



MiningWatch Canada

Mines Alerte

Newsletter

Number 34: Spring/Summer 2013

Contents:

- *Global Condemnation of Barrick's Effort to Secure Legal Immunity from Rape Victims*
- *Ambassadors for Canadian Mining Companies*
- *Ontarians Still Waiting for Review of Mining Tax*
- *Algonquin Communities Push for Joint Review for Matamec's Rare Earths Project Under New Federal Environmental Assessment Rules*
- *Is Mine Closure in Ontario Protecting the Public?*
- *Alternative Mining Indaba Brings Community Perspective to South African Mining Debates*

Global Condemnation of Barrick's Effort to Secure Legal Immunity from Rape Victims

For many years, Papua New Guineans, with the support of MiningWatch Canada and other international organizations, have demanded that Barrick acknowledge a long-standing pattern of vicious beatings, rapes and gang rapes of local indigenous women by security guards at the Porgera Joint Venture (PJV) mine, operated and 95% owned by Barrick Gold. After years of denial in the face of mounting evidence, Barrick finally acknowledged the rapes. In October 2012, Barrick started to implement a project-level non-judicial procedure to deal with hundreds of alleged victims of rape by the PJV mine's security guards.

(In addition to victims of rape by the mine's security guards, women also allege rape by police mobile units that are housed at the mine site, fed and supported financially by PJV. Barrick's claims process will not provide benefits to women who have been raped by police mobile units.)

In November, 2012, MiningWatch Canada was provided a copy of Barrick's remedy framework (not by Barrick). The remedy framework raised serious concerns about the benefits package being offered to rape victims (which focuses on income generating projects), the claims



Protestors outside Barrick Gold's 2013 Annual General Meeting. Catherine Coumans photo.

process itself, and the requirement that women who accept an individual benefits package must sign a legal waiver that precludes them from suing Barrick on the issues covered by the non-judicial process:

“...the claimant agrees that she will not pursue or participate in any legal action against PJV, PRFA [Porgera Remediation Framework Association Inc.] or Barrick in or outside of PNG. PRFA and Barrick will be able to rely on the agreement as a bar to any legal proceedings which may be brought by the claimant in breach of the agreement.

(Benefits packages are described as “services and support to ensure the welfare and safety of Claimants, or to provide the Claimant with sustainable economic assistance,” as opposed to compensation or remedy, and may include: psychosocial/trauma counselling; health care; education and training; cooking utensils, clothing; micro-credit; assistance with school fees. For a complete list see Olgeti Meri Iगत Raits: A Framework of remediation initiatives in response to violence against women in the Porgera Valley, p.11-12.)

On May 14, 2013, 77 organizations from around the world sent a letter to the United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights to protest the fact that rape victims will only receive individual benefit packages through Barrick’s non-judicial process if they grant Barrick legal immunity from future civil action. (Additional organizations have signed on since the letter was sent. We will continue to update the sign-on list on our web site.)

Background

MiningWatch has engaged with local Papua New Guinea (PNG) organizations Akali Tange Association (ATA) and Porgera Landowners Association (PLOA) in Porgera over mining-related human rights and environmental issues since 2005. One of the issues that have been of serious concern has been the issue of the rapes of local women by mine security guards.

MiningWatch has supported the visits to Canada of leaders of ATA and PLOA between 2008-2011, and MiningWatch’s Catherine Coumans made two visits to Porgera, in 2008 and 2009. During one of these visits she interviewed rape victims. Findings resulting from these exchanges were made public in various ways including through public letters to UN Rapporteurs, press releases, background documents, a report to a Parliamentary committee, and in a complaint to Canada’s ‘National Contact Point’ for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.

While Barrick’s recent acknowledgement of the rapes by mine security guards was a positive development, we denounce Barrick’s use of a non-judicial process to secure legal immunity for the company from potential suits brought by the women.

In January, 2013, MiningWatch, together with Rights and Accountability in Development (RAID) and Earth-Rights International, issued a press release and supporting documents protesting the fact that rape victims are being asked to sign away their right to legal recourse in return for a benefits package they may receive through Barrick’s non-judicial process.

Leadership of the Akali Tange Association (a grass roots human rights organization in Porgera) and of the Porgera Landowners Association (which represents the landowners in the mine lease area) travelled yearly to Canada between 2008-2011 to meet with Canadian media, speak at Barrick’s annual general meetings and meet with Canadian civil servants and Members of Parliament regarding issues of violence by Barrick’s security forces at the Porgera Joint Venture mine. They also joined with MiningWatch Canada in lodging a formal complaint, in March of 2011 – addressing the rapes among other issues – with Canada’s National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.



Papua New Guinea women. C. Coumans photo.

Barrick’s response was to publicly defend its requirement of a legal waiver, including on CBC Radio’s As It Happens.

In March, 2013, MiningWatch’s Catherine Coumans travelled to Porgera in Papua New Guinea to assess the claims process first hand. From March 5-10 she conducted interviews with alleged rape victims. Nine of these interviews were in

depth, of which two were with women who had already entered Barrick’s claims process. She was also able to gather information on the experiences of other women in the claims process who she did not interview in depth. This field assessment of the claims process led to more detailed concerns regarding, among others, transparency of the process, the type of benefits that were being offered, the level of understanding of the process by women entering the process, and the requirement for legal waivers should a rape victim accept a benefits package.

MiningWatch has detailed these concerns in letters to the United

Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights (UNHCHR) (March 19; April 2; May 14), and has responded to Barrick's letters and web postings in response to our concerns.

Barrick reacts to criticism

On April 16, Barrick announced on its web site that it had changed the language of the legal waiver: "Further, the language MWC [MiningWatch Canada] purports to quote from the model agreement derives from an early draft; the present version contains much narrower terms."

In spite of repeated requests by MiningWatch, including at



Catherine Coumans interviewing Porgera rape victims. C. Coumans photo.

Barrick's Annual General Meeting on April 24, Barrick did not provide a new text related to the legal waiver, eventually replying that this text was "undergoing final revisions." On May 16, two days after the organizational sign on letter protesting Barrick's legal waiver requirement had been sent to the UNHCHR, Barrick released a new text related to the legal waiver. The new text reads:

"The Claimant agrees that, she will not pursue any claim for compensation, or any civil legal action that relates to the event(s) giving rise to the remedy claim, against the Porgera Joint Venture, PRFA or Barrick in Papua New Guinea or in any other jurisdiction. This limitation expressly excludes any criminal action that may be brought by any relevant state, governmental or international regulatory entity."

This new text deals with what was described to MiningWatch by a Papua New Guinean human rights expert as legal and constitutional concerns regarding Barrick's original legal waiver – stemming from the fact that the original text did not respect the Papua New Guinea state's authority to bring criminal charges and call witnesses, which may include rape victims who have received a benefits package through Barrick's non-judicial process.

The new text, however, still requires that rape victims who accept an individual benefits package through Barrick's non-judicial process sign a legal waiver that grants Barrick legal

immunity from law suits (civil suits) brought by the victims themselves.

Not "best practice"

In letters to the UNHCHR (March 19, April 2), MiningWatch provided examples of non-judicial remedy programs that explicitly do not require claimants to give up their rights to future legal action: in particular the Hokie Spirit Memorial Fund at Virginia Tech and victim's compensation schemes in Australia that provide for the payment of compensation by the government to victims of serious crime, as assessed by an independent tribunal.

These schemes provide important and relevant principles. Both cases recognize that the awards provided through non-judicial schemes may not reflect the level of compensation to which victims may be entitled under common law. (Common law of PNG, according to Wikipedia, consists of the Constitution, "customary law" derived from the "custom" of the various peoples of Papua New Guinea, and the common law of England as it stood at the date of Papua New Guinea's independence on 16 September 1975.)

This is also the case in regard to the remedy packages Barrick is offering rape victims in Porgera based on the information in the remedy framework document and interviews conducted by MiningWatch. (Barrick's letter to the UNHCHR of March 22

describes a "recent enhancement" to the company's remedy program in Porgera notably that "it will bear in mind the range of awards that have been rendered in the Papua New Guinea civil justice system for rape and sexual assault." It is unclear exactly what this will mean in practice.)

Furthermore, the Australian case provides another relevant principle, namely that compensation provided through a non-judicial mechanism may be made subject to a condition that the compensation be repaid from any subsequent award of damages in subsequent legal proceedings. This provision avoids so-called "double-dipping," which Barrick originally claimed as a reason for requiring a legal waiver.

Conditioning remedy on securing immunity: What is at stake and where is John Ruggie?

The women who have endured brutal assaults, beatings, rape and gang rape by security guards at Barrick's gold mine are overwhelmingly poor, marginalised and have low levels of formal education. The rapes have further marginalised and impoverished them. These women have suffered a gross violation of human rights.

Corporate project-level remedy processes do not have any legal status, do not necessarily afford victims the safeguards and protections of a court of law – such as independent legal counsel – and are not required to provide remedy that would be commensurate with what victims may receive through a legal process. They may also take place in very remote locations such

as the Highlands of Papua New Guinea with little or no independent scrutiny. There is no global assurance system for the operation of these corporate non-judicial mechanisms.

Barrick claims that its non-judicial claims process conforms to the *United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*, and references the primary author of the *Guiding Principles*, John Ruggie, in its remedy framework. John Ruggie is also a Special Consultant to Barrick's Corporate Social Responsibility Advisory Board. We have demonstrated that Barrick's claims process fails to meet the "effectiveness criteria" outlined in the *Guiding Principles*. Importantly, the *Guiding Principles* do not condone the use by a corporation of a non-judicial remedy process as a means to secure legal immu-

nity for the company from future civil action by the victims. However, Ruggie has failed to speak out on this issue and has not responded to our questions regarding his stance on Barrick's conditioning of remedy on receiving legal immunity.

While MiningWatch believes that Barrick should offer compensation for the harm that has been caused by its security guards, there should be no conditionality attached to the offer of remedy. A remedy package should be offered to compensate for a harm that has been suffered; it should not be used as a transaction of value. The remedy process should not be used as a vehicle by which to secure legal immunity for Barrick Gold. Nor should Barrick's non-judicial process for dealing with the rapes in Porgera be allowed to set an industry precedent.

Ambassadors for Canadian Mining Companies

From Mexico to Greece, we have been observing and documenting how Canadian Embassies go to bat to defend the interests of Canadian mining companies against the demands of communities and despite egregious human rights abuses.

In May, we released a report with Common Frontiers and the United Steelworkers based on our analysis of hundreds of pages of documents obtained through an access to information request to the Department of Foreign Affairs. Our research reveals how the Canadian Embassy in Mexico put considerable public resources at the service of Calgary-based Blackfire Exploration despite connections with suspects in the murder of a local activist, mine suspension on environmental grounds, and widely reported allegations of corruption.

Most disturbingly, we found that mere days after a damning report was circulated to the highest echelons of the Canadian government regarding the company's behaviour in Chiapas, Canadian authorities sought advice for the company about how to sue the state of Chiapas under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) for having closed the mine.

On November 27, 2009, Mariano Abarca was murdered in front of the restaurant that he owned and operated in the town of Chicomuselo, Chiapas. Abarca was a father of four and an active citizen who had fought for lower electricity rates. At the time he was murdered, he was leading a fight against Blackfire's barite mine given concerns over social and environmental impacts.

One week after his murder, Chiapas environmental authorities suspended the mine. Days later, the *Globe and Mail* reported that Blackfire had been making payments into the personal bank account of the mayor of Chicomuselo. An RCMP investigation into the allegations is ongoing.

We were aghast to learn that a few months before Abarca's murder, when he was arrested for eight days based on trumped

up accusations made by the company, the Embassy's response received 1,400 letters expressing dire concern for Abarca's life. Abarca had also just complained to an Embassy official that Blackfire workers were armed and intimidating mine oppo-



Mariano Abarca at a protest in front of the Canadian Embassy in July, 2009 (Mariano holding microphone and speaking with an Embassy Public Relations representative). Tamara Herman photo.

nents. Nonetheless, when Embassy officials visited Chiapas around this time, they appear only to have inquired about the security of Blackfire's investment, disregarding what communities were facing.

This is particularly disturbing in the context of a country such as Mexico, where Canadian companies comprise some 204 of 269 foreign firms operating in the sector and where, during 2012, we have seen some four mining opponents killed and others threatened, as well as ecologically, culturally and historically important sites put at risk from mining projects. It highlights how the one-sided and apparently unconditional support of Canadian officials as a serious part of the problem and why Canadian Embassies are becoming viewed as representatives of Canadian mining companies.

Certainly, the Mayor of Alexandroupolis, Greece would have felt this way when in March, 2012, Canadian Ambassador

Robert Peck requested a meeting that – partly captured on video – to pressure him into accepting Eldorado Gold’s open-pit gold mine project that has been vociferously opposed by the local population given threats to the environment and more sustainable livelihood activities.

Similarly, the Governor of the state of Morelos, Mexico had the same impression when Canadian Ambassador Sara Hradecky intervened in favour of Esperanza Resources, whose gold and silver open-pit mine project has been hotly contested, including by state and federal environmental authorities, for being situated a mere kilometre from the popular archaeological site of Xochicalco.

Residents of the municipality of San Rafael Las Flores, in southeast Guatemala, also shared this perception when Canadian Ambassador Hughes Rousseau participated as a witness of honour in the signing of a pact between the Guatemalan government and Tahoe Resources to voluntarily raise royalty payments from 1 to 5% upon putting the company’s Escobal silver mine into production. The pact is aimed at trying to legitimize an unwanted project. So far, twelve plebiscites have taken place at the community and municipal level in southeastern Guatemala, in the area of Tahoe’s silver project in which local

residents have voted overwhelmingly against the project. The current insistence to press forward regardless of local opposition with this project is contributing to an increasingly volatile situation. Two days before Rousseau participated in the official act, six men were shot by private security at the Escobal silver mine as they walked past the company’s property. Three days after the royalties pact was signed, the Guatemalan government declared a state of siege in the area of Tahoe’s silver project, suspending civil rights, including the right to protest or to public gatherings, and permitting police to conduct raids and detain people without warrant.

This trend reinforces the urgent need to reign in Canadian government promotion for our overseas mining sector, such that Canada create robust eligibility criteria for all government supports to mining companies, including ensuring respect for the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous communities and for binding democratic and participatory decision-making processes of non-Indigenous communities before mineral prospecting and project development begins; and pass legislation to regulate Canadian mining companies operating abroad, ensuring affected communities recourse to Canadian courts and an independent ombudsperson.

Ontarians Still Waiting for Review of Mining Tax

Of Canada’s main mining jurisdictions, Ontario has the poorest record for retaining royalties or mining-tax revenues. This is thanks to a mining tax based on profit with generous tax credits to reduce profits for tax purposes, low tax rates, and tax holidays. In response to calls from MiningWatch and others like the United Steel Workers, the Liberal government’s 2012 budget committed to reviewing the tax rates. Last fall MiningWatch met with staff working on the review, but they could not say what timeline they were on to complete it.

Over a year later there was still no sign of the review. MiningWatch continued to raise the issue during the 2013 pre-budget period including an op-ed in the online version of the Toronto Star. We were also pleased to see that the Ontario Federation of Labour’s People’s Budget included a call for increasing the mining tax. The 2013 Budget included a commitment to release a review within months. We will keep waiting for government’s analysis and continue our own work on this issue to ensure it doesn’t fade from sight!

Algonquin Communities Push for Joint Review for Matamec’s Rare Earths Project Under New Federal Environmental Assessment Rules

For the past two years MiningWatch Canada has been collaborating with Wolf Lake and Eagle Village Algonquin First Nations as they grapple with a proposed rare earths mine. Matamec Explorations Inc. is proposing the construction of a 4,200 tonne per day open pit rare earth mine in the traditional territory of the First Nations, who are insisting the project undergo a joint Canada-Algonquin review panel.

One of the first challenges was to get Matamec to acknowledge its responsibility to the Algonquin communities under Canadian and international law. On Algonquin territory, Quebec has failed to meet its requirements for the protection of Indigenous rights so it took some work to get Matamec to engage with the communities. Eventually an agreement between the company and the First Nations was reached under which the First Nations are conducting their own social impact assessment and able to hire their own technical review team at Matamec’s expense. Negotiations continue for a more global agreement about the project and exploration in the surrounding area. Since signing the first memorandum of understanding (MOU) progress on the subsequent agreements has been slow – yet Matamec repeatedly refers to having signed the MOU in their public communications.

The deposit that Matamec hopes to exploit is very near the Kipawa River and to numerous sites of historic and ongoing use by the Algonquin. The socio-economic impact study that is being drafted by Wolf Lake and Eagle Village will document the extent of current use of the area and the values that the land in the area has for them.

Because the project was over the threshold to trigger a federal environmental assessment (3,000 tonnes per day for rare earth mines), the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency initiated a review in April. Draft guidelines were issued and comments on these were filed. But the First Nations do not think the “standard” federal process will meet their needs. There is a tremendous amount of concern about the project in the communities and a process that occurs solely through written submissions and does not have the advantage of an independent panel is seen as inadequate. In May the First Nations wrote Environment Minister Peter Kent with a proposal for a joint review panel.

Though public pressure is mounting for a Quebec environmental assessment process or BAPE (Bureau d’audiences publiques), the current law excludes the project as it has a higher threshold than the federal law. At a recent public meeting

Ugo Lapointe of the *Coalition Quebec meilleure mine* and many local residents in the audience urged the company to support a BAPE process. The company demurred saying it would do what was required by the law.

Section 38 of the new Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA 2012) provides for the creation of a joint review panel with Aboriginal governments. The Algonquin Nations are insisting on a process that recognises the nation-to-nation relationship they have with the federal government. They want to co-develop guidelines and terms of reference for the review and appoint their own representative to the independent panel reviewing the project. If successful this would be the first use of

this section of the act.

MiningWatch has been supporting the demand for a joint review panel and has filed comments on the draft guidelines issued unilaterally by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. We were also pleased to put the Algonquin communities in touch with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation which has been reviewing a rare earths project proposed by Avalon Resources near the shores of Great Slave Lake.

MiningWatch has posted a variety of background materials on rare earth elements here.

Documents can be found on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency web site.

Is Mine Closure in Ontario Protecting the Public?

Across Canada past mining activities have left a legacy of degraded environments and contaminated sites that were not rehabilitated by the mine operators and became public liabilities. These have included extreme cases of the privatization of profits and the socialization of costs like the Giant Mine in Yellowknife and the Kam Kotia Mine in Ontario along with many thousands of smaller sites that pose varying degrees of environmental and safety liabilities.

Industry and governments like to portray these issues as in the past and point to improved legislation for closure planning and requirements for financial assurances as providing the protections necessary to prevent these situations from arising again. There are, however, reasons to remain sceptical about the extent to which the public is being protected. A recent report by the Canadian Commissioner on the Environment and Sustainable Development relating to federal oversight in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut and a report from the University of Victoria's Environmental Law Centre point to serious issues about the extent of oversight and amount of financial assurances that are being posted.

Two recent situations are raising concerns about the mine closure regime in Ontario, one is the operation of a bankrupt mine that is about to be turned over to the province, another is an operating mine that does not seem to be meeting requirements of the Mining Act for "progressive rehabilitation."

Inadequate Closure Bonds

Thanks to a blog post by environmental lawyer Dianne Saxe we became aware that Ontario would be taking over its first abandoned mine in a decade. The closed operation was an open pit magnesium mine just an hour and a half northwest of Ottawa. The company Timminco that operated the site has gone bankrupt and the overseers are now proposing to shed what remains of Timminco of responsibility by passing the magnesium mining site and another site in Quebec on to subsidiaries – which under a twisted aspect of corporate law relieves the parent company of responsibility.

According to Ontario's Mining Act, the company was required to post financial assurances for closure. The amount

posted, however, was only \$900,000. The costs of just maintaining existing pumping, water treatment and testing had been over \$320,000 a year – though documents filed for the proposed transfer of assets to the subsidiary indicate that the amount has been reduced by reducing testing and reporting in the winter.

In contrast to many metal mines, the main issue with the



Uncontained contaminated runoff at the abandoned Timminco magnesium mining and processing facility near Renfrew, Ontario. R. Hart photo.

Timminco property is its highly alkaline effluent that has to be treated before being released to the environment. It is also contaminated with hydrocarbons and thorium and there are several electrical transformers and buildings that need to be dismantled. There is not, as far as we are aware, an estimate for the full rehabilitation of the site but there is little doubt that it will exceed the amount of the closure bond posted by a wide margin – leaving citizens of Ontario to pay for the remainder.

Are Mines Following Progressive Closure Requirements?

The Ontario Mining Act requires operating mines to undertake "progressive rehabilitation" which is defined as "rehabilitation done continually and sequentially during the entire period that a project or mine hazard exists". This approach means should reduce risks during operation and decrease the costs and complexity of rehabilitation at closure.

North of Peterborough in the Kawartha Lakes area, a U.S. company, Unimin, operates two nepheline syenite mines and a

processing facility. The processing of the minerals has generated a large stack of dry tailings that have been creating problematic dust plumes in the air down-wind of the mines. Last summer the Peterborough County Public Health Unit issued an advisory recommending that:

Anyone experiencing symptoms related to periods of high dust levels can reduce their exposure by staying indoors and using a HEPA type air cleaner that removes dust particles. Use of an air conditioner may also be helpful. Persons with persistent symptoms should see their personal physician.

A query to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines indicated that the Ministry was not insisting on progressive rehabilitation of the tailings. The Ministry said that company's closure plan would only apply after operations cease (permanently or for an extended period) and could not provide any documentation of a progressive closure plan. The MNMD did indicate that the company is voluntarily investigating progressive rehabilitation of the tailings. We wonder why the MNMD isn't being more proactive about this and requiring such measures as they could substantially reduce the negative effects of the operation on the local community.

MiningWatch is going to continue monitoring these two cases but we are considered about what they indicate about mine closures across the province. We will be developing a peti-

tion to Ontario's Environment Commission to investigate these issues and will continue to insist on greater transparency for mine closure in Ontario and in all jurisdictions across Canada. There is no reason why the financial assurances provided by companies can not be made public. If, in fact, they are adequate



Waste piles at the abandoned Timminco magnesium mining and processing facility near Renfrew, Ontario. R. Hart photo.

that full public disclosure could provide a greater level of confidence. If they are not adequate, the public has a right to know the risks we run of obtaining more environmental, safety, and economic liabilities.

Alternative Mining Indaba Brings Community Perspective to South African Mining Debates

South Africa's economy was largely built on mining, and mining – for platinum, coal, gold and diamonds, among other things – continues to play a central role in South African politics and economics. South African mining companies are also a major force across the continent, but there is increasing compe-

tion, especially from Canadian, Australian, and Chinese investment.

With civil society organisations growing in strength and getting better connected to each other, MiningWatch is also getting more involved. At the beginning of February, Africa Program Coordinator Jamie Kneen travelled to the 4th annual Alternative Mining Indaba (or gathering) in Cape Town, along with Board of Directors member Ian Thomson (also a Kairos staff member and chair of the CNCA, who's written a great blog post on the event).

The Alternative Mining Indaba, or People's Indaba, was organised by a number of South African groups in response to the annual "Investing in African Mining Indaba" to bring community perspectives to the forefront in mining policy discussions, and to bring communities, civil society organisations, academics, and activists together to develop and proclaim a clear agenda to support mineworkers and mining communities but also to prevent and rehabilitate the environment and the health of people and communities affected by mining.

The People's Indaba heard from analysts and organisers from as far away as Ghana and



Waste rock piles at Angloplats Mogalakwena open pit mine loom over Mosesetjane's communal grazing lands, where Ivanplats wants to build a huge underground platinum mine. J. Kneen photo.

Tanzania, but the most devastating testimony was from the survivors of the Marikana massacre, who talked about the terrible conditions that led to the initial strike, and the failure of the mining companies and the authorities to fulfil their promises to improve things. The strikers were not even receiving the increased pay that Lonmin had agreed to. All the participants joined Bishop Jo Seoka, Chairperson of the Bench Marks Foundation, in marching to the official Indaba site as Seoka tried to present the South African mines minister with the People's Indaba's declaration.

All in all, the People's Indaba got a lot of visibility in the South African media and even internationally, but it also moved participants one step closer to coordinated work to make mining companies and governments alike accountable for their actions. The Alternative Indaba idea has been picked up by groups across southern and eastern Africa, with regional gatherings being held from Zimbabwe to Tanzania.

The trip itself was an important opportunity to build links with other organisations as well as following some of the grow-



Alternative Mining Indaba delegates, led by Bishop Jo Seoka (in purple), march on the Investing in African Mining Indaba. J. Kneen photo.

ing Canadian interests in the region. We visited Mosesetjane, in Limpopo Province, where infamous mining promoter Robert Friedland's Ivanplats had its drill rigs kicked out by residents who are refusing to be relocated to make way for the mine, and made excellent contacts with people dealing with Canadian mining interests – and problems – from several countries. We will be reporting on these cases as they progress.



YES! I want to help provide mining-affected communities with the support they need – and make the mining industry accountable.

Please direct my contribution to:

- MiningWatch Canada** to press governments to make crucial changes to law and policy. I know I will not receive a charitable donation receipt.
- The Canary Research Institute for Mining, Environment, and Health** to support research and education – and receive a charitable donation receipt. Charitable Registration Number 87103 9400 RR001

Here is my gift of: \$100 \$50 \$250 \$150 \$25 I prefer to give _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

Province: _____ Postal Code: _____

- I prefer to contribute by cheque (payable to the relevant organization)
- Please charge my credit card
- I would like to be a monthly sustaining donor via credit card contributions of \$ _____ per month, beginning [month, year] _____
- Visa MasterCard
- Card # _____ Expiry Date ____ / ____
Month/Year
- Security Code _____ (3- or 4-digit number on the back of the card next to your signature line)
- Card Holder Name (please print) _____
- Card Holder Signature _____

OR go to www.miningwatch.ca or www.canaryinstitute.ca and click on the **Donate** button to contribute to either organization.

I would like to receive the semiannual newsletter by mail and/or by e-mail

I would like to receive periodic news releases & action alerts by e-mail

My e-mail address is: _____

Occasionally we exchange lists with other social justice organizations. Please check if here if you give permission for your mailing information to be shared.

Send completed form and cheque (if applicable) to the address below – and thank you!

MiningWatch Canada

250 City Centre Avenue, Suite 508, Ottawa, ON K1R 6K7

tel: (613) 569-3439 • fax: (613) 569-5138 • e-mail: info@miningwatch.ca