



MiningWatch Canada

Mines Alerte

Newsletter

Contents:

Number 21: Winter 2005-2006

- *Placer Dome Admits to Killings at Porgera Mine in Papua New Guinea*
- *Kinross Gold and Katanga Mining: Part of the Pillage of the Democratic Republic of Congo?*
- *National Pollutant Release Inventory Drops Exemption for Mining*
- *The Legacy of Asbestos Mining in Newfoundland*
- *Two Trout and Salmon Lakes in Newfoundland Slated for Destruction by Mine Waste*
- *Urgent Need to Investigate Respiratory Impairment of Hemlo Miners*
- *El Salvador: Chalatenango Communities Step Up Resistance to Au Martinique*
- *Canary Institute Publishes Curriculum Project*

Placer Dome Admits to Killings at Porgera Mine

Canadian gold mining company Placer Dome, recently acquired by Barrick Gold, has confirmed reports coming out of the remote Papua New Guinea highlands that security guards at its Porgera gold mine have been shooting at, and killing, villagers. Placer Dome owns a 75% interest in, and is the operator of, the Porgera mine. Placer has admitted to eight deaths at the hands of its security forces, seven of them since 2000, but local villagers put the numbers at well over 20 dead.

MiningWatch Canada has long been aware of ongoing conflict at and around the mine, however reports of intensifying violence started to reach us in the summer of 2005. Placer's Porgera mine has always been highly controversial. Mine waste disposal at the mine is primarily through direct dumping into a major 800 kilometre-long river system that ends in the Gulf of Papua. This so-called "riverine" disposal method is well-known to create massive and irreversible damage to entire river systems and their associated habitats. Other mining companies such as BHP-Billiton have acknowledged this fact and agreed not to use rivers for waste disposal in the future. While Placer has repeatedly been asked by shareholders to stop the dumping, and asked by Ethical Funds to agree never to use this technology again, Placer has made no concessions. Villagers living downstream from the mine, who suffer the consequences of Placer's waste, frequently express their frustration by cutting down the electrical poles that supply energy to the mine and the nearby villages.

In 2000, when MiningWatch Canada's Catherine Coumans visited Porgera, she was shocked by the sight of



Village overlooking Porgera mine in Papua New Guinea. C. Coumans photo.

whole families standing in the waste stream from the mine. The adults were busy “panning” the mine tailings for remnants of gold while the children played in the cement-like material. Placer officials explained that this was a hazardous activity as the villagers would later use mercury to extract the gold from the waste, and be exposed to highly toxic mercury fumes. But given the uncontained flow of the waste, Placer officials argued there was little they could do to stop the deadly practice.

In 2000, Catherine was also told that nearby villagers frequently wandered into and through the mine site and that some even removed chunks of gold bearing rock from the

mine’s dump trucks. There was no evidence of any kind of barrier between the mine site and the surrounding villages. It is these “trespassers” that Placer now admits its security forces have been shooting at and killing. MiningWatch’s local partners have issued a report in which they claim that at least 22 people have been killed, over 100 wounded and thousands arbitrarily detained. The most recent reports from an investigative journalist, as yet unconfirmed, tell a harrowing tale of widespread rape by security forces, cultural extinction of the Ipi people and forced relocation of villagers to make way for mine expansion.

Kinross Gold and Katanga Mining: Part of the Pillage of the Democratic Republic of Congo?

According to various analyses, a joint venture involving Kinross Gold, and which is now being taken over by Katanga Mining Limited, gives the multinationals access to huge pieces of the Democratic Republic of Congo’s state mining company, Gécamines (La Générale des Carrières et des Mines) at “fire sale” prices.

Gécamines was formed by former dictator Mobutu Sese Seko in 1966 to nationalise the ill-gotten assets of the notorious Belgian company, Union Minière du Haut Katanga, (formed in 1906 out of the merger of a company created by Léopold II and Tanganyika Concessions Ltd. (a British group created by Cecil Rhodes). Despite years of Mobutu and his cronies siphoning off money, in the early 1990s Gécamines was still the most lucrative source of state revenue in the DR Congo. Now Gécamines has been stripped of virtually all of its assets and ore bodies through a number of disadvantageous contracts. One of those contracts carries a Canadian stamp.

In February, 2004, a contract was signed between Gécamines and British Virgin Islands-based Kinross Forrest Limited, creating the Kamoto Joint Venture and assigning 75% ownership to Kinross Forrest (based on a \$200 million investment) and 25% to Gécamines. The Kamoto joint venture holds copper and cobalt leases at Kolwezi, Katanga Province, as well as owning the Kamoto concentrator, the Lulu hydrometallurgical facilities, the Kamoto underground mine, several open pit mines, and related infrastructure.

Kinross Forrest has a definite Canadian connection. It was created some time prior to October 2001, owned 35% by Kinross Gold Corporation, 25% by Tain Holdings Limited (owned by Arthur Ditto, former Vice-Chairman of Kinross Gold), and 40% by George Forrest International Afrique S. PRL (owned by George Forrest, former Gécamines chairman). Kinross only reported on its participation, and the ownership structure, in its 2004 Annual Report.

On August 2, 2005 — confident of President Kabila’s ratification of the joint venture agreement — Balloch Resources Ltd. and Kinross Forrest finalised an agreement giving Balloch the right to acquire 100% of Kinross Forrest. Under the agreement, Kinross Forrest shareholders will receive common shares pro rata in proportion to their holdings in KFL.

The joint venture agreement was ratified by President Kabila on August 4, 2005.

On November 30, 2005, Balloch Resources held a special

shareholders meeting to ratify and approve the purchase of Kinross Forrest. Balloch also changed its name to Katanga Mining Limited and Kinross Forrest shareholders Robert M. Buchan (former President of Kinross Gold), Arthur H. Ditto, and George A. Forrest were elected to Katanga’s Board of Directors.

Pursuant to the August 2, 2005 agreement (ratified by Kinross Gold shareholders on September 2, 2005), by December 13, 2005 Katanga Mining Ltd. had purchased a 23.33% share interest in Kamoto from Kinross Gold Corporation for \$5.45 million, leaving Kinross with 11.67% of Kinross Forrest until such time as Katanga exercises its remaining options.

The joint venture has been controversial in DRC and internationally. Most recently, UK-based Rights and Accountability in Development (RAID) commissioned a legal analysis of the Kinross Forrest joint venture (and another similar contract with Global Enterprises) from Fasken Martineau DuMoulin (FMD), and wrote to World Bank President Paul Wolfowitz asking him to investigate the contracts. The agreements, ratified under World Bank supervision, relate to extensive assets of Gécamines being transferred or leased for use by the private sector without an international invitation to tender or any evaluation or assurance that the DRC will be appropriately paid for them.

According to RAID’s news release, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin found that Kinross Forrest and Global Enterprises:

- will likely reap substantial benefits from the ventures, including complete repayment of loans, before Gécamines receives any reward for contributing the ore bodies and mining assets;
- will manage their respective ventures, but payment to Gécamines for rented installations and machines will likely be minimal or zero; and
- will likely be paid dividends via service contracts, because this is more profitable for the private partners than sharing the remaining profits with Gécamines.

Bizarrely, RAID has since been notified by FMD that “these letters were sent to you without having been approved by a partner, as they should have been” although this “is not to be taken as any criticism or negative reflection on RAID”. The legal advice was published with FMD’s express knowledge and approval. FMD is one of the main legal firms for the

mining industry.

Also in reference to the Kamoto joint venture and the role of Kinross Gold and Katanga Mining, several Canadian non-governmental organisations (including MiningWatch) wrote to Foreign Affairs Minister Peter MacKay on March 17, 2005, urging him to find ways to regulate the activities of Canadian mining companies in vulnerable countries.

But the controversy has been brewing for years. A three-year investigation by a Panel of Experts, convened by the United Nations Security Council in 2000, exposed sophisticated networks of high-level political, military and business persons in cahoots with various rebel groups were intentionally fuelling the conflict in order to retain their control over the country's natural resources. In a series of controversial reports, the Panel exposed the vicious cycle of resource-driven conflict that had taken hold of the DRC.

In its October 2002 report, the Panel also accused dozens of western companies of violating a set of government-backed international standards for responsible corporate behavior known as the "Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises". The Panel felt it was necessary to bring to light the companies' role in perpetuating the conflict.

A Commission of Inquiry was set up in 2003 by the Congolese Transitional Government under the chairmanship of Christophe Lutundula to review the validity of the contracts concluded during the war years (1996-1998). The commission submitted its report to the Office of the Congolese National Assembly on June 25, 2005, but the report was not published until February 20, 2006. The report found that dozens of contracts were either illegal or were disadvantageous to the country, and support a 2003 report prepared by International Mining Consultants (IMC) for the World Bank on Gécamines. The IMC study — still not published — also concluded that the private partners in these joint ventures contributed hardly anything compared with what they gained from Gécamines.

Both the IMC and Lutundula reports called on the Congolese government to suspend all further negotiations, although the Lutundula Commission did not specifically look at the Kinross Forrest agreement. According to the IMC report, the mining concessions that Gécamines still owned in 2003 would have been sufficient to relaunch the company.

IMC called for "an immediate halt to all negotiations" and for "rapid preparations for the renegotiation of the partnerships".

The Lutundula Commission recommended that "all negotiations for the sale of the mine of Kamoto, Kamoto Oliveira Virgule (KOV), the Lulu installations and the Kamoto concentrator, which form the backbone of Gécamines, should be immediately halted." The Kamoto Joint Venture clearly falls within the conclusions of both the IMC and Lutundula reports, yet President Kabila chose to sign it. There has been much speculation on the reasons for this, based on the individuals involved and their interests as well as the political and economic considerations of Kabila himself.

George Forrest is no stranger to controversy either. A complaint was filed in the US under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on November 24, 2004 by Friends of the Earth-US and RAID regarding Ohio-based OM Group's joint venture with Forrest, the Groupement pour le Traitement des Scories du Terril de Lumbumbashi, Ltd., alleging anti-competitive practices, supply chain responsibility, violation of national law, and improper political involvement. OM Group never responded to US authorities.

According to the 2002 report of the UN Panel of Experts, Kinross had been thwarted in initial investment efforts by Congolese officials and George Forrest; clearly, they have worked out their differences. According to Katanga, the Kinross Forrest portion of the Kamoto joint venture is now worth almost three times the initial \$200 million investment, and the fact that senior Kinross Gold executives quit their posts in order to take up with Katanga would indicate their confidence that the venture is worth quite a bit more than that.

Katanga Mining Ltd. is registered in Bermuda and reports to the British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario Securities Commissions. It trades on the Toronto Venture Exchange under the symbol KAT. Kinross Gold is registered in Ontario and reports in all Canadian provinces; it trades on the Toronto Stock Exchange under the symbol K and on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol KGC.

On February 20, 2006, the Lutundula report was finally released.

See also "Congo Squanders its Crown Jewels" by John Vandaele, MO*31, March 2006.

National Pollutant Release Inventory Drops Exemption for Mining

On February 25, 2006, the *Canada Gazette* published a "Notice with Respect to Substances in the National Pollutant Release Inventory for 2006". In "General Criteria", Section 3(1)(h), the mining exemption now only applies to "pits and quarries".

In Canada, the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) is the means by which Canadians can get information about the pollutants transferred by companies and released to the environment in their communities. It helps government and other groups by identifying priorities for action to protect health and the environment in Canada. It is part of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA).

Since the NPRI was introduced in 1998, the criteria for reporting to NPRI have exempted facilities from reporting substances listed in Parts 1A through 3 of the NPRI, "if the

only source or use of that substance is from mining, but not the further processing or other use of mined materials."

For a number of years now, a struggle has been taking place in Canada between the mining industry and organizations that care about public health to get mining wastes and tailings included in the NPRI. The mining industry argues that low concentrations of toxins in waste rock and tailings occur in nature and are therefore not "releases to the environment".

Mining is the only sector that does not have to report on-site disposal of CEPA toxics to the NPRI. The industry claims it is only "storing" them.

The industry also argues that the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations capture releases from mine sites. In reality, the MMER reports releases of only a limited number of substances to water, and only after they have left the company

property. The industry also argues that it is one more “onerous” administrative burden. We argue that it is a cost of doing business.

MiningWatch, Pollution Probe, the STORM Coalition, the Pembina Institute and other groups argue that removing the rock from the ground and crushing it exposes dangerous substances to air and water, and disposes of them in waste rock heaps and tailings impoundments which have to be monitored in perpetuity. Their effects are cumulative and toxic, and the public has the right to know about them.

In 2002, Environment Canada decided that the mining exemption had to be re-examined as part of a review of all NPRI exemptions. Environment Canada says that “Among the drivers are the need to identify Criteria Air Contaminant emissions from mining sources, to harmonize the NPRI and Ontario’s Regulation 127, to improve comparability with the US Toxics Release Inventory, and to simplify and integrate greenhouse gases, Statistics Canada and NPRI reporting requirements.”

A NPRI Multi-Stakeholder Working Group was set up by Environment Canada to begin dealing with the issue, and a special “mining sub-group” was formed. The Canadian Environmental Network named four delegates to the sub-group: John Jackson, Anna Tilman, Marilyn Crawford and Joan Kuyek.

At the end of this process, it was agreed to remove the mining exemption. With the end of the mining exemption, there is not longer any regulatory bar to reporting on CEPA

toxics.

Digging up metals generates enormous piles of rock, which contain trace amounts of potentially harmful substances. As an example, one gold wedding ring produces anywhere from 6 to 30 tonnes of waste rock and tailings. Waste rock is unprocessed rock that has been broken into pieces to facilitate its removal; tailings are the processed finely ground rock created by extracting ore. In Canada, they are usually highly acidic, leaching sulphuric acid into waters and aquifers. They can contain arsenic, mercury, copper, nickel, selenium and other toxic substances. Tailings (also called slimes) are usually kept in impoundments of immense size, which have to be monitored in perpetuity. In Canada, mining creates more than 2 million tonnes of waste rock and tailings a day.

In the United States, the Toxics Release Inventory, or TRI, plays the same role. When mining was added to the TRI in 1997, the mining industry suddenly moved to the top of the list of polluters, contributing over half the 7.77 billion pounds of toxic chemicals released to the environment. Most of the pollutants came from the waste rock and tailings that are created at the mine site.

However, in 2002, because of lawsuits by Barrick Gold and the U.S. National Mining Association, most of the pollutants from waste rock were removed from the inventory. A US federal court ruled that many substances need not be reported if they make up less than 1 percent of the weight of the waste rock pile. But those trace amounts add up to 1.5 billion pounds in the United States.

The Legacy of Asbestos Mining in Newfoundland

On March 15, 2005, the CBC aired a story titled “Mine site air heavily laden with asbestos” about the Baie Verte Mine in Newfoundland. The story was based on a provincial government study that CBC obtained through a freedom of information request. The study shows that the former mine — which produced more than two million tonnes of asbestos between 1950 and 1985 — left behind more than 200 million tonnes of waste rock and tailings, and is clearly not a safe place.

The study, by Amec Earth and Environmental, concluded that the “mine site buildings are heavily laden with asbestos” and that “it’s likely that airborne asbestos fibres reside throughout the site.”

The Newfoundland Government commissioned the site assessment in 2004, but has said that the final report of the research would not be made public.

Two Trout and Salmon Lakes in Newfoundland Slated for Destruction by Mine Waste

MiningWatch Canada is currently participating, as a member of the Canadian Environmental Network (CEN), in a multistakeholder review of the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations (MMER). The MMER were originally promulgated under the Fisheries Act (section 36) in 1977. The revised regulations came into force in 2002 — following a 12 year review process — with a new appendix, “Schedule 2”, that was added at the very end of the review process. Schedule 2 identifies tailings impoundment areas. By being placed on Schedule 2 a natural water body is redefined as a tailings impoundment area. In 2002, CEN representatives in the review process were assured that Schedule 2 would serve to deal with ‘historic’ cases in which lakes had been used as tailings impoundments as these mines would otherwise find themselves out of compliance with the regulation. Now, however, Schedule 2 is being used by mining company Aur

Resources for a proposed copper-zinc mine near Buchans, Newfoundland, to destroy two ponds that contain trout and Atlantic Salmon by using them for environmentally toxic mine waste. These two ponds, as well as nearby brooks and streams that will also be affected by the mine, are part of the Exploits River watershed (the largest watershed in Newfoundland). Environment Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans officials have approved the inclusion of these two ponds onto schedule 2 of the revised regulations. The new regulations will be sent to Gazette I in April for public consultation ahead of government approval. We are concerned about the following:

1. The apparent willingness of government and industry to sacrifice ponds, rivers, trout and salmon habitat to benefit a mine that has a predicted lifespan of only 6.2 years.
2. The legal obligation on the proponent and on regional

Environment Canada authorities to explore alternative mine waste disposal options was not taken seriously.

3. Required “compensation” plans for the “alteration, disruption, or destruction of lacustrine [lake/pond] and riverine fish habitat” are based on inadequate and deficient data collection. The compensation plan review process in this case shows a cavalier attitude towards the natural resources that are being sacrificed.
4. After a predicted 6.2 years of operations, the destruction of two ponds and the degradation of wider river/aquatic habitat, this mine will become a “perpetual care and maintenance” mine. In the middle of a critical watershed for Newfoundland, this mine’s highly acidic waste has the potential to leach out metals and will need to be kept under water behind a number of dams that will need to be main-

tained “in perpetuity.”

This will be the first time that a new mine has received permission under the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations to destroy fish habitat by redefining it as a tailings impoundment. However, other mining companies have indicated that they too will seek to have natural water bodies containing fish included on schedule two in the future. These include the Red Chris and the Kemess North projects in British Columbia.

For more information on the history of the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations see the CEN backgrounder.

For more detail on the four concerns regarding the Aur Resources project in Newfoundland outlined above see “Issues of Concern Regarding Aur Resources, Proposed Duck Pond Mine in Central Newfoundland”.

Urgent need to look into respiratory impairment of Hemlo Miners

Almost five years after the Globe and Mail published a full page story that raised an alarm about silicosis among gold miners in the Hemlo Camp in northern Ontario, little has changed.

The Occupational Health Clinic for Ontario Workers explains silicosis this way:

“Breathing dust containing free crystalline silica is a potential health hazard because it may allow some of the smaller particles of silica to deposit in the lungs. The body tries to break down the particles to remove them from the lung. While the body tries to remove the particles, tissue may be damaged. The damaged tissue forms hard inelastic scar tissue in the lungs which may lead to a disease known as silicosis. The accumulated dust and scar tissue form small masses that are scattered throughout the lungs. These small masses may join together forming large masses of scar tissue. These scars make the lungs stiff and interfere with the transfer of oxygen into the blood. The heart must work harder to pump blood through the stiff lungs. This added strain may lead to failure of the right side of the heart.”

On October 22, 2004, in the face of a 10% increase in the number of silicosis cases in Ontario, the United Steelworkers called on the Ontario Government to review the Silica Monitoring Program at all mines. “We want the Minister of Labour to reinstate the Mining Master File, as well as the traveling chest clinics, which was eliminated in 1995. These clinics provided proper and accurate records of exposures and occupational disease.”

On March 23, 2006, Nancy Hutchinson, National Occupational Health and Safety Director with the United Steelworkers of America, says that “there is definitely a problem at the Hemlo Camp, and it is being downplayed by the companies and the government... We think the problem may be associated with silica-containing shotcrete used in paste backfill.”

Silicosis, sarcoidosis and asthma are still disabling workers, and the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (previously known as the Workers Compensation Board) is still refusing to honour most of the claims brought before them.

There are three gold mines at Hemlo: David Bell, Williams, and Golden Giant. Only the Williams Mine is without a union. The Golden Giant Mine is now closed. David Bell

and Williams are a joint venture owned by Teck Cominco and Barrick. A vote to certify a union at Williams was lost last year.

For Michael Clancy, a 51 year old former miner with lungs that are now 30% impaired, the issue of silicosis in the Hemlo Camp is a very personal one.

A non-smoking father of two teenagers, Clancy had worked at Williams since 1985, first as a labourer in the electrical department, then in the warehouse. In 1992, he transferred underground and worked as a nipper using primarily he boom truck and two yard forklift, then he moved into production, where he operated the Rock-breaker, Scooptram and a JDT426 truck for hauling backfill. Throughout this time, constant exposure to airborne crystalline silica as well as diesel exhaust was probable.

Clancy was forced to give up working in his lucrative underground mining job at the Williams Mine when he got the results of a regular chest x-ray on November 2, 1999. His doctor at the Marathon Family Practice told him he had “findings consistent with silicosis.” This diagnosis was confirmed by a CT scan and the opinion of a respirologist in Thunder Bay.

There is no cure for silicosis, but removal from the source of the silica will usually arrest the disease. In 2000, Clancy was transferred to the warehouse, with a substantial cut in pay, where he found that he continued to be exposed to silica-laden dust blowing in from areas such as the open pit. He applied for Workers Compensation, hoping he could get retraining and get out away from the pollutants. He received a wage loss subsidy for a short period, but no pension.

In early autumn of 2005, a lung biopsy for suspected cancer found that he had “sarcoidosis” (an autoimmune disease that affects the lungs). Respirologist Dr. Susan Tarlo said that “We cannot rule out underlying silicotic compromise, in the context of occupational exposure.” An article in Occupational Health Medicine in 1998 found a strong association between silicosis and sarcoidosis.

Clancy personally knows at least four other men who work in the camp who have silicosis. There are many others with other respiratory impairment, including asthma.

A Ministry of Labour field visit on Sept 17, 2003 (#5091817) found that of 28 air samples taken during mucking operations from January to August, 2003, 7 exceeded the lim-

its, and 2 were in the order of 0.4 mg/m³. In Ontario, since September 2000, the exposure limit for respirable crystalline silica is set at 0.1 mg/m³.

The inspector asked, "Why can't back-fill muck be wetted? Why is there no ventilation into a dump access?" There were no questions about the possible effects on worker health from such massive exposure. Individuals who are exposed to extremely high levels over a short period from a few weeks to four or five years, may develop acute silicosis.

Clancy and his fellow miners want the answer to three questions:

- When will the Ontario Government call a public inquiry to address the lung diseases afflicting Hemlo workers, as was asked for in a media release dated June 20, 2002 by Thunder Bay Superior North MP Michael Gravelle, while he was sitting on the Opposition benches?
- Why has the mine operator not been fined when samples show they are exceeding the legislated regulation limits in the workplace?
- Why have Clancy and other miners with a history of work exposure to elevated silica levels not received WSIB pensions?

Chalatenango Communities Step Up Resistance to Au Martinique ***by Sebastian Dario, Chalatenango, El Salvador***

The town of San José Las Flores in Chalatenango overlooks the hills the mining company Au Martinique Silver claims to be rich in gold and other precious minerals, according to its March presentation to investors posted on the Martinique web site. However, the community of 200-plus families is not overly tempted by the company's offers of development, employment, schools, and other infrastructure projects. As the same investor reports by Au Martinique Silver announce that the company is obtaining two new exploration licences adjacent to the Ojo Blanco and Petancol licences it already has, the organized communities of the Association of Rural Communities for the Development of Chalatenango (CCR) are stepping up their resistance campaign.

Recently the elected community leaders of San José Las Flores presented a series of discussions to the elementary and high school students of Las Flores and surrounding communities about the environmental and social consequences of mining. As Felipe Tobar, president of the community board stated: "The youth, our children, are the future. They are the ones who will be affected by the contamination of mining. If it were just for me, this struggle wouldn't matter, I'll be dead before long anyway. But we are fighting for our children."

Awareness raising amongst young people and students is a priority for the community board. Before the organized communities escorted the mining company out of the region, young people had been targeted by the company to carry out day labour, digging trenches and collecting rock samples. The company pays 8 dollars a day and 12 dollars on Sundays, a fortune when compared to the \$4.35 that local youth earn in a day working for the Las Flores cooperative. However, thanks to youth organizing and educational campaigns, those who had considered working for the company are now clear in their conviction. When the alert went out recently over community

radio and with the ringing of church bells that the mining company might attempt to reenter the region, the young people were among the first to gather in the street.

The Ecological Association of Chalatenango (ASECHA), is also carrying out an educational campaign for the more than 2000 students in the public schools of the city of Chalatenango, in coordination with the organized communities of the CCR. The current licences Martinique has include parts of the municipality of Chalatenango, specifically the communities of Guarjila and Ignacio Ellacur'a, and some of the territory which falls under the mining licence in municipalities such as San José Las Flores is owned by residents of Chalatenango.

Despite what has been a rotund and repeated "no" from religious leaders, including the diocese of Chalatenango and mayors and community leaders in the municipalities of Los Ranchos, San Isidro Labrador, San José Las Flores, Nueva Trinidad, Arcatao and the city of Chalatenango, the mining company announced publicly this month that it has acquired two new licences. One of these licences is the region of Arcatao and the other is for the region south and east of San Isidro Labrador, including San José Cancasque, extending all the way to the '5th of November' reservoir.

Likewise, Martinique representatives continue to search for community and religious leaders who will negotiate community consent and lands. One example is Felipe Tobar who has been approached repeatedly, including this week when company representatives called to invite him to a company event. Felipe flatly refused, and in a few words accurately transmitted the message the communities of the CCR continue to give, "We do not want to negotiate, we do not want you here. We don't want any problems with the company and because of this we ask that you not enter our communities."

Canary Institute Publishes Curriculum Project

After many months of work, MiningWatch Canada's sister organisation, the Canary Research Institute for Mining, Environment and Health, has released *The Mining Controversy: An Awareness and Education Kit for Ontario Grade 7*. Investigating mining as it relates to aspects of the economy, the environment, and communities, this is a cross-curricular programme relating Reading, Geography, and Science. Prepared by Beth Nicol and Marilyn Crawford, the package contains everything needed to deliver an effective, skill-based unit.

It's available in print on request or it can be downloaded as a PDF file.