The Explorationist Newsletter is brought to you as a 'member service' of the Ontario Prospectors Association. The 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 the members and Directors. The writers accept full ownership of their contributions.

A SUMMER LIKE??

The summer has come and all but gone! The volume of exploration has been recorded as the highest ever. A common joke has become: Would you have a; geologist, drill, prospector or staker. In phone conversations the first 4 words get out and the laughing starts.

The full employment is great but little flaws or cracks are starting to show. I’m personally worried quality of work will slip or some of the “flow through” won’t get spend but returned to the investor!

The success of extensive exploration has been noted across Ontario. Free flowing exploration dollars have resulted in the expansion of the Rainy River Resources gold zone, new exploration and discoveries on Goldecorp – Premier Gold JV lands in Red Lake, Marathon PGM’s Coldwell PGM project and continued success at McFaulds Lake, Noront’s new Ni-Cu discovery.

To assist the Prospector the Ontario Exploration Corporation has been reviewing the comments on the Prospectors Assistance Program. The Board has been working on a new funding system that would inflate the amount funding to prospectors and opening up more properties being eligible. These changes will be outlined at the OEGS in Sudbury in December and will be in effect for the 2008 funding year.

In Memory of Paul Coad

I'm pleased to inform you that the Ontario Geographic Names Board has approved our application to recognize Paul Coad for his work and contribution to furthering the knowledge and understanding of the Timmins area geology. We now have an official landmark, Coad Hill, named in Paul's honour.

Coad Hill is located in Loveland Township on the east side of the Abitibi logging road approximately 8 km north of Kamiskotia. UTM Zone 17, 452967E, 5389203N, NTS 42A/12. If you check Google Earth, it appears as “small mountain near Enid Creek down Abitibi road”. Coad Hill is underlain by east-facing pillowed mafic volcanic flows of the Kidd Munro assemblage and was the site of the last geological report written by Paul. Thanks to all who supported the application and to the Ontario Geographic Names Board.

Brian Atkinson P.Geo

NEWS RELEASE

INCOME TAX INTERPRETATION WILL HELP MINERAL EXPLORATION COMPANIES WORKING IN CANADA

Toronto, September 20, 2007 – The federal government announced yesterday an interpretation of Canada’s income tax legislation that
will have a significant and positive impact on companies exploring for minerals in Canada. In a letter sent to the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC), the Canada Revenue Agency provided guidelines that it will use to determine whether costs incurred by exploration companies for community consultations, baseline environmental studies, and feasibility studies will qualify as Canadian exploration expenses (CEE).

PDAC President Patricia Dillon stated that this announcement marked the successful outcome of four years of lobbying by the association for this interpretation. “Consulting with local communities and conducting baseline environmental studies are integral to exploration programs today. The mineral exploration industry accepts them as costs of doing business. However, because these costs have not been treated as CEE, they could not be covered by funds raised through flow-through shares. This made it difficult for junior exploration companies, most of which rely on share issuance for working capital.”

Under the new CRA guidelines, activities such as environmental assessment or consultation processes undertaken to meet a legal or informal obligation under the terms of an exploration permit will, in general, be treated as CEE.

A copy of the guidelines, which were prepared in consultation with Natural Resources Canada and Finance Canada, is available at www.pdac.ca.

The Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada is an advocacy association for prospectors and companies active in the search for and development of mineral deposits. The association annually hosts the largest international convention of its kind in the world in Toronto. The 2008 event will be held from March 2 to 5 in the south building of the Metro Toronto Convention Centre.

More information
Bernard Ross, Canada Revenue Agency, telephone +1 418 649 3043

Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC)
34 King Street East, 9th Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5C 2X8
Telephone +1 416 362 1969
info@pdac.ca
www.pdac.ca

RE: EBR Registry number 010-1018

The Ontario Prospectors Association (OPA) has a long history of being proactive in dealing with issues that affect its members and the public perception of prospecting and exploration. The issue of conflict between mining rights and surface rights holders has been a difficult one to resolve that is fair to all concerned.

Though the OPA agrees with the general ideas put forth in the Registry there are some components that we believe need some further examination and clarification.

1. We agree that reducing impact to the environment is a progressive and desired effect but going to Map Selection is not endorsed by our membership. The OPA has a standing resolution from an Annual General Meeting that states our opposition to map staking. Though very practical in surveyed townships, our fear is that it will “creep” out of Southern Ontario (location of most of the conflicts) into the North. There still is a viable population of stakers and prospectors that derive an income from the physical staking of claims. If Map Selection were to be implemented a cost increase on recordings or bond system (similar to other provinces) to acquire land may be needed to stop the acquisition of large tracts of land with no exploration being competed. Any additional derived revenue from “map selection” should be put directly back into MNDM or to OPA to support prospectors.

2. During the process of trying to solve the conflicts of mining and surface rights holders the OPA thought the intent was to make more
land available for prospecting but with fewer conflicts. The continual erosion of the land base for exploration, be it from new parks, urban sprawl or new definitions of lands by MNDR not open to staking, will impact the economics of Ontario. The present consumption of minerals in the world is outstripping the discovery and development rates of new deposits. We need to protect land for exploration, not remove it.

3. The idea of having a dialogue between the mining rights holder and the surface rights holder is a very good idea. The dialogue will obviously prevent some conflicts and allow a smoother exploration process. The largest concern is that the mining rights holder needs a method of locating the surface rights holder that works. Also not mentioned is what occurs if the owner does not respond to the notice of exploration and becomes agitated once the exploration has started.

4. The revision of consent requirements are a step forward that should open up new lands for exploration that previously were too cumbersome to get permission to explore. The question the OPA has is how these lands will be demarcated on the claim map system? The identification of some types of improvements or features that are listed could become subjective and some education of explorationists may be required to prevent conflict.

The OPA would like to get a sense of the timelines expected for the required legislative changes.

Overall the recommendations presented in this EBR are a great step forward to laying the groundwork that will minimize surface rights and mining rights conflicts. The OPA would also offer its assistance to any further work required to get this process complete.

Yours truly,

J. Garry Clark
Executive Director

Chamber of Mines Eastern BC
A Common Problem

All members need to read this. The Gov changed the Mineral Tenure Act. The changes have been enacted but not implemented yet.

The changes force anybody “Searching for Minerals” to Notify Private Land owners and Crown Land Lease holders of your intention to travel through or prospect on their land or lease.

Below are part of the changes to the Act and the Penalty section.

The new section reads:

19 (1) A person must not begin a mining activity unless
(a) the person first serves notice, in the prescribed form and manner, on
(i) the owner, other than the government, of every surface area,
(ii) the holder of a lease of Crown land under section 11 of the Land Act granting the holder exclusive surface rights to the leased land, and
(iii) the holder, under Part 5 of the Land Act, of a disposition of Crown land, on which the person intends to work or intends to utilize a right of entry for that purpose, and
(b) the prescribed period has elapsed from the date that notice was served under paragraph (a).

(1.1) The chief gold commissioner, in the prescribed circumstances, may exempt a person from the requirements of subsection (1).

The Mineral Tenure Act defines this term as follows:

"mining activity" means any activity related to
(a) the search for a mineral or placer mineral,
(b) the exploration and development of a mineral or placer mineral, or
(c) the production of a mineral or placer mineral, and includes the reclamation of a previously mined area and the monitoring and long term protection, control and treatment of a previously mined area; Suspension of certificate

The Chamber was asked to attend a meeting last January about this issue. All mining groups in attendance were against these proposed changes to the Act. The Government went ahead and
passed the changes to the Act anyways. Now through a consultant the Government is looking for industry groups to participate in helping them with the Notification rules.

This is our response:
We do not support the legislation.

We have no interest in providing input on implementation of legislation that we disagree with.

Providing notification to land owners will accomplish nothing except create more friction and anti-mining sentiment in this province.

Providing notification to land owners will be onerous and expensive for legitimate prospectors.

The legislation contradicts the Mining Plan - Action 27 (reduce regulation)

Government has not told us what the problems are and how this legislation will fix them.

We suspect that the legislation is a result of pressure on Gov't from some other (non-mining) group who likely know nothing about our industry.

As far as we know, Government did not consult with our industry (particularly prospectors) prior to deciding to implement the legislation.

It is our understanding that at the meeting with consultant for Ministry of Mines at Roundup 2007 everyone in attendance was opposed to the legislation.

We would therefore expect that there is little or no support from the mining industry.

In our opinion the bottom line is that we are being asked to help government implement bad legislation that we don't need, don't want and were never consulted on.

Tay Valley Township Council

Issue: Mining Act provisions which allow mining activities to take place on private lands for which the Crown controls mineral rights

Action: All municipal Councils pass the attached motion in support of AMO’s position and forward your motion to the Premier, the Minister of Northern Development and Mines, AMO and Tay Valley Township

Background: In parts of eastern, southern and northern Ontario there is a significant number surface-rights only (SRO) properties. These private land owners own only the surface of their properties and the Crown holds the subsurface mineral rights. Under the Mining Act, 1990, licensed prospectors have a statutory right to stake mining claims and conduct assessment work on these lands even if the surface rights are privately held.

As a result, an increasing number of SRO properties in several parts of the province have been subject to extensive mining activity. Many of these lands are home to residences, cottages, farms, lakes, roads and other local infrastructure and many in areas of significant cultural, heritage and recreational areas. Under Section 78 of the Mining Act, the holder of the mining claim only has to inform the surface-rights owner regarding future mining assessment activities once, just prior to assessment work begins. Because legal searches are limited to forty years, finding the prospectors stakes is often the first time landowners are made aware of their property’s SRO status. Assessment work may involve excavation and surface stripping, imposing considerable property damage and risk to the water table. This activity proceeds with no authorization from the municipality, conservation authority, with no environmental review and no approval from the landowner.

Mining is an important economic driver for many Ontario communities. However, given that Crown lands cover 87 per cent of the province, there are abundant opportunities for the mineral mining industry that does not intrude on private SRO lands, in eastern, southern and northern Ontario. Reunification
of mining and surface rights through transfer or sale of these lands would resolve provide some resolution to this situation. The Mining Act provides for Ministerial discretion and the ability to cancel or annul the forfeiture of any lands or mining rights.

Lanark County Council passed a resolution calling on the Minister of Northern Development and Mines to reunify SRO property and mining rights. The issue has also received support from the Eastern Ontario Wardens’ Caucus. On June 24, 2007 AMO passed a motion to petition the Premier and Minister of Northern Development and Mines for action.

**Council Meeting**

Date: July 10, 2007
Moved By: S Freeman
Sec’d By: C Rawling
Motion: # 7A-07-201

WHEREAS Ontario’s municipal governments recognize the importance of Ontario’s mining sector to the Ontario economy and to the economies of mining communities; and
WHEREAS Canadian law has traditionally recognized as a fundamental freedom, the right of the individual to the enjoyment of property, a right not to be deprived thereof; and
WHEREAS the Mining Act of Ontario recognizes separate mining and surface rights on many private lands, bringing about a state of affairs where there may be two owners to one property; and
WHEREAS mining activities on these properties have frequently resulted in property damage, environmental degradation, and unmapped mining hazards, disturbing residents’ quiet enjoyment of the land and risking public health and safety; and
WHEREAS mining activities, prior to advanced exploration, are not subject to any municipal authority, conservation authority, environmental review, nor the approval of the landowner; and
WHEREAS municipal governments in regions with an abundance of surface-rights only (SRO) properties have previously called on the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to reunite surface and mining rights on SRO properties to resolve the situation; and
WHEREAS many of these properties are on residential, cottage, recreational lands and some in areas of Environmental, Cultural and Heritage significance where mining is incompatible with established land use practice; and
WHEREAS the Mining Act provides for Ministerial discretion and the ability to cancel or annul the forfeiture of any lands or mining rights under the Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT in support of AMO’s position, Tay Valley Township petition the Premier and the Minister of Northern Development and Mines to reunite surface and mining rights on SRO properties when requested by the SRO property owner or the municipality in order to effectively resolve this issue.

Carried

**The end of exploration in Ontario?**

By Terence Bottrill
9 August 2007

Two separate, but related, events in Ontario indicate that either by deliberate design, or simply through political and bureaucratic inaction, that exploration in Ontario, Canada is soon to come to a close in large parts of the Province. These two events are the continuing legal recognition of the primary rights of the so-called “first nations” or aboriginal peoples to legal title to much of the province, and the decision to give priority rights to private land owners rather than to mineral exploration.

The courts in Canada have been moving progressively towards the politically correct position that the so-called “first nations”, just by the logic of that term, were here in Ontario (and the rest of Canada) first, and that they have prior rights as a “nation” that the late arrivals - the rest of us - have to recognise. Initially intended to give the aboriginal people a reasonable opportunity to participate in discussions and even decisions on major industrial development - such as new mines - in areas of traditional use by the aboriginal peo-
ples, recent decisions are clearly moving to the position that as the first occupants of the land that they have prior rights and effective ownership of the land. One band leader claiming all of the 36,000 square kilometres of the Ottawa River watershed blocking access to an exploration property said that “she will stay on the mining property for as long as it takes to get the government to put a moratorium on mining. She says she won’t go even if the judge grants the injunction. We will not allow the diamond drill at any cost. It’s our responsibility to Mother Earth and the water.”

The second situation is well documented in a recent discussion document distributed by the Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, wherein they state the importance of new mine development to the economy of the province, and thereby the country, but wherein they are proposing to change the current Mining Act to give priority of land use to private land owners on lands granted under the laws existing during early settlement of the country. (Act Proposal Notice: EBR Registry Number: 010-1018 Title: Potential changes to how claim staking and mineral exploration would be conducted on property where the mining rights and surface rights are held separately, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, July 18, 2007). It almost makes one think of the rule of the landowning barrons before the days of emergent democracy in the British Isles.

The fact that these two approaches - i.e., ownership of the land by the aboriginals and private interests as against the public at large - are internally inconsistent is generally overlooked, simply because each provides the greatest attraction to the local electorate in the areas most affected by these decisions, to the aboriginal people in most of the less industrialised part of the Province - which is by far most of it - and to private land owners in large parts of southern Ontario and other industrially developed areas, including the very large “municipalities” created around many historically significant mining districts in order to increase the local tax base. Those in the exploration industry well recognise the importance of access to land in order to undertake modern exploration efforts, especially those in areas of better developed infrastructure and therefore of lesser interest to the environmental lobbies who wish to preserve most of the remainder of the Province as a form of wilderness area with limited access - and certainly no mining. But now, even areas which have been developed largely in order to support mining activities, are to be withdrawn from access in order to protect the private rights of subsequent land owners and municipal governments, who will always agree to restrict land development as a way to get elected.

Unfortunately, government in general, and the relevant ministries in particular, have forgotten that it takes access to a great deal of land to stand even a chance of making a new discovery, especially in areas such as Ontario, which have had most of the near-surface territory well explored since the arrival of the earliest settlers. They have forgotten that the mineral rights are developed to the benefit of the entire population, well beyond the local community, and that decisions on whether or not to proceed with further development have to be based on decisions regarding the overall good of the people at large, rather than those of greatest benefit to private land owners or other special interest groups.

The situation in which both sets of circumstances have come together has been in a recent exploration programme for uranium in southern Ontario, where much of the surrounding land is privately owned, and all of it is claimed by various groups of aboriginal people. There has not been a lot of news around the situation, partly as the company involved is private, i.e., not listed on any securities exchange, and therefore with little interest in spending its available funds on public or investor relations. Unfortunately, rather than spending its money on exploration it is now faced with unenviable litigation wherein its legal opponents are the native bands, but in the background are the local private land owners and environmental NIMBY lobby groups, as well as the province and the provincial police.
The property in question was staked over the past two years over an area of what is called “Crown land”, i.e., owned by the government and open for staking, and on which over a million dollars has been spent in exploration since then, all in compliance with the Mining Act and regulations. Apart from the aboriginal groups who are claiming the entire watershed, local residents with land around the perimeter of the exploration property are demanding a stop to all exploration and mining based on the un-founded belief that diamond drilling will expose them to radiation. The fact that they are living on top of and around one of the largest and highest amplitude surface uranium anomalies in southern Ontario, in an area with almost no overburden, as demonstrated on maps released in the past few years by the Canadian government, does not seem to concern them as to the natural radiation they are exposed to already or any radioactive material in their local drinking water supplies. But the small amount of rock in drill core will clearly harm them! In reality they do not want their current life style affected by any form of industrial development, whether mining or otherwise, and have put up large fights in the past over the proposed development of industrial mineral operations.

The mineralisation in the area is widespread, as shown by the government maps, as well as by past exploration, the last in the late 1970’s, including almost 200 diamond drill holes scattered over an area over 10 kilometres long and two to three kilometres wide. The uraninite mineralisation is widely dispersed in sheeted leucogranite hosted by Neoproterozoic gneiss similar in style and setting to the so-called alaskite orebodies at the large Rio Tinto Rössing mine in Namibia.

The local police force has refused to enforce the existing laws regarding access to property, largely arising from past confrontations with aboriginal peoples, wherein violence has resulted, including the death of one person, with the blame being placed squarey on the shoulders of the police, rather than the politicians who allow conflicts over land use and ownership to continue because it is politically expedient to do so - i.e., ignoring the problem in the forlorn hope that it will go away is the easiest way to get re-elected. Irrespective of the circumstances around access to land for exploration, neither the federal or provincial governments have yet to develop a consistent policy where it comes to conflicting land rights between aboriginal people and everyone else who came later. Canada has been found at fault in the past by international bodies by comparison with situations such as the Palestinian people outside of Israel, and even with apartheid in South Africa and the development of the “homelands”, as comparable situations to aboriginal (“Indian”) reservations in Canada. Unfortunately, whichever side the government takes, it will be at fault. If it proposes to treat all of the people of Canada as equals, with equal rights to land, then it will be accused of not helping the first-arrival dis-advantaged people - i.e., the aboriginals, who have a court enforced and recognised prior claim to the land. If they negotiate settlements to give effective ownership and control of large segments of land to the aboriginal peoples they are accused of apartheid and the development of “homelands”. Even when such accusations do not arise, it is almost inevitable that the aboriginal people will subsequently decide that whatever agreements they entered into previously, the so called “treaties”, were illegal because the negotiations were not between people of equal standing, but where one was effectively the conquered people (the aboriginals) and the other the conquerors (the original settler colonies). They want to re-open negotiations and will do whatever is necessary and however long it takes, to win their argument, including total disregard for the rights of others and the law. The exploration industry is just one victim of this political inertia. The threat of violence is all the aboriginal groups need to gain public sympathy through the short attention times and lack of journalistic integrity characteristic of today’s media.

While the particular circumstances which gave rise to this letter are in southern Ontario, it is clearly an increasing phenomenon, as for example in the lead story on the “aborigines’ demands “blackmailing” miners” in the Min-
ing Journal of July 27, 2007. Even here, the Mining Journal adds confusion to non-expert readers, in that the story relates to exploration companies, not miners. This distinction is one which is often forgotten, and is hard to reinforce in all the circumstances when exploration is described as, or thought of, as being equivalent to mining. There was a time when the same, mostly large, companies carried out the majority of exploration and mining, but this has not been the circumstance in most of the world for several decades. They are distinct companies, owned by different types of shareholders with different interests and risk profiles. In Ontario, what is called the “Mining Act” has very little if anything to do with the practice of mining, except where it relates to mine development, closure and rehabilitation, but instead is the law describing the conditions under which individuals and companies can gain access to, and eventual ownership of, mineral properties.

The current proposal from the Ontario ministry is to give priority rights to surface land owners, who are clearly the squeakiest wheel at present, as compared with the almost non-existent organisations which are supposed to represent the exploration companies, but which have been totally ineffective in providing access to land in every circumstance where reduced access has been proposed by some special interest group, with no consideration whatsoever on the potential economic impact on the province. For a very long time governments have supported the myth that extractive industries are a historical artefact and that the future lies in service economies. That myth, still the popular line with banks and other financial interests, has once again been proven false with the booming economy - and benefits to all the population - in Alberta with development of the tar sands. It was also clear that many of Canada’s primary industries were seen to be of great value by the various companies such as CVRD, Xstrata and Rio Tinto who have recently purchased between them all of the historically important major Canadian mining companies and mines, even if the governments could not see their value in employment, taxation revenue, export earnings, etc. Unfortunately none of those nice things can be directly tied to votes, whereas following the current sacred cows of environmental limitations on access to land, satisfying the demands of private land owners and aboriginal peoples can be directly tied to gathering votes at which ever level of government is next up for re-election.
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Detail of a map showing mining claims in the Outaouais. Archaic pro-mining legislation gives prospectors too much right to explore and develop land that other people are already using.

Many landowners in and near Sharbot Lake are finding themselves on the wrong side of an archaic law that gives prospectors expansive rights to hunt for minerals on other people’s land.

A company called Frontenac Resources is hunting for uranium, the nuclear fuel. Several questions are in play at Sharbot Lake: an unresolved aboriginal land claim and locals’ concerns about long-term pollution are the most significant. Working these out is bound to be time-consuming and expensive. But a bigger problem is the collision between the rights of miners in Ontario and those of the people who own land that might have minerals on or under it. The situation is similar in other provinces; in the Outaouais, a company called Aldershot Resources has staked hundreds of square kilometres of mining claims. The Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines is clear that its purpose is to promote mining in Ontario. The government owns the mining rights on most land that now belongs to the Crown or ever did, and the government grants expansive rights to people with prospectors' licences to hunt for valuable minerals.

This is a fact of the Mining Act, and surface-rights holders can't be excused for not knowing how it affects their property. Still, that
doesn't mean the system works the way it should.

Despite the plain meaning of the term "surface rights," people who hold them do not have the right to stop people from using the surface of a piece of land to prospect, claim, drill, and eventually mine on. Mining rights and surface rights have equal legal standing.

In fact, mining rights seem to supersede surface rights. When prospectors start digging around, they don't have to tell surface-rights owners they're doing it. They can cut trees down to use for stakes, dig holes and trenches to get samples and tape sections off -- all without ringing a doorbell or leaving a note.

In what seems to be an effort to placate surface-right holders, the ministry says only about one claim in 10,000 ultimately leads to a working mine, and usually not until after 10 or 20 years of careful study. From a landowner's view, that could mean 10 or 20 years of workers traipsing over your land and of being unable to sell the surface rights for their ordinary value.

The rules should protect people who are using their surface rights to land for homes, cottages or businesses. Such changes don't have to be onerous but not making them leaves surface-right holders at risk.

The existing law might have been acceptable when the Crown was first granting land to private citizens, often in vast parcels to people who planned to use it for its resources. It will not do in an age of high prices for desirable rural property, eco-tourism, retirement-project bed-and-breakfasts, and market-gardening. Mining is not always the highest and best use to which land can be put.
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Residents, natives protest uranium mine; 300 participate in Sharbot Lake march

Jordan Press
Monday, July 09, 2007 - 00:00

Local News - A retired minister, John Hudson moved from Kingston to the Sharbot Lake area 15 years ago. He moved for the scenery, the environment and the quiet, but all that could change and yesterday, he was preaching against a plan that would see uranium mined near his home. Marching along Highway 7, Hudson said he's worried about the environmental impacts from the proposed operation.

"I'm right down the river and I see enough crap coming down our river," said Hudson, 70. "The bottom line is I don't want a uranium mine at my back door."

And neither did the estimated 300 people who marched along with Hudson, area residents and Sharbot Lake and Ardoch Algonquin First Nations members.

"We were hoping for 100," said Doreen Davis, chief of the Sharbot Lake Algonquin First Nation. "I am just honoured and humbled that the people are here to support us."

Davis said everyone wants to see a full moratorium on mining the substance and the demonstration was designed to get the attention of upper levels of government. "And if not, we'll do this again," she said. "We'll continue until somebody listens."

Yesterday's march went from the intersection of highways 7 and 509 west to Highway 38. Along the way, the band of demonstrators grew as more people appeared on the road and joined the march.

Waving flags, chanting, singing, drumming and holding signs, the march had a simple message summed up on many of the homemade signs they carried and the T-shirts they wore: "No uranium mining."

Provincial police closed off that section of the highway and re-routed traffic through the area for the one-hour march that police described as "extremely peaceful."

Harold Perry, honorary chief of the Sharbot Lake Algonquin First Nation, said there is an obligation to fight the proposed mining operation.

"We can't afford to have this kind of stuff going on," he said. "I don't want my daughter
Mining uranium causes long-term environmental and health effects because of its radioactivity, said Joan Kuyek, national co-ordinator for MiningWatch Canada. "In this case, the local communities are saying they don't want it, the Algonquins are saying they want it and we support that," Kuyek said. A group of Algonquins have been at the entrance to the proposed mining site. The occupation is now into its second week.

Along with Algonquins have come area residents who oppose the project. Some have brought themselves, others food and supplies. Frontenac Ventures Corporation has staked 400 claims over about 8,000 hectares in North and Central Frontenac. The land is a mix of private and Crown land, the latter being the subject of negotiations between the Algonquins and provincial government.

Frank Morrison is one of those people who found out the company has a stake on his property. He marched yesterday and said residents needed to back the Algonquins because it was the area's lone hope.

Under provincial law, the land on native reserves isn't available for mineral collection. "The land claim is going to save us and if it wasn't for that, we might as well pack up and go home," he said.

Just like the march, the number of people taking up the cause is increasing, Morrison said. "It's just growing exponentially," he said. "That's what happens when people finally find out what's going on here." "This," he said looking up and down the mass of marchers, "is more symbolic than anything else."

Hudson said he was concerned about the way the proposal was being handled with people such as Morrison simply being told the company had a right to mine their property. "It will be interesting to see what the position of our provincial government will be," he said.

Any hint of problems from mining uranium could cause damage to the area's economy, said Norman Gunteresperger, a councillor from Central Frontenac. Mining uranium could damage the area's hope to attract more tourists and needed to be stopped, he said. "We want to get the word out. I see this as the beginning of a long fight," he said.
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Safety and Compliance

"Why do I need to think about safety and compliance? Isn't that the job for someone back in the office to do? I've got to get out to the field and do the required work, and since I've been doing this for a long time, I'm pretty sure I know what I'm doing."

Has this thought every passed through your mind?

My name is Jake Vandahl, and I make Health and Safety my business – full time. The purpose of this article is to and get you thinking about health and safety.

Some of the basic obligations that are required by employers are having appropriate WSIB coverage, reporting all injuries requiring health care, and following First Aid Regulation 1101. With respect to health and safety training and information, they must have the following program in place to deal with such things as roles and responsibilities, accident investigation, emergency planning (injuries / fires) workplace inspections, health and safety representation, WHMIS, lock out / tag out, and work refusals. Other training may include chainsaw and brushsaw safety awareness, transportation of dangerous goods, propane heaters and torches, A.T.V. rider training and possibly a defensive driving program.

As an employer under the Occupational Health and Safety Act, you are obligated to take every precaution to protect workers in the workplace. From a legal stand point, this is due diligence. Our focus on safety should not end at the end of the workday. We must be focused and committed 24 hours a day,
seven days a week. If you require any assistance with your health and safety matters, please feel free to contact me.

Jake Vandahl
Intola Safety
6980 Townline Road
Thunder Bay, ON
P7G 2G8
Tel: (807) 767-7485
Fax: (807) 768-9782
Cell: (807) 624-6651
info@IntolaSafety.ca
www.IntolaSafety.ca

« MASHA Safety Corner »

Map Skills and GPS
Hand-held Global Positioning Systems (GPS) have made travel through wilderness easier and easier, but they can also provide a false sense of security. GPS systems are incredibly user-friendly and accurate for identifying the user’s geographic location, but are susceptible to dying batteries, indented screens, and water damage. A GPS should always be used with a map and compass in case any damage to the system occurs.

Topographic maps allow users to see much more of the landscape at once (GPS screens tend to be small and involve a great deal of scrolling). This enlarged map view makes route finding easier as obstacles between Point A and B can all be seen at once. Topographical maps reveal elevation contour lines and physical hazards and features to help choose a safe, efficient path.

Companies should have a navigation program in place for workers travelling through bush. The program should include training on map, compass and GPS use. Before workers go into the bush to navigate by map and compass, they should be able to demonstrate the following:

- Identify features on a Canadian 1:50 000 topographical map.
- Understand the scale of the map to determine distance between two points.
- Understand how contour lines and physical hazards affect route planning.
- Identify magnetic North and corresponding declination.
- Recognize and express the identified location in relation to north, east, south, west directions as related to the surroundings, for example the east side of the road, west side of the lake etc.
- Identify the UTM and latitude/longitude grid ‘tick’ or indicator marks in the corners and margins of the map.
- Describe the location (with coordinates) on the map and give direction details or physical features to help with location.

A GPS user must also be able to:

- Enter the map datum setting according to the map datum source on the 1:50 000 or 1:24 000 topographical map they are using
- Mark a waypoint
- Save a waypoint
- Retrieve a waypoint
- Demonstrate the ‘Go To’ function
- Read the position or navigation page of the GPS unit (UTM or longitude/latitude) in relation to a topographical map

Safety Scenarios
How good are your map skills? Workers heading into the bush, dependent on map, compass and GPS should feel comfortable responding to the following situations:

- On route to your work area, a member of your group falls and breaks his leg and goes into shock. You need to radio in with the location of your party.
- You keep seeing evidence of bears in an area five kilometres from the
camp. You would like to relay this location to everyone back at base camp.

While hiking, you spot smoke in the distance and suspect a forest fire. You need to radio in the location and wind direction to an emergency contact.

Training on map skills, GPS use and route finding is often available for local outdoors centres.

Source: National Green Check GPS Certification Program

www.greencheckgps.ca

Glossary

Topographical Maps: Provide details of land (as opposed to charts, which focus on water depth etc). Land details include roads and rail, density of forest cover, swamps, populated areas etc.

Contour Lines: Show elevation on a topographical map. Lines that are close together indicate steep changes in elevation, good to know for route planning.

UTM: Refers to the Universal Transverse Mercator grid system. Topographic maps have a grid pattern over top of them, with corresponding numbers along the sides of the map used to identify location. An example of UTM coordinates would be:

18T 0424200 5097850
18T is the zone the map is in, ‘0424200’ is the UTM equivalent of latitude and ‘5097850’ of longitude.

Waypoint: A waypoint is a stored location in a GPS. It can represent a camp, work area, first aid station, anything the user feels is worth identifying. Waypoints can be recorded by entering UTM coordinates or longitude and latitude or a reading can be taken from where the user is standing. **It is important to record coordinates for waypoints in a log book in the event of GPS failure.**

WIND ELECTRICAL GENERATORS

The OPA with the assistance of Roy Spooner of MNDM was able to discuss with David Hurd of Brookfield Power the footprint of Wind turbines on the landscape.

One of the OPA’s questions was is there a problem for explorers to be around the base of the turbine. Mr. Hurd felt there was no cause to be worried around the units except when there was possible ice build up on the blades that could fall.

The MNR has set a size of withdrawal for each site at 120 metres square. Brookfield Power needed an area 80 metres in diameter to construct the units before they are craned to their operating perch.

The one feature that would be of most concern to Mr. Hurd was the energy collector lines and the fibre optic control lines. He stated in the Sault Ste Marie cases the lines run from the towers to a main line buried on the edge of the access roads. The access roads are not withdrawn from staking on crown land and he recommends caution around the cabling. Not really anything we don’t already do around Bell lines, pipelines and power lines.

For more on Brookfield please check out their website: www.brookfieldpower.com

Ontario Exploration & Geoscience Symposium

“Ontario: Explore and Discover”
December 11 & 12, 2007
Radisson Hotel
Sudbury, Ontario

For delegate registration, booth, or poster applications and Sponsorship Opportunities please visit our website

www.ontarioprospectors.com

or contact the OPA office
toll free at 866-259-3727 or 807-622-3284

Don’t forget to purchase your Ticket for the Annual Ontario Prospectors Association Awards Dinner

Tuesday, December 11, 2007
Radisson Hotel, Sudbury, Ontario

We hope to see you there!