

written by Tom Brason, August 29, 2011

Yes, don't be a hypocrite Mr. Brown. This land is owned and to be shared equally by all Ontarians yet 99% don't know about this, thus they can't respond.

Why is the Liberal party allowing this nonsense to go on when you know it's totally illegal?

You can't lawfully give this project the go ahead even if no one responded. Cease and desist with this foolishness all across Ontario.

1/ Section 3 of the Public Lands Act was written with the intent that all lakes on which Crown land borders will always be accessible to the public...quote "the intent of this legislation is to provide for adequate, sustained access and recreational opportunities for present and future generations of Ontarians". It goes on to say that disposition will not interfere.....which means that the lease of a lot on a huge lake to an outfitter or anyone else will not interfere with the public's legislated right to access and enjoy the lake. You're violating this legislation.

2/ Mr Brown, you, Ms Jeffrey and McGuinty are fully aware that the MNR has allowed staff to bypass conflict of interest legislation found in Public Lands Act s.39 to obtain public lands for personal use including financial gain such as outfitting themselves.

That the MNR has allowed their employees to use their positions to create, change or influence policy that could benefit them in their or their co-workers endeavors.

3/ You and the Liberal party are aware that the MNR along with one of the stakeholders at the CLUAH table met without public knowledge or input and without the knowledge of the other stakeholders at the table to form a "Tourism Guidelines Working Group" whereby a working manual was created using MNR expertise on how to deter legal public access to public lands and waters in the form of TIPs. Ideas on how to tear out roads and bridges, how best to word signs to make them easier to enforce. The MNR even offered outfitters LUPs (leases) to strategic points on roads such as bridges or culverts as an "added sense of insurance".

Brace yourself Mike because on page 18 of this manual the MNR, after three chapters on why they were restricting public access said to tell the public it's to protect our natural resources, that this might be the easiest way to get public acceptance.

The MNR says this manual was to be the foundation of all future Forest Management Plans even though the public knew nothing about it and it could be of benefit to businesses possibly owned by their own employees, a gross conflict of interest.

4/ MNR Resource Stewardship Agreements between the logging companies and each individual outfitter are designed to be partially confidential.

That outfitting businesses, most foreign owned use these agreements to adversely affect legal public access to their own lakes.

5/ This practice of closing publicly funded roads immediately following the harvesting of softwood is in violation of NAFTA.

Mike Brown it is totally illegal to pursue this project, You and the Minister know it, to do so will put you and her in a risky situation being that you people are in charge over such a thing and are knowingly allowing alleged abuse of the law to occur.

Suck it up and blow the whistle on this nonsense.



...

written by Sean Clement, August 29, 2011

To Mr. Brown,

Option A, is a farce!!! I live in one of those so called buffer zones, and I was neither asked, let alone informed about this illegal land grab by greedy hypocritical "remote" tourist operators. The previous system, although not perfect, was working better then what is being proposed. I found it extremely insulting you did not attend the Dubreuilville open house. I also find it insulting you say jobs will be protected when the liberal party was kind enough to give Dubreuilville and Weyerhaeuser's wood allotment away, those killing over 200 plus full time jobs, along with 2 towns. Nice Job!!!! I promise you this I will not vote for you or the party you represent, and I implore everyone to vote for any party but the liberals. As to CIUAH, I suggest option E, none of the above, there are to many unanswered questions for this to even be considered a policy.