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.

THE 2003 TORONTO SYMPOSIUM

The Toronto show was a huge success this year. We moved from the MacDonald Block to the Chelsea and all participants complimented us on the move. The speakers had great reviews with over 50 talks in the two rooms. The presentations had better audio visual and sound systems which meant there were no poor seats in either room.

This year’s show was a collaboration with Canadian Exploration Geophysics Society (KEGS) which created a very balanced exploration show. There was a total of 40 booths and 40 posters setup in two rooms and courtyard area.

Attendance grew this year to over 400 approximately 120 more people then last year.

The OPA staff is now starting to assist the Sudbury Prospectors and Developers and North Western Ontario Prospectors Association with their shows April 13th and 14th and April 6th and 7th, respectively.

The OPA would like to thank all sponsors, speakers, exhibitors and participants of the Toronto Event.

Dear Ducks,

I recently attended a workshop put on by the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) in Toronto. At the workshop, I was presented with a document by the "Green Budget Coalition" that made a number of recommendations to the Canadian government regarding budget policy. In this document was one recommendation that I found somewhat disturbing: "Remove the federal government support for mining exploration in Canada..." I am shocked that DU would be a signatory to such a document after long history of co-operation and sponsorship with the mining industry. I see that the contacts listed at the end of the document are representatives of the Pembina Institute and Mining Watch - two organizations that are, in my opinion, rabidly anti-mining. The text of the document is reminiscent of the flawed logic they have both use to attack mining in the past. I cannot understand how DU would align themselves with such radical groups.

I was one of the original DU committee members in Kirkland Lake and have attended every fundraising dinner since that time. I have been a staunch supporter of DU at every opportunity in my capacity as a Director of the Northern Prospectors Association, and as a member of numerous committees and organizations. My home contains many DU auction items that bear testimony to my ongoing support for your organization. The mining community in Kirkland Lake, and elsewhere, have been strong supporters of DU for many years and have co-operated with DU projects such as the Lakeshore Park (mine tailings pond rehabilitation) in Kirkland Lake. Numerous new reclamation projects are on the drawing board, many containing opportunities for co-operation between DU and the industry to the benefit of all.

With the above in mind, I find it difficult to continue my support for DU after an action which I consider to be a betrayal of our long established relationship. If you feel that being a signatory to the above-mentioned document was a mistake on the part of DU, I would love to hear from you and would be glad to have your response published in
our newsletter so that my colleagues would be reassured that their support of DU was not misplaced.

Yours truly,

Michael Leahy

Dear Michael,

Please forgive our delay in responding to your email of September 23, 2003.

It fell between the electronic cracks for a while. As someone who has been one of our supporters for 15 years, you deserved a quicker response.

The Green Budget Coalition (GBC) is a non-partisan, non-political organization like DUC and is composed of 17 of Canada's leading environmental and conservation organizations. We were a founding member in 1999, and I have represented our company on the coalition since I joined DUC in December 1999. In fact, the genesis of the coalition was the Hon. Paul Martin as Minister of Finance.

As you may have observed, the Coalition is indeed composed of strange bedfellows. Welcome to the world of politics! I remember my first coalition meeting when I was told that all 'DUC wants to do is grow more ducks to shoot'. Coalition members now know and respect that we are more than ducks, and that our partner relationship with most of them has been greatly enhanced.

In spite of the coalition's diversity, or because of it, depending on how you look at it, we have had a positive impact on the national conservation scene by compromising on GBC priorities that have been brought forward to federal politicians and bureaucrats in the public service, the Prime Minister's Office and the Privy Council Office. This has never happened before where such a diversity of conservation/environmental groups have sung from the same song sheet. As a coalition, we have all had to put some water in our wine as the separate, individual, long standing issues of each member organization were merged into the GBC wish list. The Coalition package is now 50 pages, 14 recommendations divided into four key categories:

1. Ecological Fiscal Reform
2. Clean Air and Climate Change
3. Healthy Communities and Toxics Cleanup
4. Protecting Canada's Natural Heritage

We did not all get our way, not could we pick and choose what initiatives we would or would not support after a consensus was reached. A trust factor had to prevail in order to be successful. The Chairperson, Julie Gelfand, President, Canadian Nature Federation, has shown good leadership and discretion in this area. Some other national organizations want to join the coalition but have been excluded. We may not all fully understand each others initiatives, but we trust each other. This is what has made the coalition work.

And we have been successful. The environmental window for national initiatives is open wider now than it has been in the last 10-12 years. The Coalition is one of the reasons for this, and has had an impact on a number of recent policies such as: funding for the Species At Risk Act; wind power production incentives; home retrofits and public transportation issues under climate change; progress on reducing the use of pesticides; stronger focus on toxic related issues; the creation of many more national parks and protected areas; and reduction of the capital gains tax on the donation of ecologically sensitive lands from 75% to 25%. In fact, on this issue, Tod Wright, a Past President of DUC and I met with the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff, Jean Pelletier, in January 2001.

The DUC's Conservation Cover Incentive Program was in the coalition package endorsed by all, but we had it removed after the government announced on July 12th 2002, the Greencover Canada initiative of $110m over five years (with more to follow). In fact, some of these monies have recently been approved by Agriculture and AgriFood Canada in partnership with DUC to do research on some targeted benchmark watersheds in different regions of Canada.

A senior Deputy Minister recently told the coalition that it had become "essential and indispensable" in helping the government on some priorities.

I hope you find this explanation helpful.

Sincerely,

J. Barry Turner
Ducks Unlimited Canada

MEMBER INQUIRY

I'm just wondering if you could give some information of a Hiskear mine in Black Township my
father-in law was phoned by someone concerning the
mine he inherited the shares from his uncle Jack
Rotz I was wondering if you would be able to give
me any information on Why? and what is going on
with the mine before we contact legal services. You
may contact me by email and I will give the informa-
tion to him. Would you please contact us as soon as
possible

Sincerely
Don Adcoe
Donadcoe@golden.net

OGS POSTERS FROM TORONTO SHOW

Note that all (but one) PGS and SGS posters that
were presented at the OEGS in Toronto can now be
downloaded for free from the OGS web page.
An announcement will be in our January Publica-
tions Release Notice but the posters are available
now. Peter Thompson’s Red Lake Metamorphic
poster is the only one that has not been posted due to
some technical difficulties with the file that we plan
to correct early in the new year.

The URL is:
http://www.mndm.gov.on.ca/mndm/mines/ogs/
posters/default_e.asp

REMEMBER YOU CAN POST YOUR
PROPERTIES FOR SALE OR OPTION FREE
ON THE OPA WEBSITE

THE PROSPECTING FUND FORMS ARE ON
 THE OPA WEBSITE

OLL LETTER

Hon. Rick Bartolucci Liberal MPP

Minister of MNDM

100 Elm Street
Sudbury, ON P3C 1T5
Tel: 705-675-1914 Fax: 705-675-1456

Dear Rick:

Congratulations on your appointment as the Honour-
able Minister of Northern Development and Mines. I
am a local Sudbury area Prospector, and I and others
would like to see a bright economic future for the
people of our North ..... But We need your help!

PGMs (Platinum Group Metals)

Hold the key to a Brighter Future in the Battle for
a Clean Environment.

PGMS Clean the Air we Breathe, and in turn
Protect the Water we Drink and the Wilderness
Forest Lands of our Planet.

These most Precious of Precious Metals Re-
sources should be Protected for Development in
the Conservation of the Worlds Environment

As you know the previous Conservative Government
of this province brought us the Lands for Life round
tables, composed of northern citizens who after ex-
tensive consultations across the North, did in the end,
recommend continued mineral exploration in the
newly suggested protected areas designated as Stew-
ardship Reserves and Conservation Reserves. Such
designations would have enclosed my mining claims
south of the Lake Panache area of Sudbury.

This is an area of extremely high mineral potential
with the recent discoveries of significant assays of
PGMs (Platinum Group Metals) extending over sev-
eral kilometres on and off my properties. These are
crucial elements, about 3 to 5 grams are used inside
the Catalytic converter in your car as well as tens of
millions of automobiles around the world. PGMs or
PGEs (Platinum Group Elements) as some call them
are the only metals that are capable of cleaning up to
95% of the pollutants generated by your car’s en-
gine. Over the past 30 years all other substitute mate-
rials have failed.

Now with the Hydrogen fuel cell automobile on the
road and in the testing phase even greater demand
for PGM’s will develop. The Hydrogen fuel Cell
generates electricity to propel a car by the interaction
of Hydrogen and Oxygen through a proton exchange
membrane catalyst that is coated with between 30
and 50 grams of PGMs. General Motors plans to put
these Zero Emission Vehicles into commercial large
scale production by 2010. This means that only 7
years from now the automobile will require 10 times
the PGMs that a present day car requires in its cata-
lytic converter.

Where in the world are we going to find that amount
of PGMs if we are not allowed to explore the high
potential rocks of the 3rd most important PGM re-
source on the planet. Sudbury and the mafic intrusive
rocks within 100 Kilometres are not only of provin-
cial significance, but of world significance. World
production of PGMs is falling short of present re-
quirements by 5%.

Production of PGM has been falling short of con-
sumption over the past four years, possibly even longer because of the run down of stockpiled PGMs. This stockpiled metal is all but gone and miners of these most precious of precious metals have been desperately trying to increase production.

Experts believe the shortages will continue even with the expansion plans of the largest PGM producers in the world who are located in the Bushveld complex of South Africa and the Norilsk Intrusion of Russia. These two geological regions account for 90% of world PGM production.

The third largest and most important in ground PGM metals resource is located in a region called the Huronian - Nipissing Magmatic belt of Northern Ontario, within this area any mafic intrusive rocks located within 100 Kilometres of Sudbury are considered to be highly prospective for the discovery of PGM. These metals are so rare and so valuable that deposits of only 1.5 parts per million PGM are now considered of economic interest.

Other than the Sudbury Basin itself, Mafic Intrusive rocks of East bull - River Valley and Nipissing ages are considered the most desirable in the search for new sources of PGMs.

In the past, these mineral deposits were ignored by the major Nickel miners, as their base metal content of Nickel and Copper was considered too low grade to be of economic interest. They were more interested in mineralization of the massive sulphide form of the Sudbury Basin and not the barren looking or only lightly mineralized rocks outside of the basin area.

In the 1980's and 90's some geological interest and study concluded that this barren uninteresting rock scattered up to 100 km's outside of the Sudbury basin actually had rich assays in PGMs . With tighter and tighter PGM supplies and a dwindling of stock piles of the former Soviet Union and the Major Industrial consumers of the metals, 3 of the 4 largest foreign producers have now come to the New larger area of interest surrounding the Sudbury District and have started the search for PGMs within, and over an area of up to 100 kms out from the traditional nickel deposits of Sudbury.

Anglo Platinum the largest PGM producer, Implats Platinum the second largest and Lonmin the third largest producer of platinum are here now and investing in this search. Two junior Exploration Companies that are joint ventured with these South African Companies have actually financed and performed work on my claims here at Panache. Their programs were successful and discovered additional PGM mineralization. Pacific Northwest Capital is associated with Anglo Platinum and Lonmin and Mustang Minerals are associated with Implats Platinum.

Now with the Harris - Eves government gone, my claims and the surrounding highly prospective ground surrounding my property are in the final stages of regulation into Park by MNR. This means no future claims staking, no development and no mining. My actual claims have been given the temporary designation of Forest Reserve and will be turned into park as soon as I am unable to continue to find investors to explore and develop the PGM minerals that I know are there. If I do not perform work on the claims they will expire and cannot be restaked.

Once inside the park boundary the land is considered worthless to those who would invest the tens of thousands and eventually millions of dollars in a property to bring it to the production stage. The Fraser Institute in a 2002-2003 Survey of Executives from 158 Mining Companies involved in exploration and mining around the world found that 24 % considered the uncertainty created by the Conservatives parks and wilderness protected areas policies as a strong deterrent to exploration investment in Ontario.

It was a well know fact that the Harris Government, in Toronto Hotel back room meetings with the Environmental groups and some forestry representatives, all broke their promises and threw out all the Lands for Life Round table recommendations. Thus the Politics of the Mike Harris Tory re-election bid for a second term gave rise to the creation of Living Legacy. It was a slap in our faces and proved that we were to be regarded as no better than second class citizens who have no choice but to accept a stagnant economic future and our depopulation and migration to the South. Statistics Canada reports that in the 1996-2001 time period Northern Ontario suffered a population decrease of 39,833 people.

This Living Legacy political document would once again disregard the hopes and dreams of Northerners. A growing economy, jobs, and the opportunities that would go with the recognition and support of what we do best here in the North, the continued exploration and development of our mineral resources. No other industry in the North has the potential to employ more people in higher paying jobs than the mineral industry.
Even more recently the Harris - Eves government came to the realisation that their banishment of highly prospective mineral lands was to have devastating effects on our present and future northern economy. Investor confidence and the future of developing or let alone raising the funds to explore and finding an ore body were severely affected. But then again it was not long before, in an act of desperation to boost their popularity polls with the electorate of the heavily populated South they broke another promise to the exploration and mine development community.

The Minister of Northern Development and Mines and the Minister of Natural Resources threw out their own proposal to reinstate mineral exploration in geologic areas of "Provincially Significant Mineral Potential" within areas parked by their Living Legacy.

Now your Government is left with the conundrum. Continue the Conservative policy of regulating the remaining 102 of the 378 new parked areas against the wishes of Northerners, completing the Conservatives banishment of prospecting and mining in the largest land sterilization of high mineral potential areas in the history of Ontario. To seal the future of the North to an era of economic uncertainty. The loss of thousands of future good paying job prospects, further declines and exodus of our northern population.

"OR"

Declare a moratorium and stop the Tory Living Legacy of Regulating Parks on top of high mineral potential areas, existing claims and mines. Mr. Ramsay himself stated on the news that the MNR has control over 89% of the land mass of Ontario. I am sure we can find some portion for parks that will not negatively impact or overlap our high mineral potential lands and mines of the future.

You had once written a letter to me Rick and shared with me your thoughts on the Conservatives’ mishandling of this issue. You said that due to the anxiety and confusion created, that there were no winners in this process. I realize that you were the MNDM critic at the time and like all of us had the sense of speaking into deaf Tory ears, They never did have any intention of listening or compromising. They were dishonest people, who continually broke promise after promise. It was their way no matter what.

Even today I fear that MNDM and MNR are still going forward with the Harris - Eves agenda. Now that you and your colleague Mr. Ramsay are the new Honourable Ministers of MNDM and MNR, I hope and I do believe that you feel as I do and many of our fellow Northerners that this Tory Living Legacy Lunacy must be stopped or at least frozen until the full extent of its socio-economic consequences are fully appreciated and recognized in any park planning process that may or may not continue under our present Liberal administration.

In closing I would also like to add that I have been researching and putting together a report over the last six years of about 300 pages in length detailing how this living legacy parking of high mineral potential sites and claims within the Sudbury area is such a terrible policy. It affects our economy, and will in the case I have touched on in this letter destroy the Environment by actually preventing us from producing the very PGM minerals that are saving the environment now and even more importantly in the future.

It would be my pleasure to supply you with my documentation and would appreciate discussing this matter with you further. In anticipation of an early reply I remain,

Yours Truly

Gordon Salo

** Ministers Response Next Page**

MINISTERS MINING ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

1. Length of time for a person who inherits a claim to meet Mining Act requirements. There has been a request that the time of exclusion be extended.

2. The area stripped before a closure plan is required is fixed, no matter how large the claim block or how wide spaced the stripping. A request has been made to review the way this is applied.

3. Review of the practice of applying assessment work from a mine to adjoining claims. The request is to provide more clarity to when and what would be accepted as assessment work.

Next meeting is in February. Any issues please forward them to the OPA or your Regional Group so they can be addressed.
NOV 2 7 2003

Mr. Gordon Salo
Box 46, Site 12, RR 1
2005 Northshore Road
Whitefish ON P0M 3E0

Dear Mr. Salo:

Thank you for your fax of October 27, 2003, and the accompanying copy of your letter to the Honourable Rick Bartolucci, Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

With regard to Ontario’s Living Legacy parks which are on top of areas of high mineral potential or have existing claims or mines, the government does not regulate any protected areas on lands with existing mining tenure. However, I recognize that there are concerns about situations where recommended protected areas overlay existing mining tenure. Both the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines have been working with the Ontario Prospectors Association and other groups to try to identify possible site-specific solutions to this issue. I am hopeful that this work will resolve a substantial number of concerns.

You have raised a number of important issues related to the potential impacts of protected areas on mineral exploration and development. These issues will require careful consideration and further consultation with stakeholders.

Our government is aware of the important role that the mineral sector plays in Ontario’s northern economy, as well as the important role of protected areas. A balanced approach that considers a wide range of interests is essential in addressing the issues that you have raised.

Again, thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

Hon. David Ramsay
Minister

c: The Honourable Rick Bartolucci, Minister of Northern Development and Mines
Ontario’s Shrinking Exploration Landbase
by: Bob Komarechka, Sudbury Prospectors and Developers Association

In the past several years the Ontario government has implemented a major change in its policies for its provincial crown land through the Lands for Life Process. This process has, in addition to creating more parks, also created a whole myriad of land designations which can limit or prohibit mineral exploration over significant areas in this province.

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

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

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

Proposed designations are then merged and restricted to areas lacking any existing uses.

### Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ontario's Living Legacy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>% Crown</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td># Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,199,313</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15,246</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42,479</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin recreation/utilization zones</td>
<td>-591,129</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-591,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>667,297</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>376,855</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>196,500</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>573,355</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1,240,652</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14,122</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - natural heritage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50,753</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - remote access</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>492,105</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - Great Lakes coastal area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,816</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - fish and wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - recreation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>547,572</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - intensive forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Management Areas - TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,118,246</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>5,733,648</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,027,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crown Land</td>
<td>6,992,074</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,992,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>3,462,847</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,462,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,454,921</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,454,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points of Clarification:**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Ontario's Living Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>213,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>403,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)***</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>237,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>513,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>750,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>403,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - natural heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - remote access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - Great Lakes coastal area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - fish and wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - intensive forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Management Areas - TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>12,994,134</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crown Land</td>
<td>13,397,270</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>1,445,734</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,843,004</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points of Clarification:
* includes 1 provincial park partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence. In the Ontario's Living Legacy option, existing park area reflects the proposed partial deregulation of Abitibi De Troyes provincial park.
** includes 1 unregulated conservation reserve in the Temagami Comprehensive Land Use Planning area
*** includes 5 proposed provincial parks partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence.
**** includes 2 proposed conservation reserves partially in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and 1 partially in Boreal West

### Boreal West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Ontario's Living Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,939,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,941,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>321,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>764,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Protected Areas</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,085,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen above some areas have suffered more than others in this exercise which continues through Living Legacy. It can only be hoped that the reduction of the available crown land for mineral exploration will not mean a comparable reduction in new mineral discoveries.

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

The previous 3 tables have been summarized in this last table which covers the complete study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lands for Life Planning Area</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Ontario's Living Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td># Sites</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks (existing)*</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,352,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (existing)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (unregulated)**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin recreation/utilization zones</td>
<td>-591,129</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Protected Areas</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3,011,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Parks and Additions (new)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>935,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserves (new)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,473,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Protected Areas</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2,409,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed &amp; Existing Protected</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3,011,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Reserves</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - natural heritage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - remote access</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>619,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Acres (hectares)</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - Great Lakes coastal area</td>
<td>3 53,720</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - fish and wildlife</td>
<td>4 208,085</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - recreation</td>
<td>20 677,374</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - resource-based tourism</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA - intensive forestry</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Management Areas - TOTAL</td>
<td>86 1,609,640</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Areas</td>
<td>35,461,078</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crown Land</td>
<td>39,064,032</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Federal Lands</td>
<td>6,060,825</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,124,857</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points of Clarification:**

* In the Ontario's Living Legacy option, existing park area reflects the proposed partial deregulation of Abitibi De Troyes provincial park in Boreal East
**includes 10 unregulated conservation reserves in the Temagami Comprehensive Land Use Planning area.

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

The potential exists for this process to go beyond just mineral exploration, the constraints on accessibility can ultimately lead to onerous user fees for our outdoor recreational activities as well. We must be vigilant on this issue. Jobs in the north for northerners depend on it.
A MONUMENT TO GLOBAL WARMING

THE TAY TOWNSHIP GLACIAL ERRATIC

SIMCOE COUNTY ONTARIO

By

James D.H. McCannell Port McNicoll, Ont,
April 2003
For several years, the writer has been aware of a very large boulder in Tay Township and finally located and examined the rock in October 2002. To refer to this curiosity as a large boulder is an understatement, in actuality it measures 85.5 feet in horizontal circumference and has an estimated weight of 280 tons. As it is not truly spherical or ellipsoidal it is not possible to apply a mathematical formula to calculate the true volume of the rock but the above figure, based on careful measurements, is believed to be a reasonable estimate of the weight.

The boulder is on the property of W.J. Hunter and is located 3 kilometers or 1.8 miles south of highway 12 on the sixth line of Tay Township and 75 feet east of the road. A second large boulder, about two thirds the size of the Tay Township specimen, is located in Medonte-Township 10 kilometers or 6.2 miles to the south. This rock is about 100 feet north of the Moonstone road and 900 feet west of the fifth line.

Over the past sixty years, the writer has traversed several thousand kilometers of the Precambrian Shield at various locations all the way from the Yukon Territory to Labrador and has to admit that these two boulders are the largest glacial transported erratics he has ever encountered. Large pieces of rock dislodged from cliff faces and lying close to their point of origin, are quite common but the Tay and Medonte Township rocks are unique in that they are well rounded and undoubtedly were transported during the recent glacial period for possibly as much as one hundred miles.

The Writer has classified both boulders as Paragneiss as both are highly metamorphosed and exhibit considerable evidence of their original Greywacke sedimentary origin. This rock type is very common in the Grenville Series, an old
formation forming a broad band extending in an east-west direction and well exposed from the east shore of the Georgian Bay through to the Laurentian region of Quebec. This Grenville Series contacts rocks of the Huronian Complex north of Lake Nipissing and to the south, is overlain by rocks of the young Paleozoic sedimentary series.

The theory of continental ice sheets was first proposed by Louis Agassiz, a man of exceptional academic talents. Born in Switzerland in 1807, Agassiz in early life, proved to be a keen student and first took a degree in philosophy at Heidelberg and, when he was 23, graduated in medicine at Munich. His first interests however were in natural history and he spent considerable time studying the action of glaciers in the mountainous regions of central Europe. He soon discovered evidence that the mountain glaciers had formerly spread far out on to the level plains far away from their mountain locations. From this evidence he conceived the idea that all of northern Europe in recent geological time was covered by a thick sheet of glacial ice. The scientific world was at first incredulous but the correctness of his deductions are now firmly established.

In 1846 Dr. Agassiz was invited to deliver a series of lectures in the Lowell Institute Course at Boston, USA. The success of this lecture series induced him to remain in America and continue his studies in Natural History, especially as it related to geology, and expand his theory on continental glaciation. The theory of the recent North American ice sheet has now been well established and further studies have determined that extensive ice build-ups in both the northern and southern hemispheres have been a recurring phenomena down through geologic time.

The end of the last ice age is generally considered to be twenty thousand years ago, but in reality the melting is still in progress in both Polar Regions. Glacier developments are also still in progress at higher altitudes in mountain ranges.
throughout the world, even in equatorial regions such as Kilimanjara in east Africa. Currently, Australia is the only continent free of glaciers.

The only true ice caps or areas of continental glaciation remaining are Greenland and Antarctica. In both cases, the ice caps are massive and possibly in excess of two miles in thickness. In the Arctic, many of the islands in the polar region are completely under ice. Even large islands such as Baffin, Ellesmere, Victoria, Prince of Wales and Devon are ice capped to various degrees. Land areas north of the eightieth parallel of north latitude are obscured by ice and snow. Almost all of the area of Antarctica is south of the seventieth parallel of south latitude and is covered by glacial ice.

During the last ice age, continental glaciation covered most of the planet north of the fortieth parallel of north latitude and south of the fortieth parallel of south latitude. With the exception of the island of Tasmania and the extreme southern part of New Zealand along with a few small islands, the continent of Antarctica is the only significant landmass south of the fortieth parallel of south latitude. In the northern part of the hemisphere however, a considerable part of the landmass occurs north of the fortieth parallel. This includes most of Canada, Europe north of the Mediterranean Sea, and Asia north of the southern limits of the Gobi Desert in central China. This puts close to one half of the land north of the equator in the area covered by the last continental ice sheet. The extent of the coverage during periods of previous continental glaciation cannot be readily determined.

Several theories have been put forth to explain the severe drop in world temperature resulting in the extensive build-up of snow and ice for such a long period of time. None of these theories however, have been universally accepted. With the recent development of technologies permitting a closer examination of space and
planetary movements, and studies in astrophysics, especially as that science relates to cosmic rays and the earth's protective magnetic envelope, research may eventually lead to a generally accepted theory of widespread earth cooling and warming.

The latest period of continental glaciation, which could be approaching its last phase, resulted in extensive changes in the topographical features on the part of North America that now forms Canada. There were three main areas of glacial development; the first in the cordillera region of the west coast, where large masses of glacial ice built up by force of gravity, spread west to where the north Pacific Ocean would have looked much the same as the Arctic Ocean today, and to the east for several hundred miles across the flat area of the central plain. The action of glacial movement in the cordillera region can still be observed today, sometimes even in the form of avalanches.

Two additional areas of ice build-up occurred in the northern part of North America. The first, known as the Keewatin Centre located in the northern part of what is now the Province of Manitoba, and the second, referred to as the Labrador Centre located in Northern Quebec east of Hudson Bay. In both cases the ice caps are estimated to have reached thicknesses of as much as six or seven kilometers. The intense pressure forced the glacial ice to move outwards from the bases of these two crests. The fact that there was a large mass of stationary ice to the north meant that the movement had to be in the direction of least resistance which was to the south, southeast and southwest. In these directions resistance was decreased by melting at the glacial fronts. The continental ice sheets would have included large masses of solid ice encased in granular material that would have permitted the entire mass to move more freely. The moving glacial mass would have wiped off the soil and semi consolidated rocks, rounded the outlines of hills and incorporated much of the material including small rocks and...
large boulders into the continental ice sheets. When the glaciers reached the limits of their respective advances and melting took place, the transported material would be deposited to form terminal moraines, eskers and other glacial features.

The numerous boulder moraines in the region south of Georgian Bay, like that in Tay Township, indicate that this area experienced severe melting over a short period of time. These boulder deposits, frequently containing rocks of twenty tons or more, occur at numerous locations throughout central and southern Ontario and extending west into the state of Michigan and east into the province of Quebec. Almost every type of igneous and sedimentary rock found throughout the Precambrian Shield can be observed in these boulder deposits. Frequently their area of origin can be readily identified such as Lorrain Quartzite from south of Sudbury, Quartz Pebble Conglomerate from the Elliot Lake area, Keweenawan Diabase which occurs in dikes throughout the Shield and many other readily distinguishable rock types.

The exceptionally large Tay and Medonte Township boulders, are evidence of the immense size of the glacial mass which in this area could have been as much as half a kilometer in thickness. This heavy buildup could have been a result of glacial movement similar to overthrust fault action that occurs in geological activity associated with rock structures. Very high planetary temperatures must have followed to melt such an enormous amount of glacial ice.

The only obvious sources for this heat are the sun, the molten core of the planet and chemical action and associated reaction. The cause or causes for this amount of global warming therefore must be associated with one of these sources or possibly influenced by all three. The fact that the continental ice sheets retreated long before any possible human influence leaves many of the current theories put forward to explain global warming, open to question. Much of the cause is now directed to the presence of
carbon dioxide but where this gas is concentrated in the atmosphere is not made completely clear. The amount of carbon dioxide normally present in the gas mixture referred to as air is extremely small, being only 0.03 to 0.04 percent of dry air. It is one of the heavier gases in the atmosphere, one liter weighs 1.98 grams at zero degrees centigrade and 760 millimeters of pressure. This is the standard usually accepted for weighing gases. Normal dry air by comparison, weighs 1.29 grams per liter so it can be readily appreciated that the amount of carbon dioxide present diminishes considerably at even a few thousand feet above sea level. The writer has noted that when working at elevations above twelve thousand feet fauna, even in the form of lichen, is quite sparse as there is not sufficient carbon dioxide to support plant life. Another feature of carbon dioxide, is that it is readily soluble in water and at fifteen degrees centigrade and 760 millimeters of pressure water dissolves the gas in an amount equal to its own volume. This fact, would naturally tend to lower the amount of any excess of the gas in the atmosphere. The dissolving of carbon dioxide in water forms carbonic acid, which is used in the manufacture of many common beverages.

Carbon is one of the most widespread elements on this planet and forms many compounds. The oxidation of many of these compounds such as wood, coal and hydrocarbons is the most common source of heating fuel. The operation of the internal combustion engine, a device extremely essential to modern society, requires hydrocarbon fuel in one of several forms. In all cases, carbon dioxide is a byproduct along with other gases such as carbon monoxide. In confined areas or even just localized such as densely populated urban centers, the emission of these gases frequently creates serious problems. In more open space however, these gases are usually readily diffused.

Many of the undesirable gases present but not actually a part of air, such as methane and sulfur dioxide as well as carbon dioxide and claimed by environmentalists,
to be major factors causing global warming, are all byproducts of ongoing natural processes and their production is well beyond human control. Locally, steps can be taken to improve air quality but with respect to climate change, the cooling and wanning on this planet is, geologically speaking, a continual changing process.

A condition in nature that some claim is cause for concern, is the depletion of the ozone layer. The writer has never encountered a definite account as to where in the upper atmosphere this layer occurs. Ozone is a relatively heavy gas and at 2.14 grams per liter is almost twice as heavy as air even at ground level. The fact that this gas would accumulate in a large mass even at altitudes of a few thousand feet, defying the law of gravity and Graham's law of gas diffusion, should require some explanation.

An unusual feature of the world climate is the moderate temperatures experienced by northern Europe in spite of the high latitude of the area. These latitudes in other parts of the world such as in Canada and Siberia, result in Subarctic and Arctic conditions with 8 long cold winters and short cool summers. The temperate climate of Northern Europe, Great Britain, Ireland and Scandinavia is a result of the ocean current referred to as the Gulf Stream. This stream delivers a large volume of tropically warmed water, flowing north along the east coast of North America at the rate of fifty million tons per second. At about the latitude of Newfoundland, this current swings east towards the west coast of Europe and has a decided warming affect on that entire region. The temperature of the almost constantly easterly wind across the Atlantic Ocean is also highly influence by the warm waters of the Gulf stream.

The flow of this current and its affect on the climate of Northern Europe and adjoining islands, is geologically speaking, a fairly recent condition and is generally believed to only date back about ten to twelve thousand years. The control of this current could be somewhat fragile and disruption to its present activity would
undoubtedly cause climatic changes with catastrophic results affecting much of the world's civilization. The possibility of such a development should, in the writer's opinion, be considered of much more concern than the slow progress of global warming.

James D.H. McCannell

Dated at Port McNicoll, Ont. April 23, 2003
PRESIDENTS ADDRESS TORONTO SYMPOSIUM

I am delighted to welcome everyone to the 2003 OPA Ontario Exploration and Geoscience Symposium. I am especially pleased to welcome the Honourable Rick Bartolucci the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. We are here today thanks to the untiring efforts of Garry Clark, Susan Warren, Alvina White and Terrie Bailey and so on behalf of the Directors I would like to extend our appreciation for their efforts. We all know the logistics involved in putting together an event such as this. Thanks also to our sponsors, speakers, and the many others who helped make this possible and thanks to you the participants who have greatly contributed to the success of this event.

The OEGS gives all partners in the business a chance to connect, and who are more important to Prospectors than investors? It is an exciting time for mineral sector investors in Ontario. Over the last two years there has been an increase in mineral expenditure. Investors’ confidence in the mineral sector is growing, as shown by recent forecasts placing exploration dollars at greater than 220 million for this year. Gold prices recently topped the $400 mark. Areas like Red Lake, Shebandowan, Timmins and Kirkland Lake are historical gold targets with new discoveries being actively explored. This new exploration has also provided good return for investors in examples such as FNX Mining Company Inc. and Gold Corp Inc.

Diamond exploration programmes are moving ahead in the Northeast, Wawa and the James Bay Lowlands with expenditures at DeBeers’ Victor Diamond prospect leading the way. Anne Wilson will be presenting a comprehensive overview of diamond exploration and development in Ontario at this Symposium.

Geoscience initiatives by Ont. Geol. Survey, the Lake Nipigon Region Geoscience Initiative and the Discover Abitibi Project are producing data to provide valuable information which can be used by prospectors and explorers alike, hopefully leading to new discoveries. Ontario’s geoscience information is world renowned, and participants at this symposium will have an opportunity to learn the latest details.

We have a varied agenda ranging from commodities such as gold, diamonds and magmatic sulphides to the latest technological advances in the industry. We have representation from the educational sector, junior and senior companies, and Gov’t. geologists. I am sure there is something for everyone.

The OPA would like to stress that it is our mission to further mineral exploration and development in Ontario. We recognize and appreciate the support from industry and the Ministry of NDM. We realize that working together will result in greater prosperity for the province.

Once again welcome to the 2003 Symposium. It is our sincere wish that you will leave having gained valuable information and insight into the current exploration and development activity in the province.

Merry Christmas to you and yours and may the New Year bring exciting discoveries and adventures.
The Ontario Prospectors Association
Announces the
Spring 2004 Mines & Minerals Symposiums

You are invited to join your colleagues on:

- **April 6 & 7, 2004**
  *The Northwestern Ontario Prospectors Association*  
  Valhalla Inn, Thunder Bay, Ontario  
  For further information please contact:  John Halet @ 807-475-4142  
  or visit their website at [http://my.tbaytel.net/nwopa/](http://my.tbaytel.net/nwopa/)

- **April 13 & 14, 2004**
  *The Sudbury Prospectors & Developers Association*  
  “Rediscovering Ontario: From Potential to Success”  
  Ramada Conference Centre, Sudbury, Ontario  
  For further information please contact:  Roger Poulin @ 705-897-6216  
  or visit their website at [http://www.sudburyprospectors.ca](http://www.sudburyprospectors.ca)

Accompanying Workshops and Field Trips to be Announced

**ACT NOW TO SECURE BOOTH AND POSTER SPACE**

---

ONTARIO EXPLORATION CORPORATION

“Helping Prospectors Find New Mines”

**2004 FUNDING PROGRAM COMMENCES**

FORMS AND GUIDEBOOKS AVAILABLE

For further information please visit the OPA website at  
[http://www.ontarioprospectors.com](http://www.ontarioprospectors.com)

Or

1-866-259-3818