

## News views and opinions on the mineral exploration scene in Ontario

June 2003 Issue

Date: July 2003

# 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. Its purpose is to share news and information amongst its 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 its members and Directors. The writers accept full ownership of their contributions.*

### **MINING VERSUS SURFACE RIGHTS**

This issue has never been straight-forward but recent events have sharpened the understanding of the Mining Act and may have created solutions without Regulation or Act amendment?

Firstly there are two pieces of data that must be reviewed.

1/ Section 32 of the Mining Act prohibits prospecting and staking on that part of a lot where there is a dwelling, cemetery, public building, garden, orchard, crops that may be damaged. Prospecting and staking can only occur in these areas with the consent of the surface rights holder or by order of the Provincial Mining Recorder or Commissioner. If consent is not given it may mean that the mining claim is invalid or that parts of the mining claim may be excluded.

2/ On the Claim Recording form Part C (3rd page) the Certificate of the Recording Licensee states: **I, the undersigned hereby certify that: 8. There are upon the lands staked, no buildings, clearings or improvements for farming or other purposes except as follows and indicated on the sketch or plan on Part D.**

These two linked pieces effectively have sat silent for decades. Most prospectors didn't know they existed and frankly the MNDM glossed over them also. Recent "Bad Actors" staking in areas of surface rights holders have caused the sharpening of the pencil and a more thorough requirement when claims are filed.

This has come out to catch some stakers off guard. I have to admit, I didn't understand the link until speaking with the Mining Recorders office. I was always aware of Section 32 but the Certificate

places the responsibility on the staker to make the call.

I recommend all prospectors and stakers review the Bulletin section of the MNDM website to get a better understanding of the issue.

[www.mndm.gov.on.ca/MNDM/MINES/LANDS/bulbrd/default\\_e.asp](http://www.mndm.gov.on.ca/MNDM/MINES/LANDS/bulbrd/default_e.asp)

### **EXPANSION OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE YOUR RESPONSE IS REQUIRED SUBJECT: SERVICES AT GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTRES**

In our endeavor to serve our clients better, we would like to extend several of our products and services to our client group via the Government Information Centres. There are 29 Government Information Centres (GICs) located in Northern Ontario. These services could include the following:

- ❖ purchasing claim tags
- ❖ applying and paying for a prospector's licence
- ❖ access to the Mining Lands Web site
- ❖ commissioning of affidavits
- ❖ photocopying
- ❖ faxing
- ❖ 1-800 client courtesy phone

In order that we can determine where our client needs are, it would be appreciated if you would canvass your members and ask them what GIC location they would visit to obtain the products/services noted above.



*We're easy to get a hold of*

Contact the Executive Director: **Garry Clark**

By e-mail: [gjclark@ontarioprospectors.com](mailto:gjclark@ontarioprospectors.com)

Phone: 807-622-3284 Toll Free: 866-259-3727 Fax: 807-622-4156

I have included the URL address which provides more information on our Government Information Centres as well as the location of each Centre.

<http://www.ndm.gov.on.ca/ndd/GIC/GICHome.asp>

Once we have your response, we will work with the Manager and staff of the Government Information Centres to determine which locations will provide this service.

Sincerely,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED BY RON C. GASHINSKI  
AND MAILED JUNE 3, 2003.**

### **WORLD-RENOWNED GEOCHRONOLOGY LAB TO MOVE TO U OF T**

The Jack Satterly Geochronology Laboratory at the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), scheduled to close on June 30, 2003, will instead relocate to the University of Toronto's Department of Geology in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The geochronology laboratory, which was founded in 1975, is highly regarded internationally for its high-precision rock dating, which details major events of earth's history – from the origin of the earth's crust to the role of volcanic activity in the extinction of species.

“This is like having a telescope with a resolving power greater than any other, only it involves time rather than space,” says Professor Steve Scott, chair of U of T's geology department. The Satterly lab has had a rich legacy of discovery, he says, but this is no nostalgic rescue effort for U of T. “The geology department is seizing an opportunity to secure a unique resource for earth science that generates its own research program and can be applied by faculty to resolve important problems in their own fields. Because of its low contamination methods and the experience of its scientific staff, the lab is capable of dating minerals such as zircon with a sensitivity and age resolution that are unmatched anywhere else. The facility shows no signs of abating and it is essential to Canada's leadership in geochronology,” Scott says.

“Valuable mineral deposits formed at specific times in the geological record, so being able to measure the age of prospective rock formations is a significant tool in mineral exploration and new discoveries,” says Richard Sutcliffe, president and chief executive office of URSA Major Minerals Inc. and chair of the

Ontario Geological Survey Advisory Board. “We are very pleased that the lab has found a new home at the University of Toronto and is able to continue this important research.”

The ROM, an agency of the Government of Ontario, first announced plans to stop operating the lab in November, 2002 because of the need to accommodate the Renaissance ROM project. “The Jack Satterly Geochronology Lab's history is one of proud achievement, academic excellence and cutting-edge research,” said William Thorsell, director and chief executive officer of the ROM. “Unfortunately, the retirement of its senior curator, Dr. Tom Krogh, combined with financial constraints, have resulted in a need to find a new home for the lab. Its transfer to the U of T's geology department is an ideal solution which benefits the university and the museum's continuing mineralogy and geology research programs, while ensuring the future of this important facility.”

The scientific staff and equipment of the lab will move to the geology department at U of T this summer where it will be known as the Jack Satterly Geochronology Laboratory at the University of Toronto. Many of the lab's staff are already affiliated with U of T and will continue to be supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council.

“We at the Jack Satterly Geochronology Lab feel privileged to have been able to explore the earth's past through precise dating over the past quarter century,” says Don Davis, director of the lab. “The power of isotopes for helping us understand the development of earth and other planets has only begun to be exploited. As equipment and methods continue to advance there will follow new and surprising revelations about our planet's past and the evolution of life. We are happy that the University of Toronto has given us the opportunity to continue contributing to these discoveries. Much of our past work has been carried out with university students and scientists. We look forward to an even closer collaboration with colleagues in the U of T geology department for many years to come.”

The Satterly Lab has been functioning as an important resource for U of T's geology department for the past 20 years with several of the geology department's faculty and numerous graduate

students and postdoctoral fellows using the facility or output of the lab as an important part of their research. "Moving the lab on site is not only a perfect fit for what we do now. It also opens exciting new opportunities for future research," says Scott.

## MORE OF THE SAME

### River vulnerable in new waterway park

Toronto Star, Saturday July 5th 2003

The problem begins with a deception. The Groundhog River, a premier river in Ontario for sturgeon, has been earmarked by the province for designation as a waterway park. But it won't really be a park. Calling it one is simply government sleight of hand. This is bad news for the public. But, as it turns out, good news for mining companies. The so-called park will consist of a protected buffer, 200 metres wide, along each side of the river. But the river itself, the actual water between the buffers — the only reason for claiming this as a "waterway park" — will not be protected, will not be part of the park. The Groundhog is one of 36 new waterway parks in Ontario, earmarked and under interim protection as they await final regulation. Together with 24 existing waterway parks, they'll cover 911,407 hectares. Like the Groundhog, none of them will include the rivers. This is crazy. Parks are created because areas are considered special. By this token, the buffers are special; the rivers are not. As a result, it'll be against the law to desecrate the buffer zones. But it'll be perfectly okay to treat the river as a sewer as long as you don't pollute the water beyond the limits set for ordinary, run-of-the-mill rivers. Abiding by this state of affairs suits Falconbridge Ltd. just fine. The company wants to establish a mine near the Groundhog River, about 70 kilometres as the crow flies northwest of Timmins. It expects there will be a lot of groundwater seepage into the underground working areas. It wants to pump that water out of the mine, give it rudimentary treatment in a settling pond and then dump it into the river. The river runs north for about 350 kilometres to the Mattagami River, which then runs about 150 kilometres to Moose River, and it runs another 100 kilometres to

James Bay. Falconbridge can pipe its effluent across the Groundhog's buffer zone and into the river because, as luck would have it, the company owns a small mining claim that spans the buffer zones. The claim existed before the river was earmarked as a waterway park. The effluent, when it reaches the river, will contain ammonia, arsenic, cadmium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, nickel, zinc, sulphate and nitrite that weren't fully removed in the

treatment process. However, according to studies commissioned by Falconbridge, the concentrations of all these materials are expected to meet provincial "end of pipe" water quality objectives. Once in the Groundhog River, the contaminants are expected to disperse and be benign,

following the maxim that dilution is the solution to pollution. According to Falconbridge, there are 6 million tonnes of nickel/copper ore to be mined; it will cost \$141.5 million to bring the mine into production; the mine will provide 145 direct jobs; and it will have a life span of 8 1/2 years. The ore will be shipped to the company's Kidd mine, north of Timmins for processing. It was Laurent Robichaud, a Falconbridge millwright, who blew the whistle on the company's plans — and it speaks well for both him and for Falconbridge that the company continues to hold him in high regard. Sue Lendrum, environmental coordinator at the Kidd mine, and John McDonald, project manager for the new mine say his comments are helping them to make the project environmentally responsible. Lendrum says that if Falconbridge gets a final go ahead, she wants Robichaud to help instil a culture of respect for the river among the miners. Robichaud, 52, could have stepped from the pages of a storybook about the age of chivalry. He could be Sir Galahad in search of the Holy Grail. Instead, he is Capitaine of the Club Navigateur La Ronde, which he created, and which is dedicated to protecting the sturgeon. He took a group of us white-water rafting down the Groundhog to see the sturgeon spawning beds. All of us — a Cree chief, two television cameramen, three environmentalists and two local men who helped with the raft — struggled to reconcile the conflict between creation of mining jobs with possible harm to the sturgeon. The big fish spawn near rapids, often at the head

of them, close to a bank where the water is calmer. In 2002, they spawned a short distance upstream from where the Falconbridge effluent would enter the river. The problem, says Robichaud, is that sturgeon don't always spawn in the same place. And if they spawned downstream from the effluent release point, they could be in the middle of a plume of pollutants only partially diluted. He worries, in such a case, it could be disastrous for the fish, and for their eggs. Female sturgeon spawn only once in every four to six years. And males every two to three years. Also, sexual maturity arrives late. With females it is when they are 20 to 30 years old; with males it is when they are 15 to 20 years old. So it's a very slow cycle. Interrupting it leaves a gap that takes time to close. In northern Ontario, they can live for 100 years, grow to two metres in length, and weigh more than 45 kilograms. There's passion in his voice when Robichaud talks about sturgeon, and about this river. It's the only river in northeastern Ontario where there are sturgeon throughout its entire length, he says — with the exception of about 10 kilometres at the headwaters, which are cut off by a dam for a hydroelectric generating station. It's a passion that, as the Capitaine of Club Navigateur, he has taken into Timmins' high schools to talk about sturgeon. "I try to get them in contact with the fish, and the forest, and the river. I feel that the kids are the only ones who will do the right thing someday." He's not against Falconbridge opening a mine. He just wants to be sure that there's no chance sturgeon will suffer. That level of certainty, however, has been lacking, which has been highlighted by the work of a partnership made up of the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the World Wildlife Fund Canada, and the Wildlands League. It hired consultants to assess Falconbridge's assurances that it would be safe to dump effluent in the river. The consultants found the company's effluent treatment plans inadequate. Falconbridge has responded with additional studies, and the partnership also plans to have them assessed. But for Evan Ferrari, director of parks and protected areas for the Wildlands League, the issue is not about the science of cleansing effluent. It is about the philosophy and status of parks. Parks should not be used for dumping waste, he says. Period. It's a tough stand to take. He real-

izes that this would mean the mine probably couldn't be developed. And that in the north, where people are hungry for jobs, that would be viewed as calamitous. But he points out that in the name of increasing efficiency, mining companies have eliminated far more jobs than they have created. The flaw in his argument for banning effluent from the river is that the river is not going to be part of the park. That's the trump card held by Falconbridge. And it can get its effluent to the river by crossing the buffer on its own piece of property. Norm Hardisty, chief of the Moose Cree First Nation, traveled from Moose Factory at the mouth of the Moose River to take the trip. The traditional lands of the Cree, about 6 million hectares in all, extend from James Bay south almost to the mine site. He's worried not only about what Falconbridge will dump into the river, but about the example dumping will set for other companies to follow. "You have to leave the rivers the way they are. Everything has a role, whether it's a river, or a fish, or a bird. Every time you weaken a link in the cycle of life, you endanger everyone and everything. We may not feel the effects immediately. But we will in generations to come." So, to cycle back to the beginning of this story, the problem begins with a park that's not a park. It's the same problem for all waterway parks. The solution, to my mind, is simple. End the absurdity. Make the rivers part of the parks. Declare them to be just as special as the buffer zones. And then require that any effluent reaching the river must be of the same quality as, or better than, the water in the river. Falconbridge and Ministry of the Environment officials say that the technology to economically cleanse effluent to this degree does not yet exist. But if the provincial government set the bar that high, I'll wager they'd find the technology.

*Cameron Smith is an author and environmentalist living in Gananoque, Ont.*

## **Dimension Stone Marketing Opportunity**

### **THE EVENT**

*The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines invites partners to exhibit with us at:*  
StonExpo 2003  
December 4-6, 2003  
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

*StonExpo* is the largest dimension stone show held annually in North America. It is organized and managed by the StonExpo Federation, a non-profit corporation of stone industry trade organizations. Each year attendance at the show is 4000-6000 people. There are usually over 200 exhibitors. Attendees and exhibitors represent all sectors of the stone industry including stone producers, processors, equipment, supply and service companies. Additional show details are available on the show website at [www.stonexpo.com](http://www.stonexpo.com)

### **THE OPPORTUNITY**

MNDM has secured booth space at *StonExpo 2003* in order to promote investment opportunities in Ontario's dimension stone industry. We have a 20' x 20' booth in a prominent location at the show where we will get excellent exposure.

This will be the fourth year we have invited partners to attend the show with us. Our partners from the past shows were very pleased with the display, the show and the business that was generated.

MNDM will design an exhibit that highlights Ontario's stone industry and investment opportunities. We invite industry partners to join us in promoting individual investment opportunities at this show. We will coordinate the overall exhibit, set standards for consistency and assist with design and layout.

MNDM will provide the exhibit framework (exposystems), carpeting and furniture. Based on 6 partners, each partner will have the use of 5 feet (1/2 of a 10 foot exposystem) to display graphics and samples. MNDM will ship graphics and up to 6 samples (50 kg.) per partner.

Partners will be responsible for the cost of shipping and handling larger pieces. Partners will be provided with 2 Exhibitor Badges. Additional badges can be ordered for US\$30.00. Partners will be responsible for all travel, accommodations and meal costs.

Space is available on a first come, first served basis. You can reserve two spaces if desired. Partners will be required to sign an agreement (to follow) and reimburse the Ministry Cdn \$1000.00 to display materials and work in the booth. A deposit of \$500.00 will be required to reserve each space with the balance due October 10, 2003.

To confirm your participation in this event, please advise **Myra Gerow** by **August 29, 2003 at:**

(705) 670-5828 – phone  
(705) 670-5803 – fax  
[myra.gerow@ndm.gov.on.ca](mailto:myra.gerow@ndm.gov.on.ca) – email

**Once confirmation is received, a detailed package of exhibitor information will be forwarded.**

**Cheques made payable to Treasurer of Ontario should be sent to Myra at the address below.**

Contact: Myra Gerow  
*Commodities Coordinator*  
*Ministry of Northern Development & Mines*  
*933 Ramsey Lake Road,*  
*Sudbury, ON P3E 6B5*

Please don't hesitate to contact Myra if you need further information!

### **Partners at StonExpo 2002**

**McLaren's Bay Mica Stone Quarries**  
**Owen Sound Ledgerock Limited**  
**StoneAge Lighting**  
**Attia Quarries**  
**Jeff Parnell Contracting Ltd.**

---

### **OLL DISENTANGLEMENT**

As most of our members know the OPA has been meeting with the Partnership for Public Lands (PPL), NNR and MNDM to try and modify the OLL sites to disentangle some Mining Lands. These meetings have now gone on for approximately 16 months. At first there was some very worried people from both sides of the table. Once we had met and began reviewing the sites a common understanding was quickly developed. We expressed the concern for having access to as much exploration land as possible with parks placed in the lowest potential mineral areas and the PPL wants to have areas of representative protection and avoid mining claims. The PPL continue to reiterate the need to complete the protected areas strategy for Ontario. The OLL disentanglement has got to the point of

recommendations to the Ministers of MNR and MNDM. It is my opinion that the length of time until we have some resolution will be long. The process will involve the review of each site by the MNR regional people to find new sites or trim some sites. The value being protected will have to be assessed to see if it is still providing protection. Then there will need to be some discussion with the Forestry Companies and possibly First Nations. The OPA/PPL letter sent to the Ministers was:

June 26, 2003

Dear Ministers,

This letter is to provide an update of the process to disentangle mineral tenure overlaps from Ontario's Living Legacy (OLL) protected areas. In a joint letter dated March 15<sup>th</sup> 2002, your predecessors had requested that Partnership for Public Lands (PPL) and the Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA) work together to determine recommendations to mediate the conflicting land uses. PPL and OPA have had numerous meetings with each other and with your respective staffs and are now prepared to make recommendations with respect to OLL sites that still have mineral tenure overlaps

The process involved identifying the areas of potential conflicts, requesting maps and data of these areas from MNDM and MNR staff and coming to agreement on potential solutions to the conflicts. At the outset the PPL and OPA determined that there were 107 potential conflicting OLL sites. The use of detailed maps and the review of the sites allowed the categorization of these sites. Of these 107 we determined that most of the apparent overlaps were as a result of mapping differences between MNDM and OMNR data. As a result, currently only 46 of the 107 sites now remain as areas with mineral tenure and protected area overlaps. Attached is the spreadsheet showing the categories in which these sites have been 'binned'. The process has been very fluid to this point with both PPL and OPA becoming more aware of each groups requirements and concerns.

At present we have determined that the sites could be classified as:

- 1 **Relocate:** (27 sites). Review has determined that parts or all of these OLL sites need to be relocated subject to 4 conditions as described by PPL in a June 26<sup>th</sup> letter to John Fisher A/Land Use Planning specialist for OMNR.
- 2 **Disagree:** (19 sites). These sites are areas of conflict that neither OPA nor PPL can currently reach agreement on. The attached spreadsheet indicates the solution opinion of each group. We believe that for these sites that it would be appropriate and helpful for your ministries to assess the problem and suggest possible solutions.

PPL and OPA would like to express our desire for this process to continue to move forward as quickly as possible. We appreciate the chance to work cooperatively with both OMNR and MNDM, and look forward to continuing to do so in the future. Both groups believe that working on land use issues early in the planning process will prevent problems like this in the future. Thank you for your interest in helping resolve this complex issue

Yours sincerely,  
Garry Clark, OPA  
Gregor Beck, PPL

---

The following is an excerpt from the Federation of Ontario Naturalists Report Card on the OLL progress. (Full text located at: [http://www.ontarionature.org/conservation/protected\\_areas/reports.html](http://www.ontarionature.org/conservation/protected_areas/reports.html))

#### **“Mining and Prospecting Issues**

When 378 new protected areas covering 2.4 million hectares were added to Ontario's protected areas system, it was inevitable that a lot of work would be needed to finish the job and get all sites regulated and officially gazetted. One of the major challenges has been the mining claims, leases, and patents that pre-dated the Ontario's Living Legacy announcement in spring 1999 and overlapped some of the proposed new protected areas. Over the past year FON has worked to develop a process to identify, categorize, and mitigate any pre-existing mineral tenure issues in OLL sites.

FON and PPL have developed productive working relationships with the Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA) and the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM) to achieve positive outcomes that do not compromise the ecological values or integrity of the OLL sites. Given the historic animosity between the conservation community and provincial mining interests, this cooperative approach to resolving the conflicts has been noted by government staff to be a

precedent in land-use planning in Ontario.

FON analyses of conservation and mineral values yielded 100 OLL sites that showed probable overlap with mineral tenure. FON and OPA agreed to work together to develop a method to address the issues associated with these sites and report back to government on the results. The methodology that was subsequently developed enabled OLL sites with mineral tenure issues to be categorized and then addressed through follow-up actions.

To date, all parties have worked cooperatively through this process. While discussions are still ongoing, approximately 40 of the 100 sites are now listed as "solved," meaning that mapping clarification has revealed no mineral tenure issues in these sites. After some initial reluctance to participate, OMNR and MNDM have provided resources and demonstrated the will to finish this process in a way that ensures that mineral interests will minimally impact OLL sites. With the encouragement of both ministers, it is anticipated that fair and environmentally sound solutions for each of the 100 sites should be established by fall 2003."

Thanks to Paul Leadbitter of Federation of Ontario Naturalists for the text version.

## **Ore Deposits at Depth: Challenges & Opportunities**

"This field conference will focus on the exploration and geotechnical problems associated with exploring for and mining deep ore bodies and will lead to a broader understanding of advances in technology that now make this feasible."

Hosted by

**Geological Society of the CIM  
&  
Porcupine Prospector and Developers  
Association  
September 23-26, 2003  
McIntyre Community Centre  
Timmins, Ontario, Canada**

Check <http://www.fieldconference-timmins.com>  
for details.

## **SOPA ELECTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR 2003-2004**

In accordance with the constitution of SOPA, the Restructuring Committee is asking the membership to support the election of the following persons to the 2003-2004 SOPA Board of Directors:

Mr. John McCance, P.Eng, Geophysics,  
Kingston  
Mr. Joseph Barr, Land Development  
Consultant, Kingston  
Mrs. Celia Papertzian, Geologist, Madoc  
Mr. Bob Ross, Geologist, Prospector,  
Belleville  
Mr. C. James Laidlaw, Geological Technician,  
Prospector, Madoc  
Mrs. Andrea Rae, Geologist, Gemmologist,  
Prospector, Brighton

If you accept the above nominated Board then no actions are required on your part and accept this notification of the new Board of Directors, 2003-2004, effective June 24, 2003.

For any comments or queries please contact Andrea Rae no later than June 22, 2003 at:  
Post: RR#3, Brighton, Ontario K0H 1H0  
E-mail: [johnrae@magma.ca](mailto:johnrae@magma.ca)  
Fax: 613-475-4542

SOPA Restructuring Committee

**Prospectors....Feel a little boulder every day!**

---

### **MNDM TRIVIA**

The CLAIMap System has downloaded up to 800 maps per hour.

The ERMES system has approximately 40 users per month.

---

**REMEMBER OPA POSTS YOUR PROPERTIES ON OUR WEBSITE FOR FREE**

---

***Ontario Prospectors Association***  
2003 ONTARIO EXPLORATION AND GEOSCIENCE SYMPOSIUM  
December 8, 9 & 10, Delta Chelsea, Toronto, Ontario

**Registration**

Registration Form (pdf & word format available)

Registration Fees:

- \$200.00 BEFORE NOVEMBER 17/03
- \$225.00 AFTER NOVEMBER 17/03

Registration includes: 2004 OPA membership, Lunch on Tuesday & Wednesday (December 9 & 10), A continental breakfast Wednesday December 10<sup>th</sup> and an Evening Reception on Tuesday, December 9<sup>th</sup>

**Exhibit**

Poster Display (pdf & word format available)

- \$325.00 POSTER PRICE
- \$225.00 PROSPECTOR RATE

Booth Display (pdf & word format available)

- \$600.00

Above prices above include applicable taxes

Forms will be posted on website by the end of July

**Accommodations**

The Delta Chelsea offers convention rates for delegates attending the  
2003 Ontario Exploration & Geoscience Symposium

Delta Room: \$129.00 (Single & Double Rate, plus applicable taxes)

\$159.00 (Triple Rate, plus applicable taxes)

**Deadline to book a room: November 17, 2003**

To take advantage of these rates, simply contact directly and identify  
you are with the OEGS:

Delta Chelsea  
Reservations Department  
33 Gerrard Street West  
Toronto, ON M5G 1A24  
Telephone: 1-800 CHELSEA (1-800-243-5732)

**Sponsors**

Accentuate your presence by obtaining beneficial exposure  
through a sponsorship.

For more information:

Ontario Prospectors Association

Telephone: 1-888-259-3727 (807-622-3284)

Email: [oegs@ontarioprospectors.com](mailto:oegs@ontarioprospectors.com)