WHY BE AN OPA MEMBER?
The Ontario Prospectors Association exists to serve its members. Its primary goal is to advocate for the Explorationist’s within the Province. The principal target of any lobbying that occurs is the governmental agencies that effect our operations. To accomplish this the OPA becomes involved in the various projects and committees that are setup by government.

OLL Disentanglement Working Group:
Over the last year the Ontario Living Legacy (OLL) disentanglement project has been a major thrust for the OPA. This process involved the negotiation of protected area boundaries off of Mining claims. The first success of this process was the recognition of patents and leases are not being able to be placed in the protected areas. The Ministers of Mines and Natural Resources asked the Partnership for Public Lands (PPL) and OPA to meet and come up with recommendations to the claims covered by protected areas. At present after lengthy discussions a series of recommendations for boundary modifications or no modifications were sent to the Ministries for consideration. At present we await the Ministries final decisions.

OGS Advisory Board (OGSAB): This advisory board is comprised of explorationists and academics that provide suggestions of the type of projects the OGS should complete to enhance the exploration attractiveness in the province. This committee has one OPA representative that represents the explorationists of the province. Over the years the advisory board has guided OGS field work.

Ministers Mining Act Advisory Committee (MMAAC): This committee was established in 1992 to advise the Minister of changes to the Mining Act and Regulations. This Committee can be directed of concerns within the Act and Regs by Explorationists through OPA or the Local Prospecting Assoc., the Minister or the Ministers Staff. This working group is composed of an OPA rep, one rep from each Regional Assoc. and various other stakeholder Reps impacted by the Mining Act or Regulations. The Committee is presently examining the point where assessment work would stop being allowed in a Mine environment, how staking and assessment work is completed on surface rights held lands and alternative methods of claims acquisition in areas of alienated surface rights.

NAN-OPA-OMA Community Education Initiative: This committee has been examining the education requirements of First Nations to assist in understanding the Exploration and Mining sequence. It also has been examining the Exploration Communities short falls in understanding the First Nations Communities. Recently the committee has been looking at Consultation of First Nation communities within the exploration sequence. The
committee is looking at compiling the successful and unsuccessful methods of consultation with First Nations communities. Presently OPA has two representatives on this committee.

**Local Citizenship Committees (LCC):** These committees comment on the Forest Management Plan (FMP) of the various Sustainable Forest Licence areas. The committees comment on the FMP’s and try to promote a cooperative method so the various resource stakeholders are not negatively impacted by the Forestry industry. The OPA has helped to populate these committees with explorationists. These committees are at the point where we can impact the development and removal of roads, bridges and culverts.

**Provincially Significant Mineral Process (PSMP):** This process was developed by industry representatives, including OPA. PSMP was mandated through the OLL to help protect our mineral wealth. The OPA has worked hard to get the MNR to accept this into all protected areas development. The PPL has recognized this as our industries contribution to any protected areas development also.

**Room-to–Grow (R2G):** This process was started by the OLL Forest Accord. This process states that if there is new fibre or lumber allocated to the Forestry companies there will be the development of new parks or protected areas to offset the new cutting. The OPA has worked extremely hard to get representation within this process. We have been given a guarantee that we will be at the beginning of the process to protect Mineral potential. The process, from the beginning, will avoid any present Mineral Tenure and employee PSMP on any selected areas. The OPA has been asked to sit on two of these processes to date and will represent explorationists on all future projects.

**Northern Boreal Initiative (NBI):** The NBI is an MNR driven project that will move the portion of the forest used as harvest further north. To do so impacts on certain First Nations traditional lands. To move further north the MNR has empowered the First Nations communities effected to complete land use planning and effectively drive the process. In preparation for this the MNR has brought all stakeholders (forestry, PPL, OPA etc.) together to have a voice in the project. The OPA has been working within the process to ensure any new protected areas do not impact high mineral potential and to try and influence road construction so as to access high mineral potential. The OPA sits on a Mineral Working Group that is working within the process.

**Ontario Mineral Industry Cluster Council (OMICC):** OPA sits on the newly formed OMICC representing the explorers of Ontario. This group is looking at the advantages of all facets of the Exploration and Mining sector working together to better compete and promote the industry.

**Ontario Prospector Magazine:** The magazine is published 3 times yearly and is the good news vehicle for the OPA. The magazine frequently highlights junior explorers success stories and other news from the exploration community. To be published in the magazine is as simple as contacting the OPA and asking. The magazine articles are based on the volume of advertisement. More advertisements more articles.

**Symposia:** The OPA organizes the Toronto show in December and is a partner in the two April Regional events. These events strive to place prospectors, junior and major companies and the OGS together in a two day venue to share results and promote each other. These events attract 3-400 people and have been very successful in introducing all the players. The posters and speakers are all current and informative. To participate please see the forms in the later part of this edition.

**Website:** The OPA website has become a source of information for the Ontario Explorer. The site has a properties for sale or option section where prospectors or companies can get additional exposure. The various events and programs are also posted on the site.

**Geoscience Initiatives:** The OPA has worked to partner with industry to provide a new geological data set for the Lake Nipigon Region. The OPA and the OGS say a void of data for this high mineral potential area and proceeded to lever funding from the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (NOHFC) and Industry. This integrated project is completing geological mapping, airborne mag-
netic and gamma ray spectrometry survey, gravity survey, rock property studies and a series of other studies. This project will result in over $10 million of geoscience data being delivered to the public over the next two years. **Ontario Exploration Corporation (OEC):**

The OPA has worked hard to set up a grassroots prospectors funding agency. The OEC has entered into its second year of funding. The fund sits independently to OPA and applications are available on the OPA website or MNDM offices.

**VOICE:** The OPA provides a voice to the explorers of Ontario. When the government needs to know what the industry needs they call the OPA. If there is an issue that hits the press the OPA gets called for the “Prospectors” opinion. **If you would like to discuss the OPA please just call Garry Clark (866-259-2737).**

“We need you to be a member so we can be stronger in number and protect the rights to explore for the mineral wealth of the province.”

**THE TRAPROCK ISSUE**

I have spent a lot of time in the Wawa area. I welcomed the news that somebody with foresight and vision was going to use the existing facilities at Michipicoten Harbour to ship rock products to serve the Great Lakes Basin region. I was dismayed to hear that in an area that has been home to mining, and to shipping of mine products, so-called "environmental" groups see the need for an Environmental Assessment that will delay un-neccessarily and possibly kill this project. Here is an opportunity for some jobs in Wawa, a community with the existing skills required for the operation! Shipping by water is the most efficient (energy-wise) method of transportation. Real environmentalists should be encouraging this project, not trying to kill it. I have worked as a consultant for the Glensanda Quarry in Scotland. Ships (including Great Lakes type self unloaders) transport rock from the quarry in Northern Scotland to the industrial heartland of Europe. They have set up what are called "Virtual Quarries" in dockside areas of the major cities on the continent. Here the material is off-loaded, stored, and distributed to ready-mix and construction companies etc. This eliminates the long truck hauls of rock products from rural areas, clogging the city arteries etc. Environmentalists hail it as giant step forward. Here in Montana, radical environmentalists, with the objective of making the state a playground for the rich and famous, have been the primary force behind a crusade to stop mining, logging and ranching. They have succeeded to the point that Montana now ranks #50 in terms of average wage from the top ten position that was formerly held. Do not let them prevail in Ontario!

I urge the people of the Soo and area to be real environmentalists. Ensure that Ontario’s environmental laws are obeyed, urge your governmental officials to come down hard on violators etc. Canada and Canadians are recognized throughout the world for their high level of expertise in the mining industry. The technology exists to put men and women (ask Dr. Roberta Bondar?) into space. Surely there is enough technology in Canada to mine in an environmentally safe manner, especially in an area where mining has been conducted for a century or more. Ask yourselves. If mining can not be done in a safe and environmentally friendly way in Ontario, where in the world can it be done?

But please do not allow obstructionists to prevail under the guise of environmentalism.

Joe Bardswich

**POTENTIAL OFFICE CLOSURES**

David Orazietti, MPP

Dear Dave:

Last month I spoke to you of the Sault and District Prospectors concern regarding the possible closure of the local Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM) office (Mines and Minerals Division). During a meeting with the MNDM in September 2003, a number of scenarios regarding restructuring were presented. ALL the scenarios had the Sault office closing. The main reason given for this was that two person offices don’t work. Sault Ste Marie was made into a two person office after the LAST restructuring go round.

The MNDM created the problems inherent in this set up. At that time they removed Wawa
from the Sault’s jurisdiction, and made it part of Timmins’ jurisdiction. A large part of the business formerly conducted through the Sault office was shuffled to Timmins, thus creating a self-fulfilling prophecy that the Sault office would not be viable.

I submitted some thoughts to the MNDM following our meeting, and would like at this time to share them with you.

LAND ISSUES
STF Weldwood, the company which manages all the ACR townships (including those in Wawa), have their offices situated in Sault Ste. Marie.
The Land Titles Office for the Wawa area is located in Sault Ste. Marie.
On the MNDM web site under Mining Lands, Wawa is included in the Sault Ste. Marie Mining Division.
The federal Department of Fisheries is located in the Sault. For access issues such as water crossing, clients usually have to conduct their business out of the Sault office.
Many MNR Regional Office staff are located in the Sault.
Algoma Steel Inc., which owns mining lands in Wawa, is located in the Sault.

CULTURAL ISSUES
It is traditional for Wawa clients to do business in the Sault. Also clients from out of town fly to the Sault on their way to Wawa. If they need Wawa files they then have to go to Timmins instead of picking them up here.
Cultural and social ties which have historically existed between Sault Ste. Marie and Wawa, were established as a result of the relationship between steelmaking in the Sault and the mining of iron ore in Wawa.
The Northern Development Division of the MNDM has its regional office located in Sault Ste. Marie. The Algoma area Economic Development Team which includes Wawa is located there.

These reasons help illustrate the need to return the Wawa area to the Sault’s jurisdiction. Doing so will increase the efficiency of the office as well as make many clients a lot happier. There is no good reason to close the Sault office thereby losing yet more jobs. We do not want to see it go the way of the Mining Lands Recorder’s office which disappeared along with the position when the last person in that job retired in 2002.

I look forward to discussing this and any other matter I can assist you in.

Sincerest regards Vivienne Cote

Good day Garry
I don’t know if you can help me or not, but maybe you can point me in the right direction.
I was going through some papers of my parents the other day and ran across two mining share certificates. They are from a company called Foster Lake Mines Limited. They are dated April 19, 1967 and June 21, 1967. Would you be able to give me any information on this matter.
Thanking you in advance for any help you may be able to give me
Yours truly Bob Holt bobholt@nbnet.nb.ca

A BOOK REVIEW BY PHIL OLSON:
CLUDE RESOURCES
MINERAL AGREEMENTS AND ROYALTIES
by Karl J. C. Harries, Q.C. P.Eng.

Filling a huge void in the explorationist’s library, this two volume, 950-page treatise explains the underlying legal concepts and develops the drafting framework for mineral agreements. The two spiral bound volumes are divided into fourteen chapters and five appendices. Written in the familiar, each chapter is prefaced by a table and short summary of contents. Topics covered range from the formation of agreements, confidential information and joint venture relationships to royalty agreements and ‘boilerplate’ language. From format to binding, these volumes are designed for easy, frequent usage.
As an update and compilation of three previous books, the author’s express intent is not to turn explorationists into lawyers, but rather to teach explorationists how to make more
effective use of legal counsel through the understanding and application of fundamental legal concepts. Drafting mineral agreements should be a shared process with the wording very carefully chosen. Mineral agreements should be drafted in anticipation of exploration success. A well-structured and documented option agreement often deters would-be suitors from pursuing frivolous litigation. As a well-known mining engineer and lawyer, Mr. Harries writes from experience, frequently clarifying legal subtleties with illustrations from Canadian mining case law.

Chapter 1: Formation of an Agreement. This chapter covers the agreement fundamentals of offer, acceptance and consideration. The author recommends these terms be presented clearly and succinctly. Additional sections include representations and warranties. Mr. Harries acknowledges that most formal agreements are preceded by letters of intent. He discusses their shortcomings and the need for cautionary language. Other sections cover assignment and novation whereby interests are transferred when ownership is subject to a number of transactions.

Chapter 2: The Courts, the Law and Litigation. Prefaced by discovery/success prompts legal action, the author discusses the subtleties of common versus civil law. In the former, the defendant is innocent until proven guilty. In the latter, the defendant must prove his innocence. This chapter has a sub-section devoted to the creation of a ‘paper trail’ to avoid litigation and strategies to use when litigation is unavoidable. The chapter concludes with a section on professional responsibilities and liabilities.

Chapter 3: Confidential Information. The author warns that receipt and use of confidential information is an invitation to litigation. Explorationists must understand the concepts of fiduciary relationship, constated trust and breach of confidence before drafting a confidentiality agreement that is complete and unambiguous.

Chapter 4: Property Interests, Entry and Consents. The author clarifies the differences amongst licences, claims and lease. He discusses the scenario where the surface rights are not acquired with the mineral rights and the special precautions necessary when dealing with the surface rights owner.

Chapter 5: Royalty Interests. This chapter identifies the various types of royalties, provides historic background for their creation and lists their merits and deficiencies.

Chapter 6: Some Property Acquisition Agreements. This chapter discusses the elements common to many standard exploration agreements related to property examinations and acquisitions, identifying a number of grey areas. It examines related aspects, including consent to enter, rights of first refusal and grubstaking.

Chapter 7: The Joint Venture Relationship. In the evolution of a joint venture, the participants are they venturers or shareholders share similar concerns, but have very different abilities to effect change. Joint ventures are a special type of partnership where the participants are deemed joint and several to reflect each party’s liability.

Chapter 8: The Farm-in/Joint Venture Agreement. For exploration projects that advance to production, more complex farm-in agreements become the norm. Aspects from accounting procedures, areas of interests and assignments through to buy-out options, cash calls and dispute resolution mechanisms should be anticipated and concisely included in the agreement.

Chapter 9: Royalty Agreements. As distinct from the royalty overview given in Chapter 5, volume two is a dedicated reference volume dealing with specific royalty provisions, formats and concepts.

Chapter 10: Definitions. In this chapter, a number of commonly used ancillary terms are defined. Concepts like operator, product, recipient, work, year and the commencement of commercial production are described from a legal perspective.

Chapter 11: Types of Royalties. The chapter identifies the similarities and critical differences amongst the various types of royalty agreements. Included in this discussion are net smelter returns, net profit royalties, net proceeds royalties, product tonnage royalties and complex royalties that are combinations of the preceding types. Royalties as related to diamonds are uniquely covered in the final sections of this chapter.

Chapter 12: Determination and Payment.
This chapter covers the format and formulae for calculating royalties. Sections cover subjects that range from adherence to generally accepted accounting principles to dispute payments and safeguarding procedures.

Chapter 13: Miscellaneous Royalty Provisions. This chapter describes some of the less common provisions seen in royalty agreements. Amongst others, topics covered include confidentiality, assignment, right of first refusal, buy-out options, co-mingling and dealing with an underlying royalty.

Chapter 14: Boilerplate. This chapter explains the substance of many of the legal concepts that appear in most legal agreements. As opposed to window-dressing or legalese, boilerplate are essential provisions of any agreement and should be treated accordingly. Sections include; arbitration, corporate opportunity, counterpart execution, enurement, force majeure, number and gender, and severability.

The text is backstopped by five appendices that include Craig Haase’s “The Art of Creating a Financially Rewarding Royalty”, a royalty checklist, an annotated joint venture agreement table of contents, a source of reference and a glossary. The fourteen chapters and five appendices provide the reader, working in concert with local legal counsel, with the topics and mechanisms for drafting a workable mineral exploration agreement. Understanding their content and having these texts as a ready reference are an absolute necessity for the new ‘professional’ explorationist.

MAP STAKING WILL NOT GO AWAY
Tuesday, February 10, 2004
Mr. Wally Rayner
Chair Minister’s Mining Act Advisory Committee
5 Martin Road
Toronto, Ontario M4S 2V1
BY FAX- 416-486-0542

Further to my letter today and since I will be away for a week, I should like to take this opportunity to amend my map staking proposal as follows:
I should like to name my proposal ADVANCE STAKING rather than map staking, firstly to distinguish this proposal from map staking in other provinces and because the proposal I submitted would merely be an adjunct to the existing staking practices and one of a two step process of staking a claim in Ontario., as outlined in said proposal. In addition I would recommend that each licensed prospector would be entitled under my proposal to “advance stake” only 12 to 15 claims per day, which in reality is the equivalent of, and mirrors the actual practice today, wherein an experienced staker is only physically able to stake a block of 12 to 15 claims per day and in this way the existing business and other staking practices and arrangements would remain virtually unchanged from today, with the exception that a prospector must “advance stake” or record the claims he wishes to stake.

An additional proposal would be for the Mining Recorders to only accept “advance staking” applications with appropriate fees, during regular business hours, and to confirm in writing or by e-mail that said claim was in fact paid for and recorded by the Mining Recorder.

Mining Recorders should release the new updated staking maps on a bi-weekly basis, this will allow time for Mining Recorders to properly and accurately update staking maps and areas.

The entire process should be computerized as much as possible, including “advance staking” by email provided the appropriate fees are delivered or wired in at the same time as the “advance staking”.

I hope that some of these proposals will be of some assistance in modernizing and simplifying the litigious and outdated current staking practices in the province of Ontario. Thanking you again in advance for your attention to this matter, I Remain;
Michael Oniel
1560 Lawrence Ave. West
Suite 407
Toronto, Ontario.
M6L 1B9
Tel 416-245-5421
E-mail- moni@VIF.com
cc. Mr. Gashinsky MNDM BY FAX 705-670-5681
cc _clark@ontarioprospectors.com
August 1, 2000

To: Dick Cowan, Director
    Mining and Land Management

Re: Advanced exploration – clarification of regulations

Dear Mr. Cowan,

Thank you for taking the time to help me out with these questions. I am presently involved in an exploration program and need to know where we stand re: advanced exploration.

1 - When calculating surface stripping area, is the actual excavation measured alone or in combination with the adjacent pile of soil removed from the excavation? (see sketch attached) In this example, the area stripped is 250 sq metres but the total disturbed area is 750 sq metres. A clear definition is needed here to determine what area is included in the 10,000 sq metre limit before the project becomes advanced exploration.

2 - If there are several excavations on a property (group of contiguous claims), are their areas totaled to arrive at the 10,000 sq metres or must a single excavation exceed 10,000 sq metres to trigger advanced exploration?

3 - If the calculation involves totaling several discontinuous excavations, what definition is used to determine which excavations must fall into one total? I have been told by Mr. Mandal that if the excavations are within a contiguous group of claims held by one party, policy says they must be totaled. Could you provide a copy of the policy directive referred to by Mr. Mandal?

Could you please fax your response to this query to the above number as soon as possible since our plans for the remainder of the exploration program are dependent on the clarification of the above questions.

Yours Truly,

Michael Leahy
August 10, 2000

Mr. Michael Leahy
139 Carter Ave.
Kirkland Lake, ON
P2N 2A1

Dear Mr. Leahy:

Thank you for your letter requesting clarification on the regulations pertaining to Advanced Exploration. The following addresses your questions as posed.

1. When calculating surface stripping area, the measurement includes the actual area of stripping of overburden; it does not include the area of an adjacent storage pile of removed overburden. The total surface area to be stripped must take into consideration the overburden thickness in order to accommodate the volume criteria.

2. If there are several areas of overburden stripping or excavation on contiguous claims, the areas/volumes are totaled to determine the area stripped or the total volume removed. This is the approach we have used consistently with all projects. Consideration could be made in the case of a very large claim block where two distant and distinct or unrelated showings were being examined.

3. We do not have a formal written definition or policy beyond that expressed within Regulation 248/00. This allows us some flexibility as in the example above. We use the “stripping/excavation on contiguous claims” approach to avoid a situation where a proponent might try to circumvent Part VII requirements by leaving small areas intact between large areas or volumes of stripped or excavated overburden.

I hope this is the information you require. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
W.R. Cowan
Director of Mine Rehabilitation
February 16, 2004

Mr. N.W. (Wally) Rayner
Chair
Minister’s Mining Act Advisory Committee
Ontario Prospectors Association
5 Martin Road
Toronto ON M4S 2V1

Dear Mr. Rayner,

I am responding to the recommendations of the Minister’s Mining Act Advisory Committee (MMAAC) to my predecessor regarding the Surface Rights/Mining Rights Working Group determinations. I look forward to working with MMAAC and receiving future recommendations for improvement from the committee.

I accept those recommendations on Notice of Staking that received unanimous or strong support in principal. However, I understand that there are some significant privacy issues related to obtaining the names and addresses of the surface rights holders. These issues will have to be overcome before we can proceed further on this matter.

I also accept those recommendations regarding Notice of Ground Exploration that received unanimous or strong support in principal. The same comments as above relate to this issue.

Those items which did not receive strong approval by MMAAC may be revisited by the committee at its discretion.

I am instructing staff of the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to review the implications of the proposed recommendations on Sections 29, 30, 32 and 78 of the Ontario Mining Act and to prepare draft material for discussion by MMAAC. I understand MMAAC will be meeting soon to discuss the follow up to your letter and this response.
In addition, I am very interested in receiving recommendations from MMAAC regarding less intrusive staking methods for obtaining access to Crown mineral rights, particularly for those areas where surface rights are commonly held separately from the mining rights.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your continuing contributions to MMAAC and please accept my best wishes.

Sincerely,

Rick Bartolucci, MPP, Sudbury Minister
Garry Clark
Executive Director
Ontario Prospectors Association
1000 Alloy Drive
Thunder Bay Ontario P7B 6A5

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for your letter of January 9, 2004, supporting the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada’s request for the continuation of the federal and Ontario flow through share tax credit programs.

Your perspective on the positive economic impacts by junior companies in Ontario is well taken. It clearly promotes employment and spending in the north and accelerates the discovery of new mines.

At this time, the Ministry of Finance is reviewing a number of provincial tax expenditures in preparation for the next budget. The economic impacts related to changes to the tax expenditures will be carefully considered before any decisions are made. Although I cannot predict what the budget will include, I am fully supportive of maintaining government incentives for the minerals sector.

In closing, I would like to reiterate the government’s commitment to work with Northern resource industries, including mining, to ensure they achieve their potential.

Once again, thank you for writing and please accept my best wishes.

Sincerely,

Rick Bartolucci, MPP, Sudbury
Minister
February 9, 2004

The Honourable Rick Bartolucci,
Minister of Northern Development and Mines,
99 Wellesley St. West,
Whitney Block
Room 5630
Toronto, Ontario,
M7A 1W3

Reference: NORTHERN ONTARIO PROSPECTORS & CONTRACTORS CHEATED,
TAXPAYERS ARE NEXT,
MINISTERIAL INTERVENTION REQUESTED

Dear Mr. Bartolucci,

Much painstaking research and physical work in the bush led us to discover and stake a high silica content quartz deposit in Timmins very close to Falconbridge’s Kidd Creek smelter which requires a long-term, reliable source of silica flux.

We admit, in retrospect, that we made a grave error in our choice of “development partner” to quarry this material. Immediately upon the commencement of the production phase (revenue to the developer) that company embarked on a long period of what we consider to be outright fraudulent behaviour ignoring its contractual obligations to us and inflicting serious economic hardship on several local contracting firms. It has been in substantial default of our Agreement almost from the beginning of operations on our claims. Its technical incompetence and inappropriate business attitude have had a negative impact on the image of our deposit and have soured an extensive community of local and area consultants and contractors.

Production was intermittent at best and there has been no activity (other than MNR-enforced environmental non-compliance rehab work) for over a year and yet it persists in its refusal to return title to the claims to us. To make matters worse the property has been “liened-up” to the hilt by disgruntled former contractors and consultants of the company. In spite of letters to and discussions with the lienholders we have reason to believe that the loss of our property to one of them is imminent.

We realize this is not a new “sad story”. However, after three long years of unnecessary, time-consuming and very frustrating effort to save our property (having done nothing dishonestly or illegally) the outlook remains dismal at best. We have tried everything we can think of within our means to put a stop to the unethical behaviour of this company but in our opinion it remains a threat to us and to others in the future.

We submitted a very well-documented complaint to the Mining & Lands Commissioner’s Office in the belief that it had the authority to resolve this problem. We received courteous treatment
there and with the assistance of MLC’s Registrar Mr Dan Pascoe finally got the company to at least sign and file a Memorandum of Agreement on title. This got us a position in the lien lineup albeit not in front where we had repeatedly asked the company to rightly place us from the outset. However we were suddenly asked to sign off on our filing due to manpower and mandate limitations at MLC. Having been led to believe we could submit a future complaint to that office if necessary and open a new file, our subsequent attempt to do so was denied for reasons unknown to us. Mr. Pascoe is intimately familiar with the unprecedented(!) Abstract attached. He is aware, as are we, that the company is in fact being contacted for having items or “Pending Proceedings” posted on Abstracts which exempts it from performing assessment work (exploration) on the property. Also the apparent lack of a time limit for the filing of liens via the MLC by other probable unpaid workers is a detriment to the future development of any such disputed property.

While attempting to get information from the MNR now that we had become a recognized party on title we were slapped with Freedom of Information Forms with a $5.00 (opening!) fee to get information on our own property from our own government! The principle of that reaction was so appalling to us we sought help from Gilles Bisson. (Their apprehensive stance was probably largely a reaction to our aggravating state by that time for which we apologized to the new employee affected there). Mr. Bisson was successful in opening up the lines of communication with them but our interpretation of the subsequent unbiased and professional facts obtained there is that the company is engaged in the early stages of duping the MNR as well. There is no doubt in our minds that the MNR (taxpayers) will eventually be picking up the tab for the Environmental Closure of the quarry site which is a safety hazard in its present state.

Our consultations with numerous lawyers in this (mining) region have convinced us that exceedingly few really know much if anything about mining matters and mining law which are very specialized fields. We recently spent several thousands of dollars in legal fees for a lawyer to “review” our case (that word listed 8 times of 11 entries on his lamp sum account) and were asked for a second retainer of the same magnitude to actually get him started doing something concrete for us. No time frame or even a crude cost estimate could be extracted from him. He gave us a deadline by which to make the second installment then “closed our file” for not meeting it! We learned more at a recent 30 minute lien settlement meeting with a local Judge at absolutely no cost. On fixed retirement incomes, we simply cannot afford the exorbitant cost of justice in this country and have decided to call it quits.

What is doubly sad in this case is the fact that we have had a written offer since early last fall from another party who is interested in testing and developing our silica deposit (jobs) and could have optioned the claims or part of them to one of at least four northern nickel exploration companies so far this winter (more jobs).

The bottom line?
We are no closer to settling this mess than we were at the outset 3 years ago.
CONCLUSION

1. Prospectors have been important people in the development of the North and as a group have the unparalleled drive and curiosity essential to continued development here. Prospectors need all the help and protection your Ministry can provide.

2. We see your MLC office (especially) and the MNDM as the only groups where mining related issues have any hope of being effectively handled and resolved (The MNR needs to focus on forests and wildlife and leave mining and quarrying issues to those with the appropriate expertise.)

3. Your MLC office needs a broader mandate and more manpower with bigger teeth.

4. Prospectors need to be notified and informed about 'Rights of First Registration' and the importance of insisting upon the filing of a "Memorandum of Agreement" on their behalf every time they transfer claims to companies regardless of their then current size or status.

Can you give your MLC office the support it needs to resolve this property fiasco now?

J.E. Croxall, P.Eng.
Prospector & Technical Mine Engineer

cc: Ontario Prospectors Association
cc: Mayor of the City of Timmins
cc: Timmins Economic Development Corporation

Note: This letter is the opinion of the writer and is not intended to injure or discredit any individual or party (named or implied).