PETROLEUM INDUSTRY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
TRANSCRIPT

INTERVIEWEE: George Eynon

INTERVIEWER: David Finch

DATE: August 2001

DF: Today is the 14th say of August in the year 2001 and we are with Mr. George Eynon at his offices in downtown Calgary on the 12th floor of Bow Valley Square #4. My name is David Finch. Could you start by telling us when and where you were born please?

GE: In London, England, February 17th, 1948.

DF: Tell us about your education.

GE: I went through an English boys grammar school in north London.

DF: Public school, grammar school?

GE: Grammar school, Kilborn Grammar School, it was an English boys school. The girls school was opposite, we only fraternized on the bus to and from school. And I was going to be a teacher, I went to University of London Goldsmiths College to do my degree in geology and geography and intended to teach afterwards. Actually I did teach for a year but I got a better degree than my profs thought I would. I spent the last year captaining the rugby team and didn't spend much time in lectures, so they didn't think I was going to get a very good degree and I did the best of everybody and was able to go on to grad school. So I took a year off and taught, it was the last year you could teach high school without a teaching certificate. So it was a lot of fun, I enjoyed teaching. It was something that my father had wanted to do but he'd had to go back down the mines in south Wales, coal mines and had to leave school to support the family. And one of his sons was going to do it, somebody had to do and I guess it was me. So vicariously he got that through me. And then I went off to, came to Canada actually to do grad school. Went to McMaster University. I had places at McMaster and at St. Andrews but St. Andrews didn't have any funding. I got a telegram the day I arrived in Hamilton, Ontario to tell me the funding had come through from St. Andrews but too late. So I did a Masters degree under Roger Walker, who's the, he and Jerry Middleton were the two sedimentary geology profs at McMaster at the time in the early 70's.

DF: And what was your thesis on?

GE: It was on sands and gravels from the out wash of the last glaciation in southern Ontario. They were a large braided alluvial streams that came out of some of the glaciers. And it was the ancestral grand river running through Paris. So I did my thesis in Paris. . .Ontario.

DF: Now was this specifically related to petroleum geology or . . ?

GE: Early clastic deposition. With doing geology and geography as an undergraduate it was a keen interest in the geomorphology and the processes and this was really ??? processes but on coarse braided rivers.

#032 DF: So how did that get you into oil and gas?

GE: My thesis won the CSPG Masters award that year. I was going to go back . . actually I was going back to the U.K. and do a PhD at Oxford with Hal Reming, got it all lined up and some of the funding was reading. We had it all lined up and then 2 or 3 oil companies came through and I thought, I'd better interview, just for the hell of it and 2 or 3 companies offered me jobs. So I took the money and never went back to the U.K. to pursue an academic career, came out here.

DF: Who did you work with?

GE: I chose Amoco, they offered me $10 a month more than Texaco and who was the other one, Mobil I think. It made a big difference back then.

DF: How much was that a month, or a year?

GE: You know I don't, I think it was something like $390 or something like that, instead of $380. And the Canadian dollar then was worth slightly more than the U.S. dollar.

DF: So what did you do, right out into the field?

GE: Oil companies back then had really good training programs and if you had a particular expertise you got to get in there and do your bit as well. So I got all the training in the log analysis and the drill stem tests and hydrodynamics and all that kind of thing. Amoco was terrific. I started work right away on a project in an area related to my thesis work. Amoco had a project up in the tar sands where they had an insitu project at Gregoire Lake, it was one of these combined combustion and steam flood type things. But nobody had looked at the rocks themselves in any great sedimentological detail. So that was my task, I went up the first winter and cut about 36 core holes and then proceeded to spend a few months looking at these things and trying to make sense of them. The very simplistic two dimensional model that the engineers had and the somewhat more complex three dimensional model that I came up with, didn't really help. . I mean they were doing some things that were just too simplistic. So once they got to see the model they were able to try and design something different. I did go up there into the field the following spring because the same rocks that were at 1,000' below the surface at Gregoire Lake, updip in the Christina River, were outcropping in the river cuts. So I spent 2 or 3 weeks, I thought I'd died and gone to heaven. I said, you know, I really should go and look at these in outcrop because you know. . .and the guy said, okay. Here you are at a university and you scrimp for pennies, the next thing you know, you've rented a helicopter, got a summer student, a couple of canoes and you've got three weeks idyllic vacation on a river in northern Ontario. You work your buns off because you work from . . .

#063 DF: Northern Ontario?

GE: Northern Alberta, sorry. It was quite amazing because you just really. . I don't know, as a student I just didn't think that I'd be, you had that kind of latitude and freedom, that they'd give you that kind of scope. It was good fun because they hired you for your expertise and then used it, which was kind of fun.

DF: So they choppered you in but you mentioned canoes, how did they come in to the. . .?

GE: We floated down river and stopped at all the pieces and camped and measured the outcrops and photographed them and then were able to correlate those to those cores I'd taken earlier in the year. It was really good.

DF: So for the uninitiated, how specifically does that help with your work, trying to . .?

GE: Actually one of the most illustrative examples was, core holes are 6" in diameter and they're spaced miles apart, several miles apart on a big block like that. And so you really don't have any idea of the continuity of the wells. So by going out and looking at these outcrops, which on a big sweeping neandercup??? might go for a half mile to a mile, you really got a strong three dimensional view of what they looked like. One of the best illustrations I did for the engineers was to take, toilet paper back then was this shiny on one side and coarse on the other and absolutely indestructible, you probably remember that. But I took one of these things and pinned it at the top of the outcrop and unrolled it, took my rope and went down the outcrop and unrolled it and sort of laid it as a vertical white line and then photographed it from the other side and just said look, that's the sample you're dealing with and this is the variability you've got. And it blew the engineers minds, it was the best illustration I could ever have done, it got their attention. I was very fortunate because we had somebody up from the land in Tulsa who was a very, very senior engineer, who was quite brilliant. He recognized they needed to work with the geology once he saw some of the stuff I did. And that was a lot of fun. I mean, you got to be taken seriously, you'd been there less than a year and you're fresh out of university, you're doing work you love and people are taking you seriously. It was fun, it was absolutely fabulous.

#086 DF: So what came of that work, did it help them with the. . ?

GE: Oh yes. What they had to do then was recognize that there was tremendous variability and that if you took a 9 spot in one area on a 10 acre spacing it might not work at that same piece, cookie cutter all over the place. So they realized they had to vary the patterns as you go through the area. This was a research project, so they were trying to develop technologies for working with the insitu oil. Because of that variability we went back and tried a number of techniques to try and map these, essentially, high tar areas which corresponded in most cases to the high sand content areas. And we tried things like electrical resistivity from the surface, all sorts of different things to try. And now we would probably use, not probably, they use 3-D now but this was before the days of 3-D seismic so we were trying all sorts of things to try and figure out where these sand bodies went.

DF: And did they go on to develop that insitu or not?

GE: It ran as a research project for some time. And really, the prices of oil didn't warrant them doing it commercially and I don't think they ever went in a commercial phase. They did several small pilots throughout the area.

DF: Using what techniques again, steam. . .?

GE: They had a program called COFCAW, and it was combined forward combustion and water drive, but it was steam when you put the water in of course, with the heat. So they were doing a cycling of this heating and steaming and igniting, essentially, the oil in the ground and driving the front forward and then recovering from another well. So you'd inject radially and move our from a central well into a 5 spot or a 9 spot or something like that.

#107 DF: Right, great. So where did you go from there?

GE: I started working on clastics in the gas area of eastern Alberta when gas wasn't worth a pinch of proverbial. And we packaged up a lot of our gas properties in eastern Alberta, hundreds and hundreds of them and farmed them out and got all sorts of wells drilled on that kind of thing. So that was much less of a research, science based, as opposed to more of a business side of the piece. We had a district geologist and all sorts of hierarchy at the time so I had somebody who I reported to a couple up, who was managing the program. But they needed people to just really, go through all of the prospects and projects and areas and just assemble all the data and provide some technical back-up for each one of them for the farm out process. I did the technical work mostly but started to get involved in the farm out presentations and things like that, which was kind of fun. Did a lot of work on various sand bodies up and down eastern Alberta, in the lower Cretaceous, right from the Basal McMurray up to the Viking, that very short section there. That was probably 1972, 3, 4, that kind of period. I had an interest in. . .I'd obviously moved from the U.K. to here so I had become quite friendly with our chief geologist here and he'd moved down to the international group in Chicago, in fact we played squash together a few times, it was kind of fun. And I just called him up and said, do you need some help in the international and I moved down to Chicago, my wife and I moved down to Chicago because I was married by then and worked international for a number of years, with Amoco. First of all, lived in Chicago. When we were going to go down there, all sorts of friends who said, want to buy a sub-machine gun. But Chicago was wonderful. We lived fairly close in, rode the train every day into downtown, the El. And it was great fun, I really enjoyed living in Chicago. And then they would cycle guys into the office there, you go on in on an L-1 visa and were there for a year and they'd cycle you out to some of their international offices. So there was a chap from Texas, I guess he was from Louisiana, I'd met there and we were quite good friends. He liked warm climates and I kind of liked the cooler, temperate or more northern climates and we were convinced that I was going to Cairo and he was going to Norway. But we both got what we wanted and they actually sent us to the right places. So we went to Norway, I went over as Chief Geologist for Amoco Norway, a small office there, for 2 or 3 years and worked on the chalk fields of the southern North Sea, in the Norwegian area. In fact, we worked on the Valhall & Hod fields, they all have north mythological names, which is kind of neat. There's a chalk field. That was really a lot of fun but we also worked on the . . .

#143 DF: I know what chalk is but why is that significant to the geology of the oil industry?

GE: Chalk is extremely porous but not very permeable. And so it has tremendous porous places to hold hydrocarbons but these things don't have a great deal of, it's very, very low permeability. If you get them in these extensional fold areas and some of this trans-pressured??? faulting in the North Sea, you can actually get over-pressured chalk which expands the volume of the rock and actually makes it more permeable with the pressure. So there are a whole number of chalk fields in the southern North Sea that contained a lot of oil and some gas. You could actually see the gas, the hydrocarbon seepage through the

seal. In fact when we first drilled Valhall, with the seismic we had, it looked like it was a donut. The crest came up and there was a depression on the core and everyone thought it was a sort of central cratered or ??/ feature that had dropped down on the very crest of the structure. Which didn't make sense to me as a geologist but the seismic was showing that. Until we realized that there was the seal, the shales over the top were breached, or they were breaching, they weren't able to hold this over-pressured hydrocarbons. So you've got gas seeping through the upper section, which changed the velocity on the seismic and so it looked as though there was a donut. When we went back in and did some hand testing of changing the velocities, this thing just came out as a nice domed structure. So originally they were drilling holes around the crest of this donut and my boss and I had the temerity to want to drill right in the middle of this donut hole and got the crest of the structure. Actually I went out into the North Sea to do some of the well site as well, which was fun. Helicopter out for 3 hours and . . don't want to do it for a living but to say you've been out there and done it a few times is a lot of fun. But I remember going off, the satellite structure was the Hod field, which was smaller and lower down. It's only been onstream now about 3 or 4 years. So you know, it took 20 years to become commercial, even if it was 100 million barrels. But I went out to the first well on the Hod structure and carried back the first samples of oil that, really shouldn't have come up inside the ??? but did. But that was fun. To be involved in those rank wildcat discoveries in conditions as difficult as the middle of the North Sea, because it gets pretty blowy out there. Those North Sea gales are something to behold. So that was things we already had and were developing. And then I worked on the northern North Sea, Jurassic plays. It was the 4th round in Norway, I think they're up to about the 16th or 17th or maybe more licensing rounds now. We worked on these huge tracts that were going to offered and then the companies bid on them. So I was involved in building this incredible bidding document and you had to provide all the technical information, you had to tell how many wells you were going to drill and why. Totally unlike land sales here where every 2 weeks you sort of put your money bid in and if you get it you start working on it and if you don't you go and look at something else. But there it was a year long process to develop an understanding of the geology and to then submit that to the Norwegian authorities. And in the meantime, a major part of my job was training the Norwegian government folks, both Statoil, which was a very small company at the time, which is the state oil company and the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate, which was the body that oversaw and they had an office in Stavanger. And part of my job was technology transfer and to just provide all these guys with a lot of information about what the companies were doing. We had some of them come to our research labs and we took them on field trips and things like that. So it was a wonderful opportunity to use the teaching aspect of my bent from earlier because I still enjoy that, that's just a lot of fun. But it was great. I can remember standing at a big table with all the stacks of seismic, the stack of paper that we'd just got and looking at one specific block and looking at it and there was what looked like a water bottom multiple, just right the way through the structures. And we just kept tossing these things off to the side and the geophysicist and I both looked at each other at the same time and said, whoa, that's too consistent. And we pulled them back again, and it was a flat spot. It

was the Troll field, which has got to be a multi-TCF gas field, I mean, huge, huge. I'd never seen anything like it in my life. And this was the contact between the gas column, which was something like 300 metres and the thin oil leg of about 10 metres and then the ocean in terms of thousands of metres of water above it. And it was this flat spot right across the structure. We were going to have all these things reprocessed to get rid of it but it was real. Amoco bid on it. . .or did we. We put in a bid on the round, I'm not sure it we bid on Troll. It got to be so large that we weren't sure that with other things we had around the world, we could handle it. I went back to Norway a second time about 5 or 6 years later working as the General Manager for Superior and they had an interest in the Troll field. So I got to work on it later, when it was being drilled and developed, which was really fun. Because Amoco either didn't bid on it or certainly didn't get it. Shell was the operator and I was working with them as a non-operating partner.

#220 DF: So then where did you go, what did you do?

GE: When I was in Norway the first time we did a lot of work with the London office because it was the North Sea geology and so I worked with them. Ostensibly we reported through the London office, we actually tended to report directly back to Chicago more often. But I got another stint in Chicago, would you believe. The Canadian operation, well, the operations in Canada, Calgary, Denver, Houston, and New Orleans all had a representative in exploration in Chicago in the head office and we were kind of the liaison between the operating entity and the operating committee. Horrible name, we were known as Quiz??? Kids and what we did was, they would send down the package of material, we'd come back to the office lots and deal with the folks. Instead of having teams of people running backwards and forwards between here and Chicago, I was the liaison, they would send all the geology and geophysics down and I would make the presentations to the Board or to the operating committee and get the approvals and things like that. ??? because I'd not worked in the States before and you often had to take the Denver stuff, or the Houston stuff or the New Orleans and present that if the guy was out of town that week or whatever. And I'd forgotten or I didn't know, the differences between data availability in a place like western Canada. And to their credit, Norway of course, which really modelled its scheme on the EUB or the ERCB then I guess, and the core storage. So we have tremendous data availability here and it just doesn't happen, almost anywhere in the U.S., it's much, much more difficult. I mean sometimes the logs of wells, or even that a well was even drilled in a place has been long since lost. So it was an eye opener in that respect. I think western Canada gets developed and the resources get handled much more efficiently because we have a very strong, very good system for maintaining the data, the logs, the cores, the tests and some samples, absolutely everything. It was quite an eye opener to see how they didn't do things in the States. The difference between life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the Canadian peace, order and good government is really born out in spades in something like this. Because it's amazing what you can do with the data here and so much more effectively and efficiently. The major difference is probably for the poor landmen because down there you've not got the system that you have here. I mean, landmen here are very skilful at

what they do. Down there they have to be itinerant real estate brokers, they have to get out there in the field and try to find who's got the stuff and pick up acreage in tiny little bits and pieces. Much more difficult in some ways, much less satisfying probably, the landmen up here do an amazing job but they can do it on a larger scale and I think we can more efficiently produce our resources. Which probably accounts for why western Canada produces twice as much gas as the entire Rockies in the U.S., twice as much. We produce 16 BCF a day plus, out of Alberta, B.C. and Saskatchewan. And if you take all of the Rockies basin, from the San Juan right to the border, they produce about 8. It's just astonishing. And part of it's the legacy of the land situation. Part of it of course, is all the smaller basins and that very parochial approach to it and part of it is the fact that they've got. . so many federal agencies have control over the access the lands. But when you see the two areas are identical in terms of size and we produce twice as much gas as these guys do. It's a testament I think to the system that works so well.

#275 DF: So people oftentimes criticize government and regulatory powers but in this case the regulatory agencies have really streamlined the process haven't they?

GE: Oh, absolutely. I've worked in several places overseas and brought government officials to Alberta to see first hand what's done. And the Norwegians I think, went one better than us in terms of building modern facilities. Probably not quite as good as the core storage facility, core research facility we have here now but damn near. They realized that this was going to be a way to effectively and efficiently utilize their resources. So we've had a number of countries around the world, more or less copy the system. To their advantage, I mean, Indonesia has done the same sort of thing, some west African countries. In this case the hand of government has been good. And I mean, I use that epithet of peace, order and good government for Canada versus the U.S. and I think most Canadians believe that, even some of the radical right.

DF: So what time period do you think that hand of government springs from, post Leduc, earlier than that?

GE: I think it's post then. It was a recognition that here was an industry that was going to. . .I don't have a good idea of the actual history but it's got to be. . it was in place when I got here in the 70's and had been in place for a long time. So it's got to go back to probably the early 60's. Some years after there was the drilling at Leduc and then realizing that things had to be done about managing the situation. And it wasn't imposed from Ottawa, this was something that the Alberta government did. It's Alberta resources obviously and they set up what was then called the Energy Resources Conservation Board, ERCB. Did a hell of a good job. I think that was the difference, even the title, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, they realized they had to manage these resources for the future of the province. And the only way to do that was to make sure all the data was available for future generations of geologists and geophysicists like myself. It was fun to come to a place where you could get your hands on the data.

DF: In part it was a land ownership position too, wasn't it?

GE: Well, of course. It's provincially owned land. There's a lot of free hold, or there was a lot of free hold and over time the amount of free hold ownership of the minerals reverted to

the Crown. And absolutely that's the biggest difference in lots of ways, to the U.S. A lot of the surface access and the mineral access is broken up into such small pieces, whereas here, you're essentially dealing with Crown sales and you can do it much more effectively.

#315 DF: And that would be a pretty big difference between Alberta and say, Ontario too, wouldn't it?

GE: You know, I think you're right. I don't know enough about Ontario. Saskatchewan even, had a lot more freehold minerals in the 60's and 70's and it very rapidly, as any land was sold the minerals were then reverted to the Crown and the surface was sold.

DF: How long were you with Amoco?

GE: I came back to Calgary in, I think it was '78 after being in Chicago, say '79 and I was here for a year or two with Amoco before I left. It was a period of time when the industry was going absolutely crazy and booming, the kids were coming in from school at higher salaries than the guys we'd hired the year before and so you couldn't keep the kids from the year before because they would get an offer from a small company outside. I think at one stage I was Division Geologist for central division, I had about 25 geologists working with me. Two guys my age or older and the rest, the average experience was less than a year. It was just crazy, the turnover was just so great. It was one of those periods of time when it took 30 minutes of instruction each day to get somebody through their day and if you've got 25 of them that didn't give any time to do your own work that day. It was absolute hell. I ended up getting a phone call from a small company that I went to work for, I left and did the same thing. In fact, I went to work for Clay Riddell at Paramount Resources, in '80 through '82 I think it was. Just left at the time of the National Energy Program and all . . .

DF: So what year did you go to Paramount?

GE: I think it was 1980. I was there '80 through '82. I had tremendous fun, there were half a dozen of us in the company essentially and Clay and the chief landman, the chief operations guy and the financial guy and myself, we were in Elveden House and every lunchtime we'd sneak across to the Tiki Tiki lounge and have lunch over there. Everything we'd done in the morning, you'd toss the ideas and put them on the table and if Clay liked them you'd work on them in the afternoon and if he didn't you'd be working on something else in the afternoon. It was that instant decision making, once you've gone through a committee system that goes over weeks like Amoco, it took a little getting used to the immediate answers. But it was fun.

#355 DF: So how did the NEP affect you and Paramount?

GE: Well, it affected the industry. I mean, there was a tremendous downturn in the industry. Clay had been very successful at raising drilling funds for a number of years and in '82, I think there were only two drilling funds that closed because the industry was in such bad shape. Inflation was going berserk, the economy was having a bit of a struggle, the price of oil and gas were down. But one of only two drilling funds to close that year, you know, I went on the road tours with him to do those things because he'd done them all by

himself prior to that, he didn't have any other geologists. And things were slowing down and just at that time, actually it was a couple of years later, I got a call from two colleagues who were then working for Superior Oil, two ex-Amoco colleagues. My erstwhile exploration VP from Norway and a colleague from Chicago and they were working for Superior, one of them was the General Manager in Norway but they wanted him to move to London to take over as Exploration VP there. But they needed a replacement for him in Norway and I'd worked for him in Norway with Amoco so they came over and . . I went over to Norway to Superior as General Manager for the Norwegian office. And actually I was handling Norway, Denmark and Netherlands. We had production in the Netherlands, we had a Production Manager so he did a lot of the engineering but I did all the geological work and we were exploring in Norway or at least getting into the new rounds in Norway. Oh, we had the Troll field, which Shell was now operating. That's when I got to go back and work on the huge gas field. And Denmark was opening up for the first time so I did the Danish first round. Regional application, almost like the fourth round in Norway, where you did the same sort of thing, you had to provide the interpretation and bid on things and provide all the technical work.

DF: That all had to be included in your bid?

GE: Oh yes.

DF: And it became government information?

GE: Absolutely. It sounds strange to us, it sounds even more strange to the Americans but it was a way in which, once you'd done that of course, then you were working hand in glove with the authorities. And it worked very well. You had to expose your, let your interpretations and so on, not just go to the internal scrutiny of your company but the government folks as well, the Geological Survey, the Ministry of Energy, those kind of things.

DF: And was it true that those parts of the government didn't have that information, like were you telling them new. . .?

GE: Exactly. Absolutely. And the same thing in Norway in the early years. Not anymore because those guys are smart, but yes, we shot the seismic, we had the access to the seismic. Being the government, they got copies and they had all the archives but we were providing the interpretation. And they might get 2 or 3 interpretations from 2 or 3 different companies bidding on a particular block. And they would spend a lot of time questioning us as to what the interpretation was and then going with the best technical and business bid. Whereas when you buy land here, it's just the best price. There they were looking from something more than just the best price. Often, if you'd put 4 or 5 wells on a block, and there were only 2 or 3 prospects, to them that was irrational. So the biggest bid didn't win necessarily. It had to be a rational exploration program.

#415 DF: So it was almost an intellectual nationalization of the industry.

GE: Yes, I've never thought of it that way, but yes.

DF: I mean I grew up in South America and when Venezuela nationalized the companies all left. Whereas this is a situation where, right from the beginning, they're saying we don't want to be left out of the information chain. If you're going to come in from outside and

develop our resources we want to know what you're doing and why.

GE: Not just if, we need you to come in, we need you to provide the technical expertise to do it in the first place, to drill and shoot the seismic. But we also need your knowledge, not just the technical expertise but the knowledge to help us develop our resources. You always had the feeling it was done as a partnership. Now they had a bigger hammer as the owner of the resources but I never felt in Norway or Denmark that the government got in the way. In fact, there were several times I know we got to the table because our bid was more rational than somebody else who bid more work, a bigger work program. They didn't have the monetary bonuses as well, they felt that if they did that it would get in the way of the good technical work. People would skimp on the technical work and throw money at it, instead of doing the technical work. And they were more interested in the technical work and the technology transfer.

DF: That's why I was saying intellectual nationalization. Because if you just want the money then you just take the biggest bid. But when the money is gone so it the information and the expertise.

GE: Yes. And there was virtually in the countries in the early 70's who had any idea of the oil industry and you go back now and those guys are smart, they're all over the world doing their stuff. They took that stuff on board intellectually and then transferred it elsewhere.

DF: Now was the NEP the reason you left Paramount?

GE: It was that slow down. I mean, Clay offered me a seat on the Board to stay but you're young and foolish at the time. We kept the house here, this was another chance to go and live somewhere we'd really enjoyed and see some more of the world. Both our kids had been born in Chicago on the stints going and coming and so it's a fairly international family. And we enjoyed doing that. And still we've been back in Calgary for 15 plus years now.

DF: What did you think of the NEP as a policy?

GE: Pretty damn stupid.

454 DF: No, no, that's in retrospect. At the time, the price of oil is going to $80 a barrel, everybody wants a finger in the pie and remember Lougheed was there too.

GE: It was still pretty damn stupid. Anybody with . . the price of oil was going to $80-$100 a barrel but I don't think anybody really believed that. Certainly if you go back and look, I mean I've done this, gone back and looked at the prices forecast for oil. I have to draw something, I can't do this. But you look at the price curve going forward, and then a projection going forward was like this. Well, if you go back to any point on the curve, if this is the time here, all the projections went like. . . It was just foolish. I think we've gotten past that, I know we've gotten past that. And working in the industry at the time and looking at what was happening, I certainly didn't believe that the price was going to do that and rationally I don't think, many people in charge of the companies really believed that. But if you didn't get after the money that was available and bid up the prices you were going to shit out of luck 6 months down the road because there would be no acreage. So you get caught up in it, even over the last 6 months, 18 months, as prices have increased for gas and for oil, the first thing you see is land prices being bid up. And

then of course, once you get the drilling activity increases then the rig rates go up. Somebody asked me the other day, what's the rational for rig rates and it's whatever the market will bear. And you're only have to talk to some of the guys in charge of the rig companies to understand that. It's inevitable that they have to do that because they get taken to the cleaners in the downtime so it's what the market bears in the short term. Land prices lead that again, because you've got to have land to evaluate to drill on. And as prices go up we see that happening all the time. But I don't think anybody really believed, if you really got down to the pit of their stomach, that prices were going to be $100 for oil. They certainly didn't think gas was going to be worth anything at that stage. But it was not. . .I mean the whole idea of a made in Canada policy, a made in Canada price and the whole idea of. . I mean certainly you need to have the resources for your own industry, your own economy. But to have a pricing differential, with a market place that is, for oil, global and for gas, continental, you can't impose localized pricing. I mean, you can do some things to help our the consumers as we've seen with price caps in California, to try and do something to make up for their mistakes. And we've seen some things here with rebates to you and I, at very high gas prices. But inevitably gas prices are down again, and oil prices, now, it looks as though OPEC is going to be able to manage, to some degree, prices within a band that will allow the non-OPEC countries to explore and produce but maintain OPEC revenues so that they can get back and maintain a healthy economy. They just went berserk when prices were really high and overspent and now, with prices half what they were when they were $40, were getting themselves into tremendous trouble. So they've got to try and manage that kind of thing. But oil is a global priced commodity. And the same thing with gas, gas is a continental commodity. To some extent becoming a little more global with LNG becoming now, viable around the world and into the American market. But the North American market is stronger probably than any other market in the world.

End of tape.

Side 2

DF: While we're on the topic of what the industry is doing right now, and yes, the market is global, especially for oil and then certainly continental for gas, the Americans are certainly pulling a lot of energy into their vehicles and into their whole economic system these days aren't they?

GE: It's incredible to see how profligate the U.S. culture is, in terms of energy usage. Any time I think any of us, even Canadian, I mean, we live in a climate in the winter, where we have to consume energy. I mean, the way we're strung out across, almost sub-Arctic temperatures. We consume a lot of gas, on a per capita basis we probably consumer more energy than any other country in the world, but there's a reason for that.

DF: There's a weather reason.

GE: Yes, there's a climatic reason for that. And distances, there's 30 million of us spread over a 200 kilometre band across the northern hemisphere and we have to travel long distances. So it's not surprising but when you see the misuse and the waste in the U.S. and we get infected by it here. It boggles my mind to come into a parking lot, even here in Calgary, and 3 out of 4 vehicles are SUV's or pick-up trucks. And they're there every day, they're not being used for . . .

DF: Ranching or. .

GE: Sport utility or they're not being used to move commercial stuff, these are people's daily vehicles. Absolutely absurd. And you notice a big difference, I was in the U.K. talking to a couple of clients in May and you go to London and the size of cars there. I mean, everything is scaled down, I'd forgotten the difference in scale but you go to London and cars are about the size of a desk here and people are using them to commute around London. Perfect. High gas mileage. It's just absurd what North America does with its resources. And there is a difference between Canada and the U.S. and I'm convinced it gets back to the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness again, versus peace, order and good government because there's some total differences when you cross that 49th parallel, that imaginary line drawn across the continent. There are some huge differences, vive le difference. We do have a tremendous usage in North America, of hydrocarbons. Though I think even. . .the reason the gas industry has gone berserk in the last few years is because now we can utilize gas for power generation and 95-97% of all the new power stations in the U.S., generating stations, are going to be gas fired. We have a tremendous resources in coal and I think there's a need to recognize that clean coal technology is probably one way of helping conserve the diminishing oil and well, gas resources are pretty good, but certainly diminishing North American oil resources. When you look at the costs of upgrading oil sands and heavy oil into synthetic crude, I mean it's being done commercially very well. There's companies doing a fantastic job and over the 30 years that I've been in the industry we've seen something go from a non-commercial resource, to strongly commercial. Now you've got to have the right price structure for that but . . .

#038 DF: And a huge infrastructure.

GE: Huge infrastructure. I think Albertans are probably going to recognize it, but something like 80% of our power is generated by coal. There's no reason why a lot more coal couldn't be used around North America, even with the whole flap of potential climate change and Kyoto and the hydrocarbon emissions and so on. But I think coal technology could make a big difference. And it's going to take countries like North America, that have the resource capability to apply to those kind of things, to develop the technologies, just as we have here with the oil sands. And it's been done elsewhere for LNG and beginning to do gas to liquids and things like that.

DF: And you're talking about the financial resources to develop those. .

GE: Financial and technical resources. The research as well as the financial resources. Talk about having gone from a coal age to an oil based economy and now to a gas based, methane based economy. These other sources don't go away, there are places in the world still burning dung. I've done work in Pakistan and seen the dung patties just drying on the rocks and that's their daily fuel use. There are places that still burn wood as a fuel. Certainly we still burn coal as a fuel. We still burn oil and we will go to gas and when we go to a hydrogen economy, we won't stop using gas or oil or coal or wood or dung. They'll all be there, they'll just be an additional piece of the mix.

DF: So when did you move back to Alberta the last time?

GE: It was '84 I think. Superior was being taken over by Mobil and I had some job offers internally to go to either Cairo or Dallas and didn't really want to go to either, or maybe it was Houston, one of the two. I had looked at a couple of things in Europe, one in London, which is where I grew up but ironically, I think when our family sat down and analysed living in London, my wife Joyce and the girls would love it thoroughly but I would not be happy.

DF: Why?

GE: The companies were all located in central London. If you wanted to live anywhere that was decent you were an hour and a half commute and I just. . .

DF: No thanks.

GE: No, I mean, I essentially walked to the office in Stavanger and I can walk to the office here in Calgary and no. So we came back to Calgary. I came through on a business trip to check our house and talk to some neighbours and one of our neighbours worked as a landman at Suncor and he said, we're looking for an Exploration Manager. I called them up and talked to them. I was back in Norway quite quickly but the VP of exploration or the Executive VP for the resources group was on vacation in London. So I went over in a three piece suit in the middle of the summertime to London, to go and talk to Don Smith. He was on vacation so when I get up to his place he was renting in central London, here's this guy in a golf shirt and slacks and the golf shirt didn't quite meet the slacks. He was sitting in an armchair in bare feet, he'd been shopping with his wife and his wife was still out there shopping and I was in a 3 piece suit and he was in a nice armchair and I sat down near to the seat and he said, would you like a beer. He lent over and flipped the cooler up and. . . This interview is going to be much fun than I thought. So I actually

came back to Calgary, we came back in '84 and I joined Suncor as Exploration VP. Was there for 5 years, went and did manager planning and economics for a year and then developed a full going strategy and then got moved into the exploration department as VP, to implement the strategy. So that was kind of fun, it was one of these things where I got put on to a task force to figure out what we were going to do, then got into the planning and economics department to sort of build a plan for it and then got stuck into exploration to carry it out. And we had some great success for several years. But it was all domestic exploration, western Canadian gas and oil. And a large piece of my expertise was international. So . .

#085 DF: So this wasn't tar sands, this was conventional?

GE: No, this was conventional oil and gas. Now there was a separate tar sands group, totally separate. This was a southern Alberta, southern Saskatchewan group, lots of gas in the Hat and sort of southeast Saskatchewan area. We did look at gas all the way through eastern Alberta because we had the Alberson??? line and gas was needed in the oil sands plant. Really looked at oil through central Alberta and northeast B.C. and gas, just the whole of western Canada. The resources group went through a really difficult time and it was a downsizing time so it was one of those pieces where we restructured the organization and a number of people, colleagues that I'd become friends with, I had to let go and we really restructured. And it was tough but it was an interesting time from my career, in terms of growth in management skills. Some of them I'm not sure they're skills I ever want to use again but you go through periods like that where the thing has to be done and rather than abdicate, I would rather have and I did, sit and do it to the best of my ability rather than let somebody else just do it arbitrarily. And again, leave the HR department to do it, it wouldn't get done properly, so reluctantly I guess, I went through the exercise and tried to restructure the company, at least the exploration piece of it, in some sort of rational fashion rather than leave it to the HR folks.

DF: So what did you do after Suncor?

GE: Well, Bow Valley industries was looking for a VP of their exploration world wide and I was recruited to that position. I've been extremely fortunate. Doc Seaman was running Bow Valley at the time and was still involved. He was Chairman of the Board and still present and probably the only reason, not the only reason, one of the major reasons I went over there was certainly to have the breadth of Canada, the North Sea and Indonesia and be doing international things, but also a chance to work with and see first hand someone like Doc Seaman. I have been fortunate over my career, there have been four individuals who have been essentially my boss in some way. I'm an energetic person, I've got lots of ideas and so on, but when you have bosses who you have to run to keep up with and sometimes, rein in, it was fantastic. First of all, just doing my thesis and working with Roger Walker at university. Here's a guy, you'd come into his office with all sorts of things you'd want to discuss and you'd fire him up and discuss them and you'd walk away with 2 or 3 of them intact. But here's a guy with tremendous intellect, with tremendous energy and an incredible knack for teaching which he got across to all his students. So that was a pure piece of luck because I didn't know a guy from a hole in the

ground when I accepted going to McMaster. Well, I knew of one or two of his papers but he was a relatively young prof, but he was brilliant. He's out here now working in the industry, as a consultant. He's no longer in the university system, which is a loss to the university system but hardly surprising the way it's being handled. But then I got to work for Richard Hardman in Norway the first time and a brilliant explorationist, just a totally disorganized manager but brilliant explorationist. Then I got to work for Clay Riddell for a couple of years.

DF: Sorry, Walker's first name?

GE: Roger.

#127 DF: And he's a consultant here in town?

GE: Yes.

DF: Okay, so, back to Clay Riddell.

GE: So there's Roger Walker, Richard Hardman, and then Clay Riddell who's just amazing and then Doc Seaman. I mean, I've had the privilege of working for and learning and growing in my career, observing, right from the outset, from grad school to the last, when I was at Bow Valley 10 years ago, of getting to see someone like Doc working first hand. But here's a guy who's not a geologist, he was an engineer, a very practical engineer. But you would take to him extremely complex geological concepts to present for a new project you wanted to get the company into and were potentially going to spend millions of dollars on. And he demanded that you know your stuff, if he was going to ask a question he wasn't going to ask the poor schmuck presenting because we do have all the geologists but he wanted to make sure that you, as the VP knew as much if not more about this because that's what he paid you for. So it was intellectually challenging. But he was one of these people you could take an extremely complex, tectonic models and things like that, and you've got an hour and a half presentation lined up and within about 15 minutes you can just see the little twinkle in his eye and he knows exactly where you're going, just an amazing mind. And Roger's like this, Richard's like that, Clay was like that, just amazing people to work for. I've been quite privileged in that sense. So I was with them for 5 years. I first of all ran the, this was '89-'93. I'd been at Suncor for 5 years and I was 5 years at Bow Valley before they got taken over. But I started off running the exploration world wide. We had another character who had worked in southeast Asia so he did more of the Indonesian stuff, he and I did it. But I had worked in the North Sea so I really oversaw the North Sea operations and the Canadian operations. And I had this other guy helping me out and he would oversee the Indonesian piece because that was less of my expertise. I did that for about 2 or 3 of those 5 years and then we had a new. . .Doc wanted to step back and brought in a new President, who had been with CanOxy, an American, Gerry Wright, who was also very, very good. He wanted to have the 3 major pieces of business at business units, not functional production and exploration departments and I agreed with him entirely. So we hired a Scot for the U.K. and he ran the U.K. office. We sent somebody over to run the Indonesian office and I took over Canadian exploration and production and ran the exploration and production for a couple of years for Bow Valley until we got taken over by. . well, we knew we were going to be

taken over so I actually negotiated an exit before the formal take over. I think that happened in '94 and I left in '93. Gerry and I had been, well, a number of us had been to London to talk to British Gas and we'd had a couple of fairly major merger, acquisition projects over the, they had suggested ??? the company by acquisition and we had taken, over a period of 18 months, taken two major projects and at the last minute the Board had stepped back from the table and this had been Gerry's mandate from the Board and here they were turning it down, so he quit. And it was fairly obvious at that point that they weren't interested in growing, they were actually more interested in selling the operation, an accumulation of things. So we knew it was going to be sold and I negotiated my way out and took a totally different tack and have been doing some, I've been consulting ever since, for the last 10 years.

#172 DF: Could we get to your period on the executive of the CSPG?
GE: Oh sure. That was about that time.
DF: Yes, and it's a little abnormal for somebody who's consulting to put that kind of energy into. . .
GE: I'd already committed to it and I was VP.
DF: Okay, so how did you come to be on the VP?
GE: I had run for VO in the late 80's, where would I have been then, I was at Suncor. And Mike Cecile from the Geological Survey won the election. And I'd worked on committees. I ran the '92 convention, the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, the AAPG convention here in town, which is a 5 or 6 thousand. .
DF: Huge.
GE: Staggering. We were talking about it last night at home because I've got this bronze, the President's award from the CSPG and I think I got it because I renegotiated the contract with the AAPG and we made about a quarter of a million dollars.
DF: Good for you.
GE: About the only job as Chairman I actually did, everybody else ran the stuff, it was great. So as general Chairman that was my major contribution.
DF: Well, not insignificant.
GE: It wasn't insignificant but it's amazing this city. When I said I'd do it I called half a dozen friends and said I'm going to be doing this, I need your help and they called half a dozen friends to get them to their committees and within no time you've got 100 people working on a convention. As I said, I just ran the meetings, I didn't do a damn thing except renegotiate with the AAPG.
DF: So why did you want to be a VP and then President?
GE: I think it was, I've gotten a great deal out of the CSPG, out of geology, out of my career and I think like most of us who do this, it's some way of putting back, it's some way of giving something back to the community, in this case the geological community. There are 3,000 geologists who belong to the CSPG and it's a really vibrant organization and we just all take a turn in the barrel. It's amazing. There's 10 or 12 people every year that are working on the executive and hundreds of other people on all the various committees and it was my turn to help out.

DF: So what were some of the challenges when you were VP and the President?

GE: I think the biggest one was, and this is ironic, I started off as a very technically oriented geologist. All I really wanted to do was look at the rocks and interpret and stuff but I developed a reasonable skill in the business management side and a reasonable skill on the people skills. My wife wouldn't think it's quite as good as that but it was fairly obvious that the way organization was run, and this is nothing detrimental about the previous executives but we'd gotten to a size where we needed some more controls, understanding of the accounting and more ability to manage the business without putting all this pressure on all these volunteers. Especially this small cadre, even if you're only doing it for a year or two, it's still a lot of pressure. And we talked to a lot of the membership and decided, if we could do it properly we should probably bring in a business manager. What we had was a couple of, this is going to sound derogatory and I don't mean it this way, but a couple of girls in the office. That's not in any way derogatory about what those women were doing.

#217 DF: No, that's the way the office was run.

GE: Yes. The executive provided the management but the women weren't getting it on a day to day basis, management help and so on. So we decided that probably what we needed to do was, and I took the executive off to a half day, I used one of the rooms at the golf course at Pinebrook, the board room there and we got somebody from the management department of the university to kind of facilitate and we just brain stormed about what we needed to do. I had a kind of preconceived notion that we really should have sort of an executive director for the organization. That was pushing things too hard. In fact, the rest of the executive said, that's all very well George, but no, we're not going to do that. What we really need is a business manager. So it was someone who didn't have the sort of, I'm in charge of the organization that you often see with the Executive Director of an organization but somebody who was reporting to the executive and was the business manager, day to day business manager. And we brain stormed about where the ??? needed to go and what needed to be done. And there were lots of things but probably the most significant was the decision we made as an executive that, yes, we would go that route and somebody with administrative skills, didn't have to be a geologist, in fact, probably ought not to be but ought to have some interest in it. And boy, were we lucky. We hired Tim Howard who's the Business Manager, you've probably met Tim.

DF: Oh yes.

GE: Tim's military through and through. He is wonderful. One of things that I hadn't realized about military folks is that while the decision is, especially in the staff positions he was in, as and when they are discussing and deciding what to do, Tim is almost aggressive. And he says, there are lots more like me in the Army, but he would push and push and push you and make sure that that's exactly what you wanted and how you wanted it and you'd feel that, that's what I want. And the next thing you know it was, yes sir, and he'd turn around and implement it. So you'd get this impression that he was against it until you got to know what his style was. But in fact what he was doing was making sure that what was going to be implemented was exactly what you wanted. And then there is this sort of

immediate change in demeanour and turn around and go out and do it. We were extremely fortunate. Again, enormous skill, we were very fortunate in that he has a pension from the Army so he wasn't looking for a high salary. He was looking for something interesting to do and also would augment his pension and we just got a great guy. The thing was though, it wasn't going to happen while I was President and so Gerry Reinson, who was my Vice-President, I said, Gerry, you're going to have to work with this guy as President, you get to hire him. So he headed up the hiring committee. That was a good move too because then the very person who's going to have the most interaction with him was very comfortable with the choice. When I had been Vice-President I wasn't as involved as I would like to have been. The President before me had essentially, a one day a week that his company allowed him the freedom and time to do it, so Rick Young, who was with Home at the time had the time to do this job of essentially President and business manager one full day a week and he worked very, very hard at it. As a consequence though, I wasn't quite as involved as I would liked to have been as Vice-President. So when I started as President I told Gerry that he was going to get involved. And it was great because you have friendships when you get into these things but when you come out having worked with people like that for a year on something other than business and other than your science, it really deepens the friendships. And I think that's part of the reasons why a lot of us do it as well. Yes, it's your turn in the bow and you want to give something back but it's also an aspect of developing additional friendships. It was a good three years. We got some changes started. I can't claim to have revolutionized the CSPG, nobody does that because it's a rolling thing but we made some steps forward I think, in terms of making that decision to get a business manager involved and then, necessarily, what evolved from that and from our strategic planning day that we had was the idea that we needed to use the executive committee more efficiently, change the way we manage the business, try and bring all the finances into one because there were lots of bank accounts around and the whole audit system got to be quite onerous when you've got umpteem bank accounts. So over the next 4 or 5 and 6, 7 years, probably still going on were just small, incremental, subtle changes that I think have tightened up everything and give it some focus over time and the next successive executives and presidents put their little touch on it too. It just kind of evolves and you're just part of the evolution.

#286 DF: Why was that financial management or tightening, why was that necessary?

GE: I think because, when you go in as an executive you really feel as though you want to make some contributions, maybe we should be funding this, maybe we should be funding that. There's a temptation for each new executive to want to add something to the largesse that the Society does in the community. We don't have an incremental budget every year so what is was a matter of was, if you're going to do this, you had to get to the discipline and say, if we're going to add this what are we going to take away, what's unnecessary anymore. So we looked at it from all the aspects, or started to look at it. We just got the ball rolling. Other people following have done much, much more in terms of just tidying up. But just getting it to the point where, if you're going to have a project, put

a project in place, we have to have the funding for it, the funding has to be there for the ensuing years. You can't just do it one year and look good and walk away and leave that problem for somebody else. And nobody did that intentionally in the past but they were just things that the Society wants to do and the momentum would be there and members would get behind it but then, we were all explorationists, none of us really had tremendous financial background, but we decided that we probably needed to just tighten things up a little bit so that we could finance every year, the operating budget would be, we didn't have an operating loss in any one year. Although we've got some resources in the background you don't really want to have to keep dipping into them and reducing that. It's not a Society that has a lot of money so you've got to be operating on a sound operating budget fashion. We recognized that, I don't think we realized what it would take and it took 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 more executives to just work that system through. I think Rick Sebastian who followed Gerry then, when I was past President and he was Vice-President really took that to heart as well and continued that role forward and probably did as much as anybody to get it onto an even footing. And successive presidents have done the same thing. By having a lot of the people with 2 and 3 year terms we've got that continuity on the executive too, overlapping one so you don't lose everybody one year.

DF: Right. Well, it sounds like putting Tim into the business manager positions helps with the continuity as well.

GE: Absolutely and he's tremendous in that respect. They've now added another body in terms of administering some of the convention and things like that.

DF: Yes, because it's a busy organization.

GE: It is, it really is. We have AAPG distinguished lecturers who go around the U.S. and they do 15 or 16 locations. And they come to Calgary, usually as their last stop on their tour before they head back and they get to a technical luncheon and there in the audience is twice as many people as they've seen in their past 15 luncheons and all in one room you know. We get 500-800 people out to a technical luncheon, 22, 23 times a year. It's a vibrant organization, it really is.

#332 DF: Any hopes for the future for the CSPG, any places you think it could go?

GE: I think it has to consider where its people work. There are still large number of the. . obviously the majority of the CSPG members still work in western Canada but more and more there are companies whose affiliations are in the U.S., Canadian companies who have offshore east coast, Arctic and international operations. While we are Calgary based and most of the industry is here in Calgary, there are now people in the CSPG working in Halifax and St. John's and people who are down in the Gulf Coast of the U.S. and in Houston on a regular, regular basis. So that there is a sense I think, in which it probably has to become a little more international, a little less, I won't say parochial, that's really not quite fair but there is a lot in the CSPG that does have an international bent to it but the vast majority I think, are still Canadian based. It's a little bit like the American Association of Petroleum Geologists went through 5 or 10 years ago and are still going through, they've got 25 or 30% of their members are now non-U.S. And they've now gone to calling themselves an international geological organization. And we probably

have to recognize that ourselves. Especially with so many of us working in the U.S. as well.

DF: Seeing as you brought up the AAPG, can you tell us about that older brother organization and your negotiations with them to cough up a bit more of the money in '92.

GE: It was kind of funny. . .

DF: Was it confrontational?

GE: Well. . . No, no, peace, order and good government. They would take their conventions, they annual meetings through a number of U.S. cities. Obviously they would go to Houston, Denver, New Orleans, Dallas, every third or fourth year they're in one of those and then they'd do other cities. Membership loves coming to Calgary, one of the reasons being that they can be there and look at the rocks. It's fantastic. Nowhere else that this AAPG goes can you go to a convention city, hear about all this stuff, and then go out there and see it. So they love coming here. But when they go to Dallas or to New Orleans or Houston and so on, they head office essentially goes down there to run the. . they put a local committee together to do all the technical piece but they basically run it and they give the local organization 5 or 10% of the proceeds. That was unacceptable to us. We run our own convention every year, you forgo the convention that year to do the AAPG one. So what I said is that. . well, they came up with their budget and in it was all the money that would go back to AAPG for administration and I just simply looked at their budget and questioned a number of their pieces. I mean, they were covering off the entire convention office, which ran conventions in umpteen different places, they were charging all the expenses to the national convention and I basically said, no, no, you only charge perhaps half of your costs to the national convention because you've got a bunch of other things that aren't being done at this time. And it was really probably something as simple as that, questioning one or two huge line items in the budget and being able to say, we will only accept 50% of this charge and the other piece can go to the other areas. And they saw the rationale of that for an organization like ours that relied on the convention revenues for a major piece of its operating budget. So in a sense it was relatively amicable, it just needed somebody to point out a few things and analyze the budget quickly and push back. In retrospect, it didn't take too much negotiation at all, I just simply pushed back and it worked. It was one of those things that had to get done right off the bat and as soon as I'd made the phone calls and put a few people together and we knew we could do it and we sat down and said, okay the final piece is, before we sign on the dotted line, we've just got to make sure we're going to come out of this successfully. Actually there was an incentive to do it because the past Presidents have an annual dinner and . . .

#406 DF: What time of the year is that?

GE: The end of December some time. And I was asked to attend it, it's usually just past Presidents and even the executive, it was usually only the President who went. We've got a little less formal now so that the current executive goes as well and the business manager goes and there's a chance for all the past Presidents to ask questions, offer advice. This particular one, I got up and said, we want to bring the AAPG here in '92 and

I've been asked to be the general chairman if we do it. And one of the past Presidents simply said, well you've got to make $250,000 to make this worthwhile, we should expect that from you. And it was that kind of challenge, it was $200,000, he wanted to make $200,000, it was that kind of challenge from the past Presidents, you've just got to put it in perspective. This isn't just a convention, it's a business proposition too. With 20 or 30 of these rather senior, erudite individuals, almost metaphorically looking over your shoulder, it made the negotiations a little more meaningful.

DF: You had several people helping you then?

GE: Yes, well, even if they weren't there physically, they were there in spirit. And it was simply something like that, simply just going through the budget and looking at what we could do to make it more profitable for us, provide the CSPG with the kind of revenue that it needed from a convention like that.

DF: Any other stories from those past Presidents meetings, now that you're one of the past Presidents?

GE: You know, I think it's probably something they should do a little more often. We do it once a year and the Presidents pay their own dinner fee, every one pays their way. But it's an opportunity to garner some advice and some input from some people who've been there, done that. When you're trying to make some changes they can be a bit of a stick in the mud bunch but it strikes me that it could be a very useful forum that the Society could utilize more often. There are some other things about the Society that, I think. . I also have been involved in the AAPG and when you go to any of their meeting, whatever formal piece it is, they recognize the past Presidents. Literally they have them stand up and are named and sort of recognized. Typically, I think it's a difference again between Canada and the U.S., typically Canadian, we know they're out there and they've done their work but we don't make a fuss. And it would be, I think, appropriate because, I mean I was one of many people who have cycled through but there have been some people who have done some really good stuff, it would be appropriate more often to recognize the individuals who's given that time and effort. Because they're a great resource, it would be useful. And I do find that Tim will simply get on the phone and call a half dozen people and say that we need to talk about this and as a past President, do you have any input. So that does happen, it could happen. . . and they probably are utilizing more than I know about but it's a tremendously useful resource that the CSPG could probably take more advantage of. Because having given 2 or 3 years sometime back, these guys are certainly willing to do half an hour or half a day and do some additional things for the Society. Even if it's only small things.

#471 DF: Well, Gerry Reinson the general Chair for the big celebration next year, the 75th.

GE: Yes. People certainly become repeat offenders.

DF: Any comments in passing on the CSPG's relationship with APEGGA?

GE: You know, it's interesting. I think, in some senses, it's almost an unnecessary part of the act. Engineers who build bridges, build houses and so on, where the public's use of that facility is something that needs to be administered and not controlled but certified and made sure it's okay, I think is necessary. When it comes to oil and gas geology, where

we're dealing not for the most part with a danger to the public in what we do, interpreting rocks for the most part, it's almost unnecessary. We've been lumped into it and in order to practice, ideally you should have an APEGGA certification. It's almost in my mind, an unnecessary sort of thing. I actually resigned from APEGGA a year ago, in protest over wanting to pay the President some multi-thousands of dollars when it's a volunteer position and they have umpteen full time staff. That to my mind. . and they tried to sort of impose it without really consulting the members, which was the worst part. Now it was primarily the geologists and geophysicists who revolted, who ganged up in that one meeting and stopped the damn thing and voted it down. But they're putting it through again, after that protest and it's unacceptable. I find APEGGA, for us as petroleum geologists, unnecessary. Even though I worked on a number of committees and did some work in APEGGA. I think in all these organization you belong to, if you're going to belong to the organization you should give something back to it and I did for a number of years.

DF: I think we're going to have to leave APEGGA for a moment then and we're about running out of tape here. So on behalf of the CSPG and the Petroleum Industry Oral History Project, I'd like to thank you so much for allowing me to come and spend these minutes with you and learn from your vast font of knowledge and experience. It's been wonderful, thank you very much.