the approval of new projects, on the scale that we've been doing it, to continue into the future? Why do we insist there's a need to slow it down, if for no other reason—no ecological concerns, no environmental concerns, no cultural concerns of the small communities there—at least for the economic health of the province? Even if you put that as a major means to slow down, I think there are enough reasons to say 'slow down.' I look at the rising black gold rush that's going on. Plan is not a four-letter word, [but] that's the belief that Klein's government expressed on that.

How have we lived here a version of laissez-faire that's more extreme than what the Canadian government in the 1890s was prepared to tolerate when it came to the Klondike gold rush, and the government then was more interventionist in terms of trying to manage what was taking place up there for that gold rush than we have here for this black-gold rush that's going on. "Wc have lived here a version of laissez-faire that's more extreme than what the Canadian government in the 1890s was prepared to tolerate when it came to the Klondike gold rush, and the government then was more interventionist in terms of trying to manage what was taking place up there for that gold rush than we have here for this black-gold rush that's going on."

—IAN URQUHART

different objectives and trying to create a good livelihood, which means more than just a big paycheck for some people—this is a big issue for those people. It means good job opportunities, good educational opportunities, good life chances, all those sorts of things. And when you look at what's happened in this province since the mid-1990s, we have lived here a version of laissez-faire that's more extreme than what the Canadian government in the 1890s was prepared to tolerate when it came to the Klondike gold rush, and the government then was more interventionist in terms of trying to manage what was taking place up there for that gold rush than we have here for this black-gold rush that's going on. Plan is not a four-letter word, [but] that's the belief that Klein's government expressed on that.

RP: "Do companies plan these. There are huge corporations, big entities—these are bigger than most governments in this world—and fancy plans. Why is this strange for public polity?—democratically elected—to simply be given the responsibility of doing any planning? Is it not about the public interest, if they're not about the public good, what are they about? Philosophically speaking, what is the role of government in our society? What is the role of public interest and devise policies around it, to make sure that it's protected and enhanced and well

about. 'Well, we need to evaluate the situation,' but I'm sure how much more we need to evaluate—we know what's going on now, and I think it's time for someone to say, 'This needs to stop, this needs to slow down,' besides Peter Lougheed and Greenpeace."

One other misconception that I've heard is that if we stop it or if we slow it down, the United States will have us—and there may be some element of truth to that—but for the most part, it's a problem that we're destroying our own province for the export to another country. That needs to be evaluated. And secondly, if we are doing that, we need to start talking out some of these agreements. It's a breach of trust.

One other misconception that I've heard is that if we stop it or if we slow it down, the United States will have us—and there may be some element of truth to that—but for the most part, it's a problem that we're destroying our own province for the export to another country. That needs to be evaluated. And secondly, if we are doing that, we need to start talking out some of these agreements. It's a breach of trust."

All major parties—including the Liberals—are having a hard time understanding, do we need to continue on this, do we need to slow it down, do we need to stop it. The Liberals are the question, is there the Liberals policy, we think we need to do something about it. We think that's one of the problems that's being figured out in this election, which is critical to us. What we need is something that's going to be critical to us. We need to do something about it."

"I think we've got the help that's going to be critical to us. We need to do something about it."

RP: "Being in power for 10 years creates certain kinds of difficulties. How do you discover your party? Political parties very much live on their reputation—what they've done so far, and what they're going to do in the future—so for a party that has stayed in power for 37 years, it's difficult to expect much change because in order

native are the Liberals. The question is, then, can the Liberal party write a new direction which is radically different from what's being gone on? Can it be in fact instigate policies and bring in programs that result in meaningful change? I'm skeptical."

DC: "A lot of people have been talking about how it's just been an incredibly boring election campaign, yet it's a campaign where nobody knows what the results are going to be. A lot of people are saying Conservative government, but I've talked to a lot of people who are saying minority (government), and they don't laugh afterwards like before. I look at the underlying vote, and the last poll paid it around 18 per cent. In the last week of the campaign, the campaign seems to have changed their minds to things that are really crucial to how we've made our lives in the past. If we don't experience change and we don't see the need for change ourselves, it's going to be found on us from outside."

RP: "To replace your question if I'm going to say that a Government of Canada that will have more representation from outside Edmonton and Calgary in its representation than it does now. So that makes me think in terms of what can we expect from that government in terms of policy, it makes me expect 'not much' as too much in terms of change, and finally, I think we've seen some signs of that already. Stelmach, despite saying we've got the status quo in place, has led back off on that since then. If a minority or a reduced majority, then I hope that's going to mean that we're going to see stronger opposition in the legislature at the heart of opposition and some policy that we've been asking for."

"We have lived here a version of laissez-faire that's more extreme than what the Canadian government in the 1890s was prepared to tolerate when it came to the Klondike gold rush, and the government then was more interventionist in terms of trying to manage what was taking place up there for that gold rush than we have for this black-gold rush that's going on."

—IAN URQUHART

DC: "So much of [the debate] has been about the fiscal side of it, about "What kind of revenue are we going to collect from it?" and I think until recently, there hasn't been someone who started to articulate the environmental consequences of it, and I think it's because it's 'out of sight, out of mind.' Every Albian had an opportunity to go up there, they changed their mind."

SP: "It's disappointing to me that no political party has taken the position that [environmental development] needs a momentum or it needs to stop. There seems to be a conversation to make meaningful change, they may have to evaluate some of what they've done to the past. So I don't expect much change from the Tories' re-election. But political parties are not the only factors in determining change. Powers outside the legislature, behind the scenes, Alberta's power structure has been changing quite dramatically, Calgary—so wonder everyone refers to it as Alberta's new capital, it is indeed. Economic economic power is concentrated in those thirty towns in Alberta. So things have changed. We shouldn't simply look at a political party to come into power to change the situation, we need to engage in analysis of the power structure in Alberta, which is quite different from what it was 20 or 25 years ago."

It would be implausible to say the New Democrats have any chance of getting elected as a government on March 3rd—the only plausible altern