



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act

Thursday, June 8, 2017
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-3-13

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature
Third Session**

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (ND), Chair
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (W), Deputy Chair

Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (ND)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (ND)*
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (PC)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (ND)**
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (ND)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (W)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (ND)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (ND)***
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (W)****

* substitution for Colin Piquette

** substitution for Kim Schreiner

*** substitution for Michael Connolly

**** substitution for David Schneider

Bill 203 Sponsor

Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (ND)

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Stephanie LeBlanc	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

10 a.m.**Thursday, June 8, 2017**

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order. I'd like to welcome all members, staff, and guests to the meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. Before we begin, I would like to recognize that this meeting is commencing on the traditional land of Treaty 6.

My name is Graham Sucha, the MLA for Calgary-Shaw and the chair of this committee. I'd ask that those joining us at the committee table introduce themselves for the record, and I will start with Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, MLA, Edmonton-McClung.

Loyola: Rod Loyola, MLA, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Dr. Turner: Bob Turner, Edmonton-Whitemud.

Mr. Carson: Good morning. Jon Carson, MLA, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Ms McPherson: Good morning. Karen McPherson, MLA, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Good morning. Maria Fitzpatrick, Lethbridge-East.

Ms Dotimas: Jeanette Dotimas, communications consultant with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Mr. Koenig: Good morning. I'm Trafton Koenig with the Parliamentary Counsel office.

Dr. Amato: Good morning. Sarah Amato, research officer.

Dr. Massolin: Good morning. Philip Massolin, manager of research and committee services.

Mr. Roth: Good morning. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

The Chair: And then I will go through the list of the members on the phone. If you can introduce yourselves for the record, starting with Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: Good morning. Prasad Panda, MLA, Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Coolahan: Good morning. Craig Coolahan, the MLA for Calgary-Klein.

Mr. Yao: Tany Yao, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

Mr. Gill: Good morning. Prab Gill, MLA, Calgary-Greenway.

Drever: Good morning. Deborah Drever, MLA for Calgary-Bow.

Mr. Taylor: Good morning. Wes Taylor, MLA, Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. van Dijken: Deputy Chair Glenn van Dijken, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you very much.

Just for efficiency as well as for the quantity that we have on the phone, those who are on the phone: if you would like to be on the speakers list, if you can send our committee clerk, Aaron Roth, a direct message or an e-mail, that'd be greatly appreciated.

I'd like to note for the record that Mr. Yao is a substitute for Mr. Schneider, Member Loyola is a substitute for Mrs. Schreiner, Member Drever is a substitute for Mr. Piquette, and Member Turner is substituting for Member Connolly.

Mr. Gotfried, I'll allow you to introduce yourself for the record as well.

Mr. Gotfried: Richard Gotfried, MLA, Calgary-Fish Creek.

The Chair: Excellent.

Just some housekeeping as well. The microphone consoles are operated by *Hansard*, so there's no need to touch them. Please ensure that all cellphones are on silent mode. Audio and video of the committee proceedings are streamed online on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*. Audio and video access for the meetings as well as transcripts can be obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

We'll move on to the agenda. Would a member like to move the approval of today's agenda? Member McPherson moves that the June 8, 2017, meeting agenda of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? All right. That motion is carried.

We'll now move on to the approval of the minutes. We've circulated the minutes for the last meeting, May 10, 2017. Are there any errors or omissions to note? Hearing none, if a member would like to move the adoption of the minutes. Moved by Member McPherson that the minutes for the May 10, 2017, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. For those on the phone? That motion is carried.

We'll now move on to the next item on the agenda, the review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. Moving on to the deadline for receiving submissions, hon. members, at our last meeting the committee passed a motion to finalize a list of stakeholders to consult as part of the public process. As per that motion, the deputy chair and I provided final approval of the list. The committee will now need to decide on a deadline to receive submissions from these stakeholders. Do any members have any thoughts on this point?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. When the bill initially was introduced, Mr. Dang did say that he'd done some outreach, and he had, I think, about 30,000 responses. I know that every single time the clock has changed since we were elected, I've had a flood of people come to my office or call my office basically to stop changing the time. I'd certainly like to hear from more people because I'm sure there are people that are affected north, east, south, and west in our province, and I'd like to hear what they feel about it. Certainly, I'd like to kind of have a deadline to get that kind of submission, but I certainly want to hear from more Albertans about it.

The Chair: Okay.

Any other members wishing to comment? Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree. I mean, I think we've got a lot of stakeholders on the list here, which is excellent. Their voices are loud, and perhaps they represent a lot of people, but everybody's voice is going to count on this, and individually I think everybody's voice is going to count as well, so I'd like to make sure that we certainly allow adequate time, particularly over the summer – people are distracted; people are busy – for feedback both from groups and from individuals.

Thank you.

The Chair: I'll allow for any of those on the phone if there's any comment.

Hearing none, hearing some of the comments from the committee, does someone want to move a motion to invite written submissions from stakeholders? Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Sure. I move that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future solicit submissions from the identified stakeholders, with a deadline of July 15, 2017.

The Chair: Okay. I'll open that motion up for discussion. I'm hearing correctly the 15th as well? Yeah.

Dr. Massolin, is there any comment?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. I just would like to mention that the standard usually is about six weeks to give stakeholders a little bit more time for feedback, so maybe the 15th is a little bit too soon. Maybe towards the end of July would be a little bit better for a deadline. We were thinking maybe the 28th. I don't know if that's amenable. It all depends, too, on the committee's following meeting, but I would think the 15th – is that what was proposed? First of all, that's also a Saturday. It's probably not ideal either. You may want to reconsider that.

Mr. Gotfried: I would agree with that. There's a little event in Calgary called the Calgary Stampede, that kind of distracts everybody for a week or so in there at a very critical point. I would, as a friendly amendment, suggest that we amend that date to July 28.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I'm thinking about kind of the whole process. I recognize that it's a Saturday, and I certainly appreciate what you've had to say, Dr. Massolin. Can we do a little compromise? It's just that I know that MLA Dang has done an incredible amount of work. What I want to see is from kind of outside points on both the east and west of the province because I think they're the ones who may actually be pretty vocal about which way we're going on this. I don't want to push it off too much because if we're looking at, like, the whole process, then I think we're a little more crunched on time. If the committee would be okay if I did a compromise: the middle of the 15th and the 28th, the 21st.

10:10

Mr. Gotfried: Respectfully, I think 13 days is not asking for a lot of extra time during a time where we've got very busy people across our province both in rural and urban areas. We know that June is a crunch time for anybody with families in terms of the end of the school year and things like that, so I think, in respect of organizational and individual challenges, that allowing, you know, more of a fulsome, six-week period would be the right thing to do to allow for those organizations. Again, we're talking about, in the list here, a lot of nonprofit organizations. As we know, many of them are challenged with their own manpower. They're trying to put in applications for grants. Many of them have the peak of their events, and fundraising can be through June and sometimes into the summer. Many are busy with special events in their communities. I don't think that 13 days is asking too much, to go to the 28th of July.

The Chair: MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. My concern with pushing it forward to the 28th is that it just might not allow the committee enough time to get all the stakeholders in and report back at the other end, like, to assemble everything and report back to the committee by the end of the mandate. I think that it's a relatively fair compromise, to

come in on the 21st. That gives an extension of a week to receive the input and also allows us a bit more time on the back end to make sure that we assemble the data and prepare the report in time for the end of the mandate. That's the concern.

The Chair: Yeah. Just in relation to the comment on the mandate I would remind hon. members that October 4 is when we have to report back to the Assembly as well.

Mr. Gotfried: Maybe just a quick question for the clerk. I mean, today is June 8. Realistically, if we approve a date, when would we be able to get these letters out to the stakeholders?

Mr. Roth: Once the letter is drafted and approved, probably fairly quickly. For stakeholders probably fairly quickly. Probably next week.

Mr. Gotfried: So they wouldn't receive it probably until the end of next week.

Mr. Roth: There might be some earlier than that, but, yeah, no later than next week is when most of them would receive it.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, my concern is that most of these people are probably going to get it on their desks in the middle to the end of next week, which is then going to push us really very tight. As per research's and counsel's advice on this, six weeks would be, I think, a reasonable time to give them the opportunity. Again, we're talking in many cases here that the stakeholders have to maybe pull their boards together or maybe poll their members to give us, really, the information that is approved by their groups as well. I just think, again, an extra 13 days or in this case another seven days over what's been proposed – you know, the onus is upon us to accelerate our processes as much as we need to to achieve the desired result. I'm not going to put a heavy onus on multiple parties out there because it puts a little bit of pressure on us. Sometimes maybe we perform a little bit better under pressure.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I just want to share a little bit about my experience with MLA Dang and when he was doing the consultation with the public that he did, and I want to remind people that it was over 30,000 people that responded. I found that even when I put the information up on my own social media, people were very quick to respond. Many, many people wanted to get in their two bits right away, which leads me to believe that as soon as people get to the information, there's a pretty quick turnaround in terms of them providing the information. I think that the possibility of this occurring is publicly well known, and people have already kind of formulated their opinions one way or another. I think that it wouldn't be that much of a stretch for them to make it for the 21st, to get something in.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I want to hear from the public, and in fact my column is going to the *Lethbridge Herald* in my constituency Friday morning. I've already asked them to just put a little hold on it so I can give a link to a website or something for people to give their written input as quickly as possible.

I've asked people, if in fact they don't have access to a computer, to write it out and to bring it to my office. I certainly think we need to hear from stakeholders, but I want to hear from the public in general. The sooner we can get that message out – I'm posting it on social media. I hope we're going to do some advertising. Certainly, MLA McPherson and a few of us had a discussion this morning

about the media. In fact, rural media is missing the government putting information in those papers. I want to make sure rural papers remain viable, and we could certainly put stuff out in the rural media pretty quick, I suspect.

I'm sorry. I'm kind of partial to the 21st. I want to get this done and get working on it. Thank you.

Mr. Gotfried: You know, I totally agree with Member Fitzpatrick on the individual consultation. I completely agree with us pushing it out. Your idea about the rural media: I remember that when I first started, I went to the Legislature Library, and they have, actually, a list of all the rural publications, you know, a complete, comprehensive list. I think that's a great idea.

I think my challenge with the stakeholder list – and this is very different. We're going to reach out via social media, I hope, and hopefully through traditional media as well in different ways, but the stakeholder list is different. I mean, we all have our own opinions, and individuals have opinions. It's very quick. They can make their decision very quickly.

But the stakeholder organizations, if you look through that list, are organizations where they may or may not have empowered their executive director to shoot off a letter, and in some cases that executive director will need to convene a meeting of their board to get permission, or a draft letter will need to be circulated so that it represents the organization, not the individual. That's their responsibility to their boards and to their members. That would be my concern in terms of the stakeholder list, that we're saying: well, here it is, and you guys need to have a meeting next week and draft something up and then have it approved.

We all know that that's not the way, unfortunately, the nonprofit sector works. They're volunteer positions, many times. Getting people together, particularly through the month of June and maybe into July, could be a challenge. I'm sure that they'll meet it, but I think that if we can give them just a little extra time to be respectful of their challenges in terms of organizational approvals, to actually send a message which is approved by, possibly, their boards, or possibly even, by further extension, to poll their membership beyond what issues they may have identified for them organizationally – I just, you know, think that July 28: I mean, we're going forward there. We have the month of August, the month of September before we hit October 3, I think the chair said, a couple of months.

I think we're all prepared to roll up our sleeves and work hard on this once we have the information. I'm just asking for a little caution and being respectful of some of these external organizations, a long list and, I think, a very good list, that we give them the respect to allow them to convene board meetings, to poll their members, to put together a good draft that they can then get approved by their organizations and then submit to us as a representation of their organization, not some individual's opinion of it. We'll get plenty of those as well, which I'm looking forward to, but I just think we need to be very respectful, particularly with this stakeholder list.

The Chair: On the phone, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Yes. I'd like to kind of echo what Mr. Gotfried was mentioning before, that we need to have adequate time. When you look at what's going on even within my riding, I'm starting the rodeo circuit as early as this weekend and parades. A lot of things are starting to happen, and people's focus and attention may or may not be on this at this given time. They're starting their vacations. We need more time to be able to get this right. I concur. I think we need to have this on the 28th to be able to let the people, the

stakeholders and the general public, have adequate time to be able to take this and discuss it and see what all their options are.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In looking at this, what I see is that we have a pretty tight timeline for such a big project overall, with an October 4 deadline. It's not so much a matter of being disrespectful of stakeholders but of being mindful of what our mandate is, what we need to accomplish in a relatively short amount of time. Yes, it is a very busy time of year for everyone. It will be also very busy for the committee and for any public consultation that we're doing, trying to squeeze that all into a short timeline. I know August is a time for many MLAs to take a little break, which is . . .

10:20

Ms Fitzpatrick: Well needed.

Ms McPherson: It is. Yes. As you can tell, my brain doesn't work very well now because we've been so busy.

I would certainly speak in favour of July 21 as a compromise rather than giving ourselves a shorter amount of time on the other end of the project.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Actually, MLA McPherson took pretty well everything out of my thought process. But with respect to stakeholders and nonprofits my experience has probably been a little different than yours, MLA Gotfried, because whenever I've asked for a meeting or some feedback, within 24 hours I've got a response from any of the groups that I've contacted in Lethbridge. So I think we can get that back. Again, because it's such a tight time frame, I'd prefer the 15th, but I'm prepared to go as far as the 21st.

The Chair: MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I concur. I know that these stakeholder meetings that we are going to be holding will provide input, that will perhaps determine whether, you know, the next steps will determine a need for public meetings. If that is the case and that seems to be what's contained in that input that we get back from these stakeholder meetings, then we may well regret having spent an extra week on the stakeholder input portion of it and have lost a week where we could go into some other form of public consultation if the stakeholder meetings determine that that's something that the public wants. I strongly urge us to stick with the July 21 date to make sure that that option is available to us, should that input lead us in that direction.

Mr. Gotfried: In the spirit of compromise I would say that the 21st is amenable. I would hope, maybe, that – the stakeholder list, I think, is a very specific list. I know that we have an option to send the same letter to other individuals, which I think many of us will do to try and seek some written input. I think, maybe, as long as we're mindful that more information is better for us at this committee and that we can compress our digestion of that, distilling of that information is something we can hurry up on. What we can't hurry up on is people that we may have missed. As we discuss maybe some of the other engagement options, I'd like to see those, obviously, with a bigger window so that we can pull those in.

So I can support this amendment.

Ms McPherson: I have a procedural question. Can I amend my own motion . . .

The Chair: No.

Ms McPherson: . . . or does someone else need to do that? Okay.

Loyola: I so amend it.

The Chair: All right. By moving an amendment to strike out "15" and substitute "21."

All right. I'll open up discussions on the amendment.

I think a lot of discussion was on this point, so I will call the question. On the amendment striking out "15" and substituting "21," all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That amendment is carried.

We are back on the motion as amended. I'll open that up for discussions.

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question. Mr. Roth, if you can read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member McPherson that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite written submissions from stakeholders, with a deadline of July 21, 2017.

The Chair: Having heard the motion, all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? All right. That motion is carried.

We'll now be moving on to the public consultation section. At our May 10, 2017, meeting the committee had asked for information concerning prior public consultations conducted by the committee of the Assembly. As requested at that meeting, the committee clerk has posted to the committee's internal website information related to the cost incurred as part of the committee's public consultation process during its inquiry into growing and diversifying the agrifood and agribusiness sector. The committee had also asked about the costs of holding a referendum on the question of eliminating daylight saving time.

I will ask the committee clerk to provide additional information to the committee.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At the previous meeting of the committee the committee had asked about costs, what they would be to hold a referendum. I made some inquiries with Elections Alberta, and there are sort of two separate figures that came out of that. The first was if it was a stand-alone referendum. Previously, within the last year the Chief Electoral Officer has indicated that the cost would be approximately \$23 million to hold a stand-alone referendum.

If, however, there was a referendum that was to be tied to, say, a municipal or provincial election, the comparable cost, they've indicated, would be something like when there's a senatorial selection. The cost of that ranges, but it's about an average of \$2 million for a referendum if it was tied to a municipal or provincial election.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Excellent.

Now I'll move forward in relation to some communication options, now that we have those figures available for us. The committee at the May 10, 2017, meeting had also directed Legislative Assembly Office communications to provide options and the costing for different mechanisms that can be used to engage Albertans in our review. A document containing this information was posted to the committee's internal website on Thursday.

I would like to ask Ms Dotimas to speak to this document. If you'd like to go ahead.

Ms Dotimas: Sure. Because the options are available or were available, I was looking for direction in terms of, I guess, discussion as to what you want to do moving forward as a committee. One of the things that I, of course, want to make sure that we have coming out of this in order to prepare in an efficient time would be the messaging that you'd like, choosing, of course, any of the options. I can speak to any questions that you may have about the research that I've done and some of the best practices that we've used for previous committees. But, of course, the messaging will craft a lot of what's going to go out and might add a little bit of work in terms of getting the approvals for those. Whether it's radio or whether it's advertising, there's an element of approval from the committee or the chair.

I'm happy to answer any questions you may have about the post that went out to you.

The Chair: All right. I'll open this up for questions about the communication plans. Mr. Dach, followed by Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I have a couple of questions. I notice that in the past we've gone in different directions regarding the communication plans, depending upon a review. The last review targeted the rural constituencies, so we have some experience there. What was the best way to reach out to these areas to ensure we hear right from them? I know that MLA McPherson did talk about the rural newspapers being a medium that perhaps wasn't used as much as it could have been and that may be cost-effective. But I wanted to get feedback about the cost-effectiveness of the rural print media and if that has turned out to be an effective and useful expenditure.

Ms Dotimas: I can speak to the information that we received in the online submission forms. There was an option in there to choose which method or which media their information was received from. The majority of those people who submitted through the online submission form indicated that radio actually polled the highest in terms of how the information was received that initiated them to come and submit for that review.

The rural papers, of course, are cost effective insofar as they cost less than the daily papers in the major centres. However, keep in mind that there are approximately 104 outside of the metro areas. There are 104 publications that we can go to as well. It just depends on, of course – I mean, some of them are repeats. Some rural areas, of course, have two or three papers, so we have to pick and choose, I guess, which one has the highest circulation if what we're looking for is reach.

10:30

Mr. Dach: Okay. A further question is with respect to telephone town halls. I know that they are something that is being turned to with some degree of success. Is the cost noted in the communications options per telephone town hall, or is that combined? Like, it's each, right?

Ms Dotimas: Yes, sir. Actually, for the options that we're looking at, this would be approximately \$60,000 for each instance, and also that's dependent on the timing or duration, if you will, how many participants, how much of a reach, whether you want to reach 5,000 people or 100,000 people that they dial out to. As well, it doesn't consider at this point the interactive nature, so if you want just a call-out encouraging people to come and participate, leading them to the website, for example, or asking them to participate with other mediums that we've used, that would defer, then, from the cost of an interactive town hall, that actually would probably last about an hour as opposed to a five-minute call-out.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Would they be, like, a targeted, specific-area town hall or just province-wide?

Ms Dotimas: It could be tailored however the committee decides, whether it's a metro area, whether it's a – it could be geotargeted based on postal code I believe is the way that they use it. So if you want to have all rural areas, then we need to let them know.

Mr. Dach: So that \$60,000 is, like, a province-wide town hall anticipated?

Ms Dotimas: Actually, this one in particular, I believe, is between 75,000 to 100,000 people as a reach, but that's the minimum for – it was a five-minute call-out I asked them to quote, so it would incrementally increase depending on how long and how far.

Mr. Dach: Okay. I'm sorry. You're actually saying that this would be a province-wide call-out?

Ms Dotimas: It would not, sir. It would be 100,000 phone numbers, if you will.

Mr. Dach: But spread throughout the province?

Ms Dotimas: If that's what you choose, yeah. It'll depend on the postal codes that we choose in the package.

Mr. Dach: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Lots of great information here. Thank you for your work in doing so. In looking at many of the options here, it seems like there are a reasonable amount of relatively low-cost options, which I think we should lean towards – social media, media relations, e-cards, constituency newsletters – those things that we can utilize our existing assets to push out.

I think, to the point of Member Fitzpatrick, maybe there's an opportunity for us to work with some of the rural papers on some editorial coverage of the issue as well, not that we want to shortchange them months of potential advertising dollars. However, that's not our job, to worry about that particular situation. But we may want to do a bit of that.

I kind of like the idea of not only constituency newsletters, but I personally and, I suspect, the other members would like to have people come into their offices over the summer. It is a time when we like to engage with our constituents. If we can encourage them to “go online or visit your MLA” kind of messaging, I think, it would be very positive for us to hear face to face from individuals. So I'd like to see us, you know, if possible, lean towards that side of things.

Telephone town halls, I think, are kind of high profile, but it sounds like, from the expense, we could do a lot of work with that \$60,000 in supporting other means of communicating through traditional advertising or some nontraditional, even Facebook ads and things like that, recognizing that not all demographics are active on social media. I think we have to be cognizant of that, so maybe we have a strategy around seniors' homes and things like that and other communities where we can reach out to them.

I really like the idea of the e-cards. I think we all have a lot of events through the summer, and if this is a big issue and we want Albertans to know about it, having something that we can hand out, a postcard, an actual information card that we can hand out at barbecues and events and community events would be very, very helpful. Although relatively expensive, based on the numbers, if we're all frugal with them and give them to people who are

interested, I think we could maybe do a couple of print runs if that's necessary, if we find that we're running out of those. I mean, I'd like to ensure that we're frugal on this but that we get the reach that we need.

I think that the media is also on top of this and quite interested, so leveraging talk shows and that sort of traditional opportunity, putting ourselves out there to talk to our local media can give us a good read. I mean, I'd like to see us do this on as tight a budget as possible with getting the maximum reach, and I think that you've got some great research in that respect.

Ms Dotimas: I just want to make one clarification. I do agree, of course, with the media. I've said in the previous meeting that because it's an issue that, of course, everyone can relate to, it'll be making our job easier to try and target those areas. The e-card, however, sir: what we meant by that is the electronic one, just to make sure.

Mr. Gotfried: Yes. Sorry. That's why I clarified and said that we've got the information cards.

Ms Dotimas: For sure.

Mr. Gotfried: The e-cards are great for us because we all, again, have our mailing lists, and if we have graphics that we can use for our own social media and whatnot that links it back to where we're going to collect the data, then that's great for us.

Ms Dotimas: Okay. Good. Thank you.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a question about telephone town halls. It is very expensive, and you're talking about dialing the postal code. Does that mean that they're strictly land lines, there are no cellphones in there?

Ms Dotimas: This is correct.

Ms McPherson: Okay. So we'd end up actually probably missing a lot of people like myself, that don't have a land line, so I don't know if that's necessarily terribly effective for what we want to accomplish.

Ms Dotimas: One of the things that I asked when we asked the vendor to provide this information is that exactly. A lot of people, of course, who are on the phone are probably better reached by social media through their devices.

The only thing I want to add, of course, is that this is a first time for us, so if we are considering this, I have to make note that, of course, we have no metrics to compare it to. Its effectiveness will be questioned because I don't have anything to compare it to, whether or not it would be good for the committee.

Ms McPherson: Thank you.

The Chair: Member Carson.

Mr. Carson: Sure. I just want to point out that at the end of our last review, during the communications plan, there was mention of having an evaluation of how our last consultation went. As far as I know, we didn't get to see that analysis. I think that's something that would be important moving forward. I mean, we have a breakdown of all the costs per item, but it would be great to see what is actually effective.

You mentioned that the radio was a big way to reach out to people, and that's how they seem to get the information. So I would

just put out there that I think radio is a very important way to reach out to the rural communities. As well, the weekly newspaper ads, I think, are a good idea in conjunction with some of the lower cost ways to reach out, say, social media and, obviously, through our offices. That's what I would put forward. I don't know if anyone has any other thoughts.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I just concur with Member Carson. I mean, it's not surprising, the way Ms Dotimas spoke about the radio ads, especially in rural communities. It seems to be a very cost-efficient way compared to, well, perhaps a telephone town hall meeting. It would have a substantial reach. Of course, as has been stated here by many members from all parties, we're really interested in hearing from the public as well as the stakeholders, and I think that that would be a very efficient way for us to reach out to especially rural populations around the province so that we could hear from them.

The Chair: If I could just kind of clarify things for the record, what I'm hearing from some of the committee members is a desire to seek e-cards, radio, and rural print media if I'm correct.

I'll open that up on the phone if there's any other discussion just because we haven't caught anyone on the phone recently.

Seeing none, would someone like to – it's been pretty standard practice in the past for the chair and deputy chair to approve a communication plan that's been drafted. With that being said, would someone like to move a motion?

Mr. Gotfried: Sorry, Mr. Chair. What are we approving here? We're just accepting this report?

The Chair: Typically what we would be seeing, from the dialogue that we've been hearing from the will of the committee, from some of the discussions that we've opened up here, is that research services and communications would draft a communication plan. They would distribute it to all members for any feedback, and then that would be finalized by the chair and deputy chair. Ideally, I think, right now there's been some talk from research services of the 13th for that to be approved, giving them some time to prepare the document and for it to be circulated appropriately.

10:40

Mr. Dach: Mr. Chair, you were, I believe, looking for a motion to authorize the chair and deputy chair to provide final approval, so I do so propose that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future authorize the chair and deputy chair to provide final approval to the communications plan prepared in support of the committee's review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, on or before June 12, 2017.

Is that too fast?

Ms Dotimas: May I?

The Chair: Please proceed.

Ms Dotimas: Sir, what I need to do is actually give the exact costs and the timing to the chair and to the committee, so I would ask the committee if I can have until the 15th to provide that to the chair and deputy.

Mr. Dach: I can't hear. Sorry.

The Chair: Sorry. She was commenting on the 15th, just to provide enough time for that to be prepared.

Mr. Dach: That is a Friday? What day is that?

The Chair: A Thursday.

Mr. Dach: I'm fine with that.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, just for clarification here, what I'm hearing – and I just want to be sure that I'm hearing this correctly – is that we want to direct the committee to pursue the no-cost communication strategies in as robust a manner as we possibly can and that the other one that we are interested in, again, just trying to summarize here, was to look at province-wide radio advertising. I didn't hear anything specifically about social media advertising. That seems to be a highly cost-effective vehicle, I think, to try and get the word out. And we would also look at some of the – I'm maybe a little unclear on what we decided in terms of publications.

Is that what we're directing you to do here, to pick the things that we've said we like and to try and drop off the things we say that we don't like here and try and focus on a final plan? Is that what we're asking you to do here?

The Chair: That is correct. Just in reference to the Facebook ads, I think that was alluded to with the e-cards or the e-posting ones as well.

Mr. Gotfried: Is that the same?

Ms Dotimas: We would typically use social media, obviously, to send out just free, if you will, posts. There is a cost, of course, to spread that a little bit wider with the geotargeting outside of the specific area that we go to. I've asked for about \$1,000 for Facebook on that one. It's relatively low cost still, but I do think it's important.

Mr. Gotfried: Is that enough? Is that adequate to do some pushing through – I mean, I know Facebook ads can be very targeted.

Ms Dotimas: It will, yes. We've asked the committee before for approximately \$500. That was what we normally asked for in some cases.

Mr. Gotfried: No, no. It's very cost-effective.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to clarify that that's what we're directing you to do, and it sounds like we've got reasonable consensus that telephone town halls are a bit expensive for us to look at, and we may have some others. Thank you. Sorry. I just wanted to make sure I was clarified on that.

Ms Dotimas: I do have one quick question. We had discussed quite a bit about the rural papers. There is actually a cost associated specifically with the daily major papers in urban areas, so I wanted to get clarification that that's something that committees would accept as well or not.

The Chair: Sorry; I'll open that for Member McPherson, who's next on the list.

Ms McPherson: Okay. That wasn't what I was going to talk about, but I will make my point. In terms of social media there are many areas in the province that are not well served with Internet connectivity. I think to rely too much on social media may exclude a large portion of people that we really want to include.

That brings me back to the weekly newspapers, where we get the added benefit of supporting the local culture. Weekly newspapers have actually been meeting in Alberta for 100 years. They've been a part of rural communities. I know what I'm talking about. I grew

up in Sexsmith. The newspaper is a very important part of the culture, and it is a way that many people find out what's happening in the community. I think that they're an excellent tool to be used for this particular purpose.

As far as the dailies, I think in larger metropolitan types of areas or even in the larger small cities that we have, I don't know that we're really going to get as much bang for our buck. An urban person is more likely to be on their phone, engaged in social media, and we are more likely to hit them there rather than with a daily newspaper. Yeah. I think that just the change in that market over the last five years or so would probably not get us as much traction as we would hope or reach as many people as we would like to with the dollars that we are spending.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I just wanted to reiterate my point earlier on. I was focused more on a mix of rural radio and print. I think that it would be a matter of just seeing what is the most cost-effective way of, you know, deciding between the two. I'm not too sure. I mean, perhaps there's a rural radio that has a very extensive reach in a particular part of the province, and maybe we can go with the radio in that area as opposed to print. But these are all things that we'd need a little bit more detail on, and I'm hoping that Ms Dotimas can provide that to the chair and deputy chair and then for both of you to make a decision.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah. I think we want to reach as broad an audience as we possibly can, and I recognize that the rural weeklies are probably very good tools for us to ensure that we're polling in particularly those areas. As we saw in the research done by MLA Dang, there are some communities up in the north that are quite far removed, that are going to be very much affected by the changes in times.

In terms of if we can get a sense of consensus on this, I think that if we complement these weeklies with some other specifics – like, I'm thinking about the seniors who won't, even in the urban areas, be on social media. So if we go in Calgary with, like, *Kerby News* – and I'm sure that there are similar publications across the province that we can do. So maybe what we want to add into this mix, with respect to our experts here, is to find maybe a combination of ethnic media and some demographic media, as it were, that reaches specific groups, that we could add into that mix and have costed with it, so that we're not missing people who aren't on social media, who may or may not get the daily newspapers and sort of thrive on their community newsletters. I think that that would be very helpful, if we could include that to make sure we're not missing people, the challenge, of course, being that we're probably going to try and drive most of them to a website to answer, but we maybe have to find some other vehicles for them to respond as well.

Thank you.

The Chair: Sorry. I missed Ms Dotimas. Do you wish to comment?

Ms Dotimas: I just wanted to address a couple of questions, I guess. The rural radio stations that we used for the agriculture review were transmitters from CKUA, and they reached all of the *Call of the Land* radio stations that are normally reached through agriculture business. So I'm confident that we'll be able to reach that market.

In terms of the more targeted demographics, whether it's outside of Edmonton or outside of bigger markets, the only concern I have is their timing. In summertime, usually the seniors, the ones I know in Edmonton, take a hiatus around this time, and they close up shop

until September. So we might have missed some opportunities there. I will definitely check.

The other thing, of course, is their deadlines because most of them are monthly. It'll depend, of course, on whether or not there's reasonable time. I'd hate to put money into something that they only have a week for. I'd rather look at the *Edmonton Examiner*, for example, stuff that's delivered right to their doors. They'll have a week to be able to see it, and of course they'll be able to mail it in if they're not connected online.

Mr. Gotfried: Just in terms of the public consultation I think that we would be a little accelerated here to have that July 21 date. So I'm thinking that we have a broader window that allows us to get into – I know that most of my community things, my July stuff had to be in a week ago, so we're really now pushing into August publications. We have a bit of a challenge there to reach. I guess we have to take that into consideration on the cycles of advertising. If we're reaching them, as you said, a week before the deadline, that's not going to work for us. So I think we have to take that into consideration on the public, whether it's a web response or other written opportunities, that this is maybe separate from those stakeholder, you know, direct, written responses that we're seeking.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I agree with Member Gotfried there, but I do want to stress that, I mean, we're focused on potentially advertising in dailies. You know, I understand that in some of the ethnic media, if we were to go that way, it would mean – some of them only publish monthly, of course. But I'm thinking that it would be better for us to kind of move the date for the public perhaps to July 28. I want to suggest that.

Of course, I'll remind everyone that we do have a motion on the floor made by Member Dach to have both you and the deputy chair make final decisions on this and move us in that direction.

10:50

The Chair: Any other speakers?

Procedurally, I also want to comment because Member Dach has moved for it to be June 13. To put it to the 15th, we need to move an amendment as well.

Loyola: Okay. I so move that – pardon me. Was it . . .

The Chair: Striking out “13” and subbing “15.”

Loyola: Yeah. Whatever date Member Dach used. He said June 12, I believe.

The Chair: Sorry. He said June 12, yeah.

Loyola: I so amend by striking out “June 12” and putting “June 15.”

The Chair: All right. I'll open up the floor for discussion on the amendment.

Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question on the amendment. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That amendment is carried.

We are back on the motion as amended. I'll open that up for discussion.

Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question. Mr. Roth, if you'd like to read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. Dach that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future authorize the chair and deputy chair to provide final approval to the communications plan prepared in support of the committee's review

of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, on or before June 15, 2017.

The Chair: Having heard the motion as amended, all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That motion is carried.

Mr. Gotfried: Just a quick question. I'm totally on board with what we've just approved here, but we haven't given you any budget to work with or maximum budget or anything like that. It might be a bit premature until we get more detailed information, but I'd like to think that we're cognizant of how much this is going to cost as opposed to just a plan in place. I don't know if there are any other comments around that, but I think that we need to be cognizant of costs and perhaps even a maximum cost or historical costs for similar consultations that we need to be concerned with as well.

The Chair: Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I realize that there's been no cost ceiling put on the motion, but I think the bulk of our morning has been spent on deciding that we want an effective communications plan but one that's very respectful of cost. That direction, I think, is pretty clear to the chair and deputy chair, that the highest cost option isn't what they should be seeking. It should be effective but middle of the road, making sure that we accomplish what we need to in order to broadcast the hearings.

Mr. Gotfried: Agreed. Worth reiterating, though, I think.

The Chair: I think we also have a good sort of reference point, members, because we do have reference to the last review we did, with the agrifood sector, and I would anticipate, from what I've heard from the committee members, that ideally we're trying to seek costs similar to what those would be.

Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. Earlier on I did mention the rural dailies, but perhaps as an alternative we could go with the weeklies in terms of being more cost-effective. Of course, that's just a suggestion to you, Chair.

The Chair: All right. Hon. members, we're going to move on to public written submissions. During the previous review of bills referred to committee, it's been common practice to invite Albertans to provide written submissions on the matter at hand. I will now open the floor to discussion on whether the committee would like to solicit public written submissions.

Ms McPherson: Well, I know that MLA Dang, who unfortunately for us is not able to join us today – he's at a convocation – has already received a lot of feedback. Thirty thousand people have responded to him. I think the public submissions are still very important, but since so much groundwork has been done, I don't know that we need a protracted amount of time in order to solicit that information.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that for the work of this committee – although we should consider Mr. Dang's research as instructive, I don't think we should probably use it as the source of our decision-making here if we're going to be doing robust consultation ourselves. I think that we need to be mindful that that was not – I'm not sure what process was used there, but I would hope that, you know, our questions may be somewhat different and that we use that, the sending of up to 30,000 responses, which I

think is very instructive and gives us some good direction, but I think our responsibility here is to conduct our own research and to blend that with what we have as instructive research that was done by the member.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Sure. While I appreciate the points made, the difference with other initiatives that might be undertaken is that we really don't have to do a lot of educating of the public as to what the question is. People are very engaged already. It is something people are pretty passionate about if the responses in my riding are any indication. And that is my point, that, no, we don't need to consider what's been brought in so far, the feedback that's been received so far as to what the answer is going to be, but the process of helping people to understand what the issue is: I think people are already very, very clear about what the question is.

The Chair: Member Fitzpatrick.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with everything that's been said. I'd actually kind of like to make a motion that we solicit the public written submissions in regard to the review. Certainly, if we identify to the public that we're looking for their submissions, we could probably do that very quickly. I certainly expect to do the public stuff very quickly in my office.

So I'd like to say – okay; I'm kind of putting it together in my head – that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future solicit written submissions from the public in regard to the review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, with a submission deadline of July 28,

the week after we get the other submissions. Okay. I'll leave it at that.

The Chair: Now having a motion on the floor, I'll open it up for discussion. I know, Mr. Taylor, that you were on the speaking list, so I'll go to you first.

Mr. Taylor: Okay. Well, thank you. Yeah. I think it's important that we open that up for the written submissions and not not do it and just take what Member Dang has found out because we don't know exactly what metrics he used to determine what that question is. If you write a question a certain way, you'll get an answer.

I think it needs to have a fulsome kind of a discussion with regard to ourselves. How are we going to send out that message? What is it going to look like? Is it yes or no? Kind of: do you want to, or do you not, or do you know what the implications are of having this happen? For example, if we stay at daylight saving time, at 8 o'clock in the morning, when the kids go to school, it will be dark out. I don't know if everybody is aware of that, you know, out in the general public. If we move to this time, that's what will happen as a result. So do we know if there is going to be an increase in accidents for kids? We have to have that brought up.

So we need to have written submissions, but we need to probably massage what we're saying as well and not just say kind of a yes/no but an explanation that would be coming out of it to let the people know what would happen if we go this way or we go another way with daylight saving time or not.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm completely supportive of us having written submissions, but I think we need to clarify a

couple of things here. I'm a little concerned. A lot of people have made up their minds but actually, probably don't have all the information, and some people probably have all the information and haven't made up their minds.

I'm hoping, actually, that the information we receive from our stakeholders' written submissions will be very instructive for everybody in making that decision. We're going to hear from sports teams. We're going to hear from airlines. We're going to hear from groups that actually have to manage a lot of what happens in our world and in our society in terms of logistics and things like that. Member Taylor mentioned that there could be some school safety issues, that we may hear from some school boards.

11:00

I think Albertans are going to want to hear and see what some of these larger groups are telling us in terms of their concerns. They're responsible and maybe in some cases legally liable for certain decisions that are made and also will be bearing the costs associated with that. We've heard about that from professional sports teams – I don't think we're necessarily going to make up our minds based on what's there – but also from airlines, who typically have to rejig their schedules in spring and fall based on daylight saving time. But if one jurisdiction changes and the other one doesn't, there could be some challenges with scheduling for connecting flights and things like that.

I'd like to think that the written submissions we seek from the public may allow for a few things, that we can actually push some information out to the public so that they can respond in a more informed manner, which will, I think, then inform us more about what their feeling is, having better information. I also would like to think that, you know, we make it simple and easy. Written submissions: some people will take the time to write a letter to us and do it.

You know, what we haven't specifically discussed here is that web portal of the survey that we're going to have. I think it was mentioned by Member Taylor about the wording of that to ensure that we are as unbiased as possible in seeking input and perhaps also still having room for a write-in comment for individuals as well. I would like to see that we also, having received information on the cost of a referendum, are transparent with respect to that, that we offer Albertans a chance to select and opt-in for a referendum to decide this, with those two costs, a stand-alone and at the next general election, to be given as information and a question to them as well.

That may mean that we need to push this public survey a little further out is what I'm thinking here. That could be towards the middle of August or some such time. Again, given it's the summer, it is a busy time. I'm concerned that we're rushing this a little bit too much. If we're going to be making these decisions, if it were to go to a referendum, which is going to cost us \$2 million, if the final decision we make is going to cost organizations and businesses possibly well in excess of that in some of the challenges they may face, I would like to make sure that we have more information out to the general public, and then what we get back from them will be more valid.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. There are a number of points that I agree with with Member Gotfried. However, pushing it into the middle of August, I think that many people are going to be on

vacation. I think that giving them another 10, 15 days in this circumstance, because it's going to be over the summertime, may not make that much of a difference.

The motion that we do have on the table right now is the if, not so much the how. Although I'm willing to listen to the opinions of all the members on the how – I think that's really important – I'm hoping that we could focus on the if and get that out of the way. Then we can have perhaps further discussion on what would be sent out to people.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Certainly, I appreciate everything you've had to say, MLA Gotfried. I lived in Yellowknife for a number of years. In fact, there were six weeks of no legal darkness. It didn't matter when you got up; the sun was shining. It didn't matter when you went to bed; the sun was shining. Certainly, for me, my concern is more east-west than north-south because the sun's coming up, the sun's going down. You're going to have the same number of hours of daylight or darkness whether it's daylight or standard. I want to get as much public feedback as I possibly can, and that's what I've been actually trying to do when I reach out in my constituency and what I do when I put my column in the paper. As Member Loyola said, in fact, adding a few more weeks isn't going to make a difference in the summertime.

I've gotten lots of feedback. For example, when the bill first came up, I had a conversation with the 35 members in my church choir. Thirty four of them said that they wanted it to never change again. One person said that they didn't care. Certainly, when I look at the number of people who've come into my office and talked about it, there are some people who want it to stay, some people who don't. In one of the documents that I had seen, MLA Dang had actually identified time up and time down for both daylight saving and standard. So I think we can certainly come up with a pretty good question to send out, and we're going to get feedback, like, right away.

Anyway, that's all I have to say.

The Chair: I'll open up for discussions on the motion.

Seeing and hearing none . . .

Mr. Taylor: Can I speak again to it?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Okay. Really, I think it's very hard for us to be able to ask that question to the public until we've actually stopped and asked the stakeholders and they give us the insight of how it's going to affect them and the people that, frankly, would have better insight. We're asking the general public, that have kind of a knee-jerk reaction, "I want it to change" or "I don't want it to change." But until they're fully informed, they wouldn't really know what that question would be. I think we need to be able to talk to the stakeholders before we ask that question of the public so we know exactly what we're asking and whether it's a good idea or not and how much it's going to cost Albertans.

As Mr. Gotfried said, you know, it's going to cost the sports teams, airlines, et cetera. There are a lot of unintended consequences that could come as a result of just saying: let's go throw a question out and use the people that have just quickly identified that they don't like it. Why don't you like it? And do you know that if we do change it, this will be the impact? If you know what the impact is, would you still vote that way? We need to know what the stakeholders have to say so they can give us that input.

Thank you.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I kind of disagree with you. I think we can get the information simultaneously and get it back as quick as we can. Our time frame is really short, and I want to make sure we get as much information as we can possibly get so we can make an informed decision.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand that we're under some time pressures here and October 4 is the date. I think most important is valid and robust data for us to analyze here as a committee. I think we have a responsibility to Albertans to ensure that what we're getting is, as I think was mentioned by Member Taylor, well informed – I mean, a lot of people have a knee-jerk, "Yeah, let's just get rid of it; I don't want to change my clocks anymore," or some people may just say: "You know what? I'm done with this. Let's stop doing daylight saving time." There may not be any cost implications to them. There may not be any logistical implications to them specifically. They just don't like changing their clocks twice a year in the spring and the fall, which is valid, and they're entitled to that opinion.

I have to concur, again, that – we have a July 21 deadline. I think maybe it's good that we move that up a bit. I'm now seeing the light of that. Maybe that gives us the opportunity to very quickly collate some of the key issues there. I think we'll find that maybe we'll get them before that 21st cut-off, and then we can look at some of the implications, and we can blend that into it. I would like to see, when we're pushing this out to the public, that it's not just a survey, but maybe we have on our website some information about some of the comments or concerns we have from the stakeholders to fully inform Albertans about the implications of this. I think most Albertans would be mindful and respectful of implications to other Albertans. I think that's just the way we operate in Alberta, and for us to be able to do that, I think, will take some time.

11:10

The timelines that we have to face here: you know, we could have the month of September still. We have the opportunity in September to get together and to bring this information together for an October 4 deadline. I think for us to take the July 21 deadline and maybe have everything in place but be well informed from the information we get on the 21st and push that out immediately thereafter to the public with some information on the website of some of the information that we've received from the stakeholders that we can put in there – I suspect what will happen if there is a large cost implication for some of those stakeholders is that they may also be doing their own campaigns around this to inform people, so maybe we should take that responsibility on to inform people of the pros and cons. I think what we all hope for here is pros and cons.

I'm completely undecided on this issue, but I'm looking for more information. I'm looking to be well informed in making my decision, and I think as legislators that's what we're looking to do from this committee. Then, as it goes into the Legislature, we all want to be well informed, making decisions in the best interests of Albertans, both in terms of convenience, both in terms of impact on them, inconvenience, but also I think we owe it to the stakeholders to listen to some of the costs and the unintended consequences. If we don't do that, I think we will be very remiss.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think one thing that we're losing sight of in all of this is the opportunity to have in-person

meetings with the public and stakeholders. If we extend the timeline into the middle of August, we're just simply not going to have any time to do any sort of public meetings on the issue, and for that reason, I cannot support extending the deadline that far out.

Loyola: I think Member McPherson made the point very well. I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Gotfried: I guess I don't understand why we couldn't be having public consultation, particularly in our constituencies, concurrent with that process. If we're seeking stakeholder input, we have some information on the website, again, I would like to think that when we do the more broad surveying and as we push that out, we have the opportunity to put more information out there. I would say: what would be wrong with us having that open till the end of August?

The point about people being on holidays: you know what? We're in a province of over 4 million people. Some people take their holidays in June. Some take them in early July. Some take them in late July. Some take them in early August. Some take them in late August. That argument doesn't sit well with me because, actually, if everybody went on holidays for the first two weeks of August, then the province would be shut down. That does not happen, and I think that in the major cities, you know, if 10 or 15 per cent of people have gone on holidays, that's maybe what it looks like, but people actually spread their holidays over the entire summer. If we stretch that out, we will give everybody the opportunity to work around their holidays to actually bring us some information and some feedback.

Actually, I would be more in favour of us pushing the public consultation and public surveying towards the latter part of August, not even the middle of August, and give us maybe almost a full four or five weeks after we finish the stakeholder consultation to actually seek input from Albertans.

Ms McPherson: What I'm seeing is that we use the public input and the stakeholders' information to inform our conversations during face-to-face meetings, during public meetings, and if we're continuing the timeline until the end of August, that would only leave us September to meet with people and get that information together in a report, and I just don't see that being workable. We're certainly not going to be effective in that context, so for that reason, I certainly can't support the end of August.

The Chair: I'd be remiss if we didn't ask Dr. Massolin just to comment on the drafting of the report and the amount of time that's going to be needed for that.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, are you referring to the final report?

The Chair: Yeah.

Dr. Massolin: It's simple in this instance because the committee has to recommend whether or not the bill proceed. It's quite a quick process in terms of the drafting, so that shouldn't really be a huge consideration.

Thank you.

Loyola: I think that we really need to be cognizant of the process here. The other thing, too, is that we want to make sure that people get in their opinions, not necessarily based on specific stakeholders, right? Like, I mean, we want to throw out the option for people: hey, this is the issue. And I'm not saying that we don't want to have information on the website, by any means. That's something that we could potentially do, but we'd have people have their own

written submissions. Then based on those written submissions, we would be doing public consultation.

You know, we haven't even talked about that yet, the possibility of actually hosting, where we would host these. I think it's very important for us to think about – let's wait for those written submissions to come in before we think about: "Okay. Well, where would we hold the public consultations? Would we travel through the province? Would we not?" These kinds of issues.

Because there are so many things that need to take place in this process in order for this committee to make a well-informed decision, I think that we need to stick to this tighter timeline that we're proposing so that we can make it through all that. We may decide to host several public meetings, maybe not. I don't know. That's a decision that we're going to have to make. But I think that a lot of it is reliant on the written submissions that we receive, so setting the date for July 28 helps us. We can meet after receiving the written submissions, after gaining the insight from those written submissions from both the public and the stakeholders and then make further decisions as we move through the process.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Respectfully, I disagree. I think the process here – you know, we're going out to stakeholders, both on our list and, I think, outside of that, that we're allowed to do, which are representative groups of, in many cases, larger organizations or companies that may have an impact on this.

The public consultation, to me, is something that we need to leave as broad and as deep as we possibly can in terms of seeking input from people at their convenience, with appropriate deadlines that allow us to submit our report by October 4 in a meaningful way. We've heard from Parliamentary Counsel that the actual report itself does not need a long wrap-up period to be submitted in an appropriate manner back to the Legislature. I think the longer we can extend the consultation, not at our convenience but at their convenience: that's really what we should be focusing on here, and I don't hear that. What I'm hearing is: we're going to have a stakeholder, and then we're going to have a hurry-up after that, and then we're going to take a bunch of time to digest what we've got.

I would rather have, you know, a much deeper response from Albertans, allowing them time, allowing us to push it out. I'm going to be doing consultations every day in my constituency office, so we'll be reaching out. I'll be talking to people at barbecues. I'll be talking to people at community events. If we have those printed cards that we can carry with us which will say to people: come and see us, or go to this website for further information – I'm a little concerned that we'll push that out too early. I'd like to see that we have that well structured, well informed, well promoted and that we actually focus our attention on that phase of it.

The stakeholder one is very straightforward. We're sending out letters to a stakeholder list. Again, from what I've read, we are able to take a draft of that letter and send it to other stakeholders within our constituencies. That's one side of it. The public consultation side is, I think, where the real push and the real expense is going to come, and I think we'd be premature, doing that too early. What I would like to see is that we have a great website with a great survey, with a robust back end to that, that we're pushing it out to the public to seek their input, because the stakeholders, I think, we're going to touch, and I think we'll do that quite well. But the surveys: I would rather see a longer window with multiple pushes to get the first wave, which is always the first and early adopters, a second wave, and even a third wave.

You know, I'm saying again: the end of August. What I'm hearing here is that, with some practicality in terms of our meeting dates put into this mix, we can actually push it to Labour Day and still have time, with a couple of meetings after that, to provide Parliamentary Counsel and our Clerk's office here with the opportunity to put a report in place. We can analyze that, and we can have that information at our fingertips through the stakeholder input and through robust data that we can receive online from the committee in terms of what the responses are and some of the metrics around that, and then we can make a better, informed decision in terms of what we're recommending back to the Legislature.

You know what? This hurry-up is not sitting well with me, and I think we owe it to Albertans to do robust consultation and to give them a reasonable window, that we can not only push but push again and give a final push to get as much response as we can get from people across Alberta.

11:20

The Chair: Sorry, Member Carson. Were you on the list?

Mr. Carson: I don't believe so. Or maybe I was, but I don't need to add anything to this.

Mr. Dach: Just a final comment. I understand MLA Gotfried's concerns. However, I really do think that it's incumbent upon us to make sure that we leave our options open, to ensure that there's ample opportunity for public consultations, timewise, near the end. I think that logistically they are a little more lengthy and difficult to put together, so reducing that time window in a way that might make it impossible to have those public consultations, if indeed that's where the initial stakeholder input leads us, would be a mistake. So I really don't support his view that we shorten it up. I think we should stick with the 28th.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to speak to the motion?

Mr. Taylor: I would like to speak to the motion if I could.

The Chair: Yeah, Mr. Taylor. Go ahead.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you. I have to agree with Mr. Gotfried. Making sure that we're able to get our message out to people that are, frankly, probably on vacation as we're speaking, as he mentioned earlier – and they will be on vacation in July and in August. If we have two, three pushes with this message, we're going to have a better chance of getting well-rounded feedback from the public so we have that opportunity.

I'm in my riding and going around, and I ask people all the time, "What do you think?" or they're telling me what they think about this. I've had that frequently happen. Last night I probably had 10 people want to talk about their opinion on the daylight saving time act, as they would call it. We're actually engaging in public consultation on a daily basis. I think people need to be well informed and have that information. So I would hesitate to try to rush any of this part in order for us to be able to get as broad feedback and, I guess, informed feedback as possible.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Mr. Taylor, I think you hit the nail on the head. People have been talking to you and talking to me and talking to, probably, all of the MLAs since the first time the time changed since we were elected. We've been getting public consultation. I think this is kind of the icing on the cake, to get in a last push, and I'm certainly of the mind that we need to stick with the date as I put forward in the motion.

Thank you.

Mr. Taylor: Could I speak to that again, please?

The Chair: Yeah. Go ahead, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: I have to keep going back to that. You know, we need to be able to speak to the stakeholders. We're having conversations, but we don't know exactly what the implications are or what's going to happen for the stakeholders in this. When we have our conversation, we want to make sure that these people are fully informed, and until we are fully informed as MLAs, we can't give them all the information that could be pertinent to it. Then we're able to push out those messages. We've got the initial one. We've got the knee-jerk reaction of people. But there are so many things that could happen. It could be safety, it could be cost, or it could be what's going to happen to somebody like the NHL, CFL. I don't know where this is going to have effects, but until we get our feedback from the airline companies, et cetera, we frankly are not doing the public a service. We're not doing Albertans a service until we know everything.

Thank you.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to speak to the motion? Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can't support the motion as it's standing. It feels to me like a hurry-up, and I don't think that that's what we've been charged to do in this committee. I think we've been charged with trying to do thoughtful and open and respectful consultation with Albertans. I think we need to give an opportunity during a busy time period for all communities, whether they're urban or rural communities.

Again, it sounds to me like we would have adequate time even if we went as far as Labour Day, which would then encapsulate everyone, to put that information together to bring back to the Legislature. You know, because we might have to do a little bit more intensive work in September to get this done – I'm prepared to do it. I can't support these very, very short timelines, that I do not believe meet the needs of Albertans in terms of us doing what's best and making the best and most well-informed recommendations that we possibly can to the Legislature.

Thank you.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to speak to the motion?

Mr. Gill: Yes, Mr. Chair. I agree with Mr. Gotfried. I mean, we shouldn't be rushing into this thing. It's the same thing. I mean, I don't want to drag all the track record of the government rushing into legislation. I see the same trend here. If you really want to respect people's input, then let's do it properly. So, yeah, I won't be supporting this motion as well.

Thank you.

Mr. van Dijken: Chair, can I get on the speakers list?

The Chair: Yeah. Go ahead, Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Thank you. I do believe that we need to be able to extend this timeline further once we have the information and people can make informed decisions and informed comments. I don't believe we're doing it justice if we only have a week between the two periods. I would agree with Mr. Gotfried, that by extending it even up to Labour Day, where we're getting closer to changing the time again, we have a good chance that possibly it'll be higher on the radar for a lot of people, and then they will also be able to digest some of the information that we've been able to gather on the consequences that stakeholders are identifying. So I cannot

support this timeline. It just appears to be too rushed, and all we will be getting are opinions based off uninformed individuals, so I would suggest that we push this off and close the date just before the Labour Day weekend.

The Chair: Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm of the mind that some of the strongest submissions that I've ever received and this committee has received have been the ones that have been face-to-face submissions, and I really don't want to limit our opportunity to have those face-to-face, in-person submissions. I really want to make sure that we allow enough time in the process for that to happen, and I think it's incumbent upon us to be sure that time is reserved at the end. It's not a matter of rushing the previous portions of it; it's a matter of making sure that each component of the investigation is allowed to proceed. I think that we should ensure that the opportunity isn't eliminated to have the face-to-face public consultations.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a couple of things I want to say. I have not made my decision personally on this because I don't believe that I'm well-informed enough. I'm actually looking to be better informed so that I can make my own personal decision on this.

The other thing is that if my recollection is correct, in this committee what we've done in the past is that we've made a selection from the written submissions of what we believe, through their written submissions, are going to be some of the groups that will be the most impacted financially or logistically by this, and those are the stakeholders we've called forward, as we did with the last consultation.

11:30

We will actually have those with a hard stop on July 21, so for us to be able to schedule something in September concurrent with us meeting to review what we get from a survey, which could go as late as late August or Labour Day – we can schedule those well in advance. This public consultation process, broader consultation process I don't believe will handicap us in terms of calling some key stakeholders in.

I believe, again, that the public consultation, i.e., the individual consultation, face to face – we have 87 offices across this province that can engage in that starting almost immediately to gauge input. Public consultation is going to start very soon in terms of face-to-face public consultation. We can inform them as we move forward. We can tell them that the information from the stakeholders will be available after July 21. We can tell them that there will be a public survey that they can then weigh in on after that date, with a broad window. Again, if we did that after July 21, we would give them approximately six weeks to respond, again, a timeline that's been noted here by Parliamentary Counsel and our research and clerk's team.

I want to be well informed, I believe Albertans want to be well informed, and I don't believe that we will hold up our ability to have some face-to-face submissions and consultation with some key stakeholders by moving the date for public consultation to a later date because we will have a hard stop date on July 21, as we agreed upon here. Then we can move forward and set dates for that consultation.

Again, I really cannot support at all this hurry up on a public consultation. The public is more fickle and busy and distracted with

many different things. I think we owe it to them for them to be well informed and to then inform us for us to make the best decision.

Thank you.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, can I get in?

The Chair: Yeah. Just one sec.

Just being cognizant of the time for the committee, is it all right if we proceed briefly over time here as well? Okay.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, I heard all sides of the argument, and personally I'm not well informed on this. I also heard in the past that many Albertans told us that, you know, when we don't consult them adequately – we heard that when we were debating Bill 6 in the Leg. and when we were debating Bill 17. Albertans already have a perception that we're not consulting them enough on any of the important legislation, so I fully concur with Mr. Gotfried that we shouldn't be rushing this and we should allow time to do a good job on this. I can't support it as it is. I concur with Mr. Gotfried on this.

Thank you.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to speak?

Mr. Gotfried: I'd actually like to propose an amendment to this if I could. I'd like to amend it that the public consultation be extended to September 1.

The Chair: There's an amendment on the floor. I'll open it up for discussion.

Loyola: I'm trying to understand the rationale of the members from the opposition. By no means is this shutting down consultation. We have yet to have a conversation on what public meetings are going to look like in this process. I think that we need to look at this in stages, that we need written submissions to get an overall understanding from both stakeholders and the public on what their primary concerns and issues are and then, based on that, come up with further documents that would then give more light to how people are feeling about the issue and then move into public meetings with people where we can give them: these are the pros and cons; these are the details of everything.

This is not about shutting the consultation down on the 28th. This is about accepting written submissions until the 28th so that we can then carry on with the public consultation and have public meetings. As I already alluded to, we may want to hold one here in Edmonton, maybe one in Calgary, maybe one in some rural area. The public consultation would continue, you know, so these arguments that are saying that we're shutting the public consultation down are without merit. This is about process. This about written submissions first, then public meetings. I don't know how else to make that point. We need to move on to the conversation, which, to me, is more important, about how we're going to hold those public meetings, right?

So I speak against this amendment and encourage all members to vote against it.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chair, if I could.

The Chair: Mr. Taylor, go ahead.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, please. Thank you, Mr. Chair. What I believe Mr. Gotfried is saying and I'm saying is that we're not trying to shut down public consultations. That's not the intent. We want them to have as much information as possible, and with the timeline that we're given, I don't believe that they're going to be able to have as much time as needed to be able to have that fulsome discussion with

the public. Frankly, I have to agree with Mr. Gotfried. We should be setting this date for September 1, and that would be a better time frame than trying to rush it and not get it right. We need to make sure we get it right. If we're going to put any laws in, we want to make sure every time we put a law in that we get it right. I think that extra time is going to just help us.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to admit something here. Maybe I'm confused. Could somebody please define for me "public written submissions"?

Dr. Massolin: Well, typically they are submissions made by the public in writing with respect to their opinions or observations about a certain matter that's before, you know, a body, in this case a committee. That's how I'd summarize it.

Mr. Gotfried: Possibly a web survey with a free-form write-in portion to that as well?

Dr. Massolin: Yes, Mr. Chair. Through you to Mr. Gotfried, yes, definitely, it could be that if the committee chose that route, certainly.

Mr. Gotfried: So what I'm hearing here is that public written submissions will be closing on July 28. That could include the mechanism for us to have a survey with some fill-in, free-form opportunities for written submissions. I would then consider, based on the description here, that us going out to the public with a survey with some opportunities to have their own responses as opposed to just checking (a), (b), (c), or (d) would be considered as a written submission.

I would submit again to this committee that I want that process to be extended as long as I possibly can to pull in as much data – we will get some specific data from that response, from that survey, which I think will be highly informative and very important for us to see in terms of those neutrally written questions that we will have metrics and data to pull from. In addition to that, we will have some written comments, which we can then extract or have given to us or maybe summarized, as I think we've had before, where there are some common threads whereby we can do this.

So now we're going to cut that off on July 28 so that we can move it around our desks for another six weeks, maybe have some public consultations, which we may not be able to afford, which we haven't budgeted for at all in our plan to date. I'm not sure what a public consultation is. Does that mean we're going to rent some hall somewhere? We're going to go out and say: "Here's what we've heard from Albertans. Do you want to tell us any more?"

I would rather see us go out there with a well-informed, very robust website with some pros and cons. Maybe we have it exactly like that, pros and cons from some of our stakeholders, from some of our submissions, which I think will be very easy for us because we'll get submissions saying: "Go for it. This is exactly what we want." We'll have some saying: "You know, it sounds good, but this is what it's going to cost us. Here are the logistical problems." We can create a balance sheet. I know there are some challenges with balance sheets around here – we won't get into that – but maybe we can create those pros and cons with a balance sheet that says what we're going to do.

11:40

What I'm hearing is, "Let's hurry up the stakeholder consultation; let's hurry up the public written submissions" – i.e., this survey,

that I think could be not well informed – and then we're going to push that out so that we have more time to chew it around and, what it sounds like to me, maybe come up with some decisions at this table and then go back out to Albertans and say: "Well, this is what we've seen. This is what we've heard. Now do you endorse it?" I'd rather just hear from Albertans and allow us to have really robust data for us to make that recommendation back to the Legislature. This timeline is completely – Member Loyola, I don't get what you're saying here. What you're saying is that we need this so that we have more time, but what you're actually telling me, by supporting this motion, is that we're going to give Albertans less time so that we have more time. I just cannot support that.

Loyola: You're completely wrong in what I'm trying to state, Mr. Gotfried. What I'm trying to state – and I'll try to be as clear as possible through the chair to you – is that initial written submissions and collecting that data will then help us put together a survey. I see the process taking the reverse as you. Right now we don't have enough information to put a survey that I think would do justice to the Alberta public. By getting the written submissions now and putting the deadline as the 28th, that would then help inform how we would continue to consult with the Alberta public. The written submissions would give us a general idea.

We would then have a meeting, I suppose. We would then collect all the data. Parliamentary Counsel could then coalesce all that data. Then we would have an informed way of saying, "Okay; now let's put together a survey" or however which way we see that we could potentially reach out to the public and then have public meetings where individual stakeholders could all come together to this committee rather than going independently to other MLAs, where we're not sure that that information is going to come back to this table. At the end of the day, we want to make sure that all the data and information and opinions and issues and concerns are coming back to this table so that collectively as a committee we can make a decision and then make a recommendation to the Legislature.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, by the definition we've been given, the public written submissions could take the place of a survey. Then I just heard from the member that he wants to do surveys after July 28. Your motion is actually going to shut down public written submissions on July 28. Which do you want? Do you want to have public written submissions ending on July 28? If we vote on that, that's the way it's going to be. Or do you want to do surveys after July 28, which are by definition part of a public written submission? Do you want July 28 as the cut-off, or would you rather extend that to September 1 so that we have all the written submissions, including online surveys, done by September 1, which gives us the latitude at this committee to not break your motion?

Loyola: It would be completely up to this committee on how it would want to continue forward. What I'm stating is that written submissions are going to help us formulate how we continue having the conversation with Albertans. You know, contrary to what the opposition likes to say, it's really important to me and to us as a party that we consult on this. The public meetings are the ones that are really important, giving Albertans the opportunity to come forward to this committee to actually do presentations to us. I think that that's really important. That's the important part of it. The written submissions would help us formulate how we would continue having the conversation, and that's my interest. How the committee chooses to proceed is completely up to them.

Mr. Gotfried: By virtue of this motion you would limit public written submissions to July 28. Basically, then, you would have to reopen that file so that we would then have to approve at this

committee that we will actually allow further written submissions – i.e., online surveys – after that date. I think, you know, you brought it into it. You will be judged by your actions on this.

If you say July 28 is the cut-off for public written submissions and then you need to change it later, why do we not just amend that date? There's nothing to stop this committee from taking public written submissions received to date on July 28 and reviewing those and getting a snapshot, an update, of the data we have received to date on July 28. We can do that again on August 15. We can do that again on August 28, and we can do a final push out to people, saying: "We have received X number of thousands of surveys. We want to give all Albertans a last chance. September 1 is the cut-off deadline for that." Then we will have even more data.

Absolutely, you cannot tell me that what we receive by July 28 couldn't be much better if we went another four weeks past that, to September 1. Again, by some guidelines that we've been told, from July 21, the date for the stakeholder submissions, will give us a full six weeks to September 1. I think that is a respectful and logical time period, and there's nothing to stop us. If we are successful in driving a huge number of people to the surveys by July 28, great. If we can get another 25 or 50 per cent more by August 15, great. But why wouldn't we leave that open to September 1 with this committee being able to get an update on the data we receive to date, to make sure that we get the information?

I want the best information and as much information as I can get at this committee to make the best decision, and I would assume that everybody at this committee wants the same. By saying that July 28 is the cut-off – again, by the definition given to us, public written submissions could be somebody scrawling on the back of a napkin, or it could be them going to our website and completing our survey, which, again, will be done subject to the recommendations of the committee and the best minds we have here to get the kind of information we need to make the best decision.

I'm sorry; I'm hearing one thing, but it looks like the action here is going to be contrary to that, and you will be judged on your actions around the consultation.

The Chair: I'm going to move on to Mr. Dach, who's on the list, but before I do, just as a clarification and if it is the will of the committee to seek further information, you can make that judgment call as well as long as it's moved through a motion following that. As we do the next dates, it is of the will of the committee to move forward how they want to choose to do so.

Mr. Dach: I was just going to say that I think that members have expressed themselves clearly and amply on the matter and that we should move to a vote.

The Chair: Vote on the amendment? All right. On the amendment as proposed by Mr. Gotfried, I'll have Mr. Roth read it out for the record.

Mr. Roth: Moved by Mr. Gotfried that the motion be amended by striking out "July 28, 2017" and substituting "September 1, 2017."

The Chair: Having heard the motion . . .

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, may I ask for a recorded vote on this, please?

The Chair: I have to rule first, and then you can request that.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay.

The Chair: All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? The amendment is defeated.

Mr. Taylor: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: I will go for a recorded vote. We'll start with Mr. Gotfried, work our way around, and then I will poll those on the phone.

Mr. Gotfried: I vote yes.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, MLA. No.

Loyola: Rod Loyola, Edmonton-Ellerslie. No.

Dr. Turner: Dr. Turner, Edmonton-Whitemud. No.

Mr. Carson: No.

Ms McPherson: No.

Ms Fitzpatrick: No.

The Chair: All right. I will start with Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: Yes.

The Chair: Make sure you state your name for the record as well.

Mr. Panda: Prasad Panda. Yes.

Mr. Coolahan: Craig Coolahan. No.

Mr. Yao: Tany Yao. Yes.

Mr. Gill: Prab Gill. Yes.

Mr. Taylor: Wes Taylor. Yes.

Mr. van Dijken: Glenn van Dijken. Yes.

Drever: Member Drever. No.

11:50

The Chair: Mr. Roth, go ahead.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, total for the motion, six. Total against, eight.

The Chair: That amendment is defeated.

We are back on the original motion.

Seeing no one that's wishing to speak, I will call the question. Mr. Roth, if you can read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future solicit written submissions from the public in regard to its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, with a submission deadline of July 28, 2017.

The Chair: Having heard the motion, all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That motion is carried. Just for the record, recorded votes need to be called after my ruling.

Mr. Gotfried: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair: All right. We will start with Mr. Gotfried. Of course, please just for the record state your name and your position.

Mr. Gotfried: Richard Gotfried. No.

Mr. Dach: MLA Dach. Yes.

Loyola: Rod Loyola. Yes.

Dr. Turner: Bob Turner. Yes.

Mr. Carson: Jon Carson. Yes.

Ms McPherson: Karen McPherson, MLA, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill. Yes.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Maria Fitzpatrick, Lethbridge-East. Yes.

The Chair: And on the phones?

Mr. Panda: Calgary-Foothills. No.

Mr. Coolahan: Calgary-Klein. Yes.

Mr. Yao: Tany Yao. No.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Wes Taylor. No.

Mr. Gill: This is Prab Gill. No.

Mr. van Dijken: Glenn van Dijken. No.

Drever: Deborah Drever. Yes.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, total for the motion, eight. Total against, six.

The Chair: That motion is carried.

Hon. members, being cognizant of the time and from some of the conversations I've heard from many of the members that we are not in a position to make any decisions in relation to public meetings, I will defer that to the next meeting. I just want to make sure that we have consensus to defer that for the next meeting. Okay. I'm seeing yeses here.

With that, is there any other business that members wish to discuss?

Oh, sorry. I've missed one key point. My apologies. In relation to public submissions now committee members have made some decisions in relation to seeking feedback. I would now need approval for advertisements, as has been requested and sought out here. Again, any of the communications would be reviewed by the chair and deputy chair prior to approval of these advertisements as a motion I have proposed here. With that, I can open it up for discussions, or if someone would like to move a motion for public advertisements for submissions.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I so move.

The Chair: Okay. I have a proposed motion here. I'll get Mr. Roth to read it out for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve advertisements on behalf of the committee in its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, ensuring that said advertisements highlight that any submissions received may be made public by the committee.

The Chair: I'll open up that motion for discussion.

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question on the motion. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That motion is carried.

We'll move on to other business. Are there any other matters that members wish to bring up?

Seeing and hearing none, I'll call for a motion to adjourn. Moved by Member McPherson that this meeting be adjourned. All those in

favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. That motion is carried.

The meeting now stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 11:56 a.m.]

