

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

"South of the sixtieth parallel it will probably remain unrivalled as the largest single gas field in Canada" says a petroleum industry man long active in the southeastern Alberta region.

In market terms it could increase Alberta's known gas reserves by 10 per cent, the equivalent of eight years' supply at present consumption rates in Ontario.

According to preliminary estimates, eventual proven fuel reserves in the Suffield block could surpass an estimate made earlier this year by Premier Peter Lougheed that the area could hold four trillion cubic feet of gas worth at present wellhead prices at least one billion dollars.

Contractors have drilled 26 wells in the first round of the current winter exploratory program. All confirmed gas discoveries. Another 51 wells have been licensed to be drilled during the remainder of the 1973-74 winter season. About 78 wells will be taken down to an average depth of only 1600 feet to reach potential gas bearing zones to complete the evaluation phase of the military range.

Subsequently, private industry would develop the Suffield reserve in conjunction with the Alberta Energy Company which has among its portfolio of investments title to all the gas which might be found under the prairie land north of Medicine Hat and in the vicinity of the Medicine Hat gasfield, until now the largest proven accumulation of gas in Canada.

The Suffield gas is less costly to develop than fuel from the equally prolific foothills belt which because of difficult drilling conditions could be as expensive to explore as Arctic gas prospects. The Suffield gas, according to industry information, is probably the last of the easy-to-get reserves in western Canada. In addition, it is free of most impurities, dispensing with the need for expensive processing plant.

The article concludes by saying:

Pipeline connections to transport fuel from the Suffield block are readily available, too.

This concludes the portion of the *Globe and Mail* story that I thought was most timely and pertinent. As might be expected, this relatively recent energy development in my constituency has had some very satisfying results. First, the population of Medicine Hat, which has remained almost stationary during the ten years from 1961 to 1971 at about 25,000, has increased dramatically. Since 1971 it has increased by well over 4,000 to 30,500. In addition, the agricultural community served by Medicine Hat and Redcliff—essentially the same area as I described in my comments about natural gas production—has enjoyed a long overdue bonus as a result of well drilling, pipeline construction and related service activities which have benefited the entire agricultural area. This agricultural community is one of the most sparsely settled areas in populated Canada due, of course, to its semi-arid climate with the ever-present threat of drought.

Here are some tangible results of the energy boom. First, the expansion of a longstanding ceramics industry and more recently a thriving fertilizer plant taken over from United States control by Western Co-operative Fertilizers Limited, a Canadian, farmer-owned corporation. I should mention, also, the establishment of a Goodyear Tire and Rubber plant. In the petrochemical field, a new carbon black industry known as Cancarb came into production only about a month ago. Also under construction in the petrochemical field is our \$55 million Allarco plant.

All these developments, and many more, including sprinkler irrigation using natural gas for power, are the end result of generous reserves of relatively cheap natural gas. All Canada would benefit from these activities quite

[Mr. Hargrave.]

apart from the value to central Canada of exported surpluses. It is no exaggeration to suggest that both the city and the rural communities serviced by Medicine Hat and Redcliff have waited some 20 odd years for this pay-off.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—PROPOSED LICENSING POLICY FOR EAST COAST FISHERMEN—SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on November 14, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) outlined the government's new policy with respect to the registration and licensing of all fishing craft, skippers, crew, traps and all other fish-catching units. The effective date of these new licensing regulations is January 1, 1974.

The minister's statement in this connection has given rise to a great deal of uneasiness and concern on the part of a large number of Newfoundland fishermen. The hon. gentleman failed to answer a number of important questions which are obviously in the minds of the fishermen affected. Tonight I should like the minister's parliamentary secretary to answer some of the questions which have been put to me by some of the fishermen in my constituency and in other parts of Newfoundland.

For example, how does the minister intend to define a bona fide full-time fisherman? The nature of the Newfoundland economy is such that people living in the rural areas must fish for certain periods of the year and must also, of necessity, get a job on shore, in construction, on the highways or whatever else offers, so as to earn sufficient money to exist. What will happen to such people? Will the minister's new licensing policy prevent them doing what they and their forebears have been doing for centuries, that is, earn a partial living from the fishery?

Another important question that I hope the parliamentary secretary will answer is this: How will the new licensing regulations affect the payment of unemployment insurance of fishermen? For example, will UIC benefits be restricted to full-time fishermen as defined by the minister and his officials? Or will they apply to fishermen who of necessity fish for part of the year and then work on shore for the rest of the year to earn sufficient money to exist?

● (2200)

Another important question that comes to mind is, how will these new licensing regulations affect many of our young people who have to fish during the summer to earn sufficient money to enable them to go to school or university during the winter? How will these regulations affect