayner@sympatico.ca |
| Patrick Reid | OMA | Toronto | 416-364-9301 | 416-364-5986 | preid@oma.on.ca |
| Ted Shellhorne | SDPA | Sault Ste. Marie | 705-759-1303 | | tjshellhorne@hotmail.com |
| Fred Swanson | SOPA | Highland Grove | 613-332-3857 | 613-332-3857 | fswanson@bancom.net |
| Frank Tagliamonte | AT LARGE | North Bay | 705-476-2885 | 705-476-3561 | geotag@vianet.on.ca |
| Andre Tims | PPDA | Timmins | 705-268-8063 | | nomex@onlink.net |
| William Waychison | PPDA | Timmins | 705-267-7514 | 705-267-4659 | waychiso@ntl.sympatico.ca |
| Neil Westoll | APGO | Oakville | 905-844-7601 | 905-844-7092 | nwestoll@cogeco.ca |